

Contents

Chapter 12 Aesthetics	12-1
12.1 Introduction.....	12-1
12.1.1 Overview of the Chapter.....	12-1
12.2 Affected Environment.....	12-2
12.2.1 Affected Environment Common to All Systems	12-2
12.2.1.1 Regulatory Environment Common to All Systems	12-2
12.2.1.2 Treatment Plants	12-3
12.2.1.3 Conveyance Corridors	12-4
12.2.1.4 Outfalls.....	12-6
12.2.2 Affected Environment: Route 9 System	12-6
12.2.2.1 Treatment Plant: Route 9	12-6
Visual/Aesthetic Characteristics of the Route 9 Site.....	12-6
Visual/Aesthetic Setting of the Route 9 Site	12-6
Summary of Existing View Corridors and Major Visual Landmarks for the Route 9 Site.....	12-7
12.2.2.2 Conveyance: Route 9	12-8
Portals Common to Both Route 9 Corridors	12-8
Route 9–195th Street Corridor	12-9
Route 9–228th Street Corridor	12-10
12.2.2.3 Outfall: Route 9.....	12-10
12.2.3 Affected Environment: Unocal System	12-11
12.2.3.1 Treatment Plant: Unocal	12-11
Visual/Aesthetic Characteristics of the Unocal Site.....	12-11
Visual/Aesthetic Setting of the Unocal Site	12-11
Summary of Existing View Corridors and Major Visual Landmarks for the Unocal Site.....	12-12
12.2.3.2 Conveyance: Unocal	12-13
Primary Portals: Unocal Conveyance.....	12-13
Secondary Portals: Unocal Conveyance.....	12-13
12.2.3.3 Outfall: Unocal.....	12-13
12.3 Impacts and Mitigation	12-15
12.3.1 Treatment Plant Methodology	12-15
12.3.2 Conveyance Methodology	12-16
12.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems.....	12-18
12.3.3.1 Treatment Plant Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems	12-18
Construction Impacts Common to All Systems: Treatment Plant.....	12-18
Operation Impacts Common to All Systems: Treatment Plant	12-18
Mitigation Common to All Systems: Treatment Plant	12-19
12.3.3.2 Conveyance Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems	12-19
Construction Impacts Common to All Systems: Conveyance.....	12-19
Operation Impacts Common to All Systems: Conveyance	12-20
Proposed Mitigation Common to All Systems: Conveyance	12-22

12.3.3.3	Outfall Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems	12-25
	Construction Impacts Common to All Systems: Outfall	12-25
	Operation Impacts Common to All Systems: Outfall.....	12-25
	Proposed Mitigation Common to All Systems: Outfall.....	12-25
12.3.4	Impacts and Mitigation: Route 9 System.....	12-25
12.3.4.1	Treatment Plant: Route 9	12-25
	Construction Impacts: Route 9 Treatment Plant.....	12-25
	Operation Impacts: Route 9 Treatment Plant	12-26
	Proposed Mitigation: Route 9 Treatment Plant	12-27
	Potential Design Mitigation Options: Route 9 Treatment Plant.....	12-28
12.3.4.2	Conveyance: Route 9	12-29
	Construction Impacts: Route 9 Conveyance	12-29
	Operation Impacts: Route 9 Conveyance	12-30
	Potential Mitigation: Route 9 Conveyance.....	12-30
12.3.4.3	Route 9–195th Street Corridor.....	12-30
	Construction Impacts: Route 9–195th Street Corridor	12-30
	Operation Impacts: Route 9–195th Street Corridor.....	12-31
	Proposed Mitigation: Route 9–195th Street Corridor.....	12-31
12.3.4.4	Route 9–228th Street Corridor.....	12-32
	Construction Impacts: Route 9–228th Street Corridor	12-32
	Operation Impacts: Route 9–228th Street Corridor.....	12-32
	Proposed Mitigation: Route 9–228th Street Corridor.....	12-32
12.3.4.5	Outfall: Route 9.....	12-33
	Construction Impacts: Route 9 Outfall.....	12-33
	Operation Impacts: Route 9 Outfall.....	12-33
	Mitigation: Route 9 Outfall	12-33
12.3.5	Impacts and Mitigation: Unocal System.....	12-33
12.3.5.1	Treatment Plant: Unocal	12-33
	Construction Impacts: Unocal Treatment Plant.....	12-33
	Operation Impacts: Unocal Treatment Plant	12-34
	Proposed Mitigation: Unocal Treatment Plant	12-36
	Potential Design Mitigation Options: Unocal Treatment Plant.....	12-38
12.3.5.2	Conveyance: Unocal	12-39
	Construction Impacts: Unocal Conveyance	12-39
	Operation Impacts: Unocal Conveyance	12-40
	Proposed Mitigation: Unocal Conveyance.....	12-40
	Potential Mitigation: Unocal Conveyance.....	12-41
12.3.5.3	Outfall: Unocal.....	12-41
	Construction Impacts: Unocal Outfall.....	12-41
	Operation Impacts: Unocal Outfall.....	12-41
	Mitigation: Unocal Outfall	12-41
12.3.6	Impacts: No Action Alternative	12-41
12.3.6.1	Route 9 Site.....	12-42
12.3.6.2	Unocal Site.....	12-42
12.3.7	Cumulative Impacts	12-43
12.4	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	12-44
12.5	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation	12-45

List of Tables

Table 12-1. Above-ground Structures and Aesthetic Settings of Portal Siting Areas on
All Corridors 12-17

Table 12-2. Conveyance Corridor Typical Impact and Mitigation Figures 12-18

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for
Brightwater Systems 12-46

Chapter 12

Aesthetics

12.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the affected environment, impacts to the environment, mitigation measures, and significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to aesthetics for the proposed Brightwater System. The analyses of potential impacts are discussed in terms of compatibility and consistency with the existing regulatory and visual environment. Measures to eliminate or reduce potential impacts are provided, along with a description of several design mitigation options.

This chapter includes revisions based on comments received on the Draft EIS. Included in the text are impacts and mitigation measures that take into account new or modified project information. Please note that all figures cited within this chapter can be found at the end of the chapter.

12.1.1 Overview of the Chapter

The chapter organization has been modified for the Final EIS. The Affected Environment and Impacts and Mitigation sections have been reorganized, allowing for impacts and associated mitigation to be discussed together for each treatment plant system, which includes the treatment plant site, conveyance corridors, and outfall facilities. Also a description of impacts and mitigation common to all systems is presented at the beginning of the Impacts and Mitigation section.

Changes in the analysis and findings for this chapter are based on the review of development regulations and analysis of amended and updated treatment plant site layout and conveyance system planning as well as response to Draft EIS comments. The aesthetic/visual impact and mitigation analysis 3-D computer simulation figures were also regenerated and analyzed with findings and conclusions recorded.

Analysis of the conveyance system has been updated where more specific information has become available. Because of the large number of candidate portal sites, the conveyance routes were analyzed based on typical aesthetic settings found within the portal siting areas. Drawings have been developed to illustrate typical impacts and potential mitigation approaches within those settings. This analysis appears within the sections of the chapter titled Affected Environment and Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems.

In response to comments on the Draft EIS, revisions to this chapter were made in the following areas:

- For those jurisdictions and communities with Brightwater System facilities and sites within their designated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), the applicable aesthetic standards and guidelines were examined.
- More detail on the plans and policies associated with City of Edmond's Downtown Waterfront Activity Center Area and City of Woodinville's UGA industrial area overlay for the Unocal and Route 9 sites has been added.
- Through the project description and illustrations, this chapter evaluates the type, location, general shape, height, mass and bulk, and topographic position of each of the proposed facilities within each site.
- Impact and mitigation sketches of the various above-ground portal structures are now included in this chapter to address requests for more analysis of above-ground facilities at portal siting areas.

12.2 Affected Environment

This section describes existing aesthetic conditions, focusing on the visual quality of the alternative sites and conveyance corridors for the Brightwater System.

12.2.1 Affected Environment Common to All Systems

The affected environment common to all systems includes regulatory environment and an overall aesthetic environment common to the treatment plant sites, conveyance corridors, and outfall zones.

12.2.1.1 Regulatory Environment Common to All Systems

Aesthetics and visual settings are regulated by local jurisdictions in their local land use plans, policies, and zoning codes. These documents often establish visual and aesthetic standards for such things as:

- Building and structure height and mass
- Offsite light and glare
- Landscape screening, buffering, and enhancement
- Significant tree identification, preservation, and removal
- Building setbacks from property lines
- Compatibility with surrounding land use character

Aesthetic standards for new construction at the Unocal site, including height, bulk, articulation, and setbacks, would be reviewed under the City of Edmonds Comprehensive Plan—Downtown Waterfront Activity Center Area goals and policies—and the Master Plan Hillside Mixed Use 1 and 2 zones established for this site. Amended and extensive review of aesthetic standards under any rezone, variance, or conditional use of the site can be anticipated. Refer to Chapter 11 for a detailed discussion of existing regulatory policies and procedures associated with facility land use and zoning requirements. Specific aesthetic design criteria are found in the City of Edmonds Community Development Code in the chapters on Architectural Design Review.

Aesthetic standards for development at the Route 9 site, including height, bulk, articulation, and setbacks for new construction are found in the Snohomish County Municipal Code, Title 30 Unified Development Code.

Guidelines for construction of new, above-ground structures along the conveyance corridors are found in municipal or zoning codes of local jurisdictions. Snohomish County, Edmonds, Woodway, Mountlake Terrace, Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Brier, and Bothell implement specific design guidelines for the appropriate height, bulk, landscaping, setbacks/buffers, fences, and signage of new structures according to the zoning designation of the property. Design of the above-ground portal facilities along the identified conveyance corridors, including the new pump station at Portal Siting Area 11 for the Unocal corridor, would be subject to specific design guidelines of the local jurisdiction. These aesthetic codes and standards for the treatment plant sites and conveyance corridors are discussed in the Impacts and Mitigation section of this chapter.

12.2.1.2 Treatment Plants

Treatment plants and sites have been examined and evaluated within established aesthetic standards and visual design principles. Aesthetic standards, codes, and criteria are derived principally from the visual sensory preferences of a community and from design principles based on the technical characteristics of views, such as neighborhood character; the type, scale and texture of nearby buildings and vegetation; and valued visual landmarks or views. Within this regulatory and review context sit key aesthetic evaluative frameworks, including site settings, view corridors, and viewpoints.

View corridors are continuous composite views of a site either along a linear path or across an expanse. They are defined by their direction or orientation, extent of site/route exposure (the vertical and horizontal range), and clarity of visual access (the likely position, elevation and distance relative to site, and speed of the viewer, such as from a vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian, or static position).

Viewpoints are locations from which the site can be seen, sometimes defining a specific point within a view corridor. They are defined as either “onsite” or “offsite.” The two types of offsite viewpoints are those that are nearby or adjacent to the site (within one-quarter mile) and those viewpoints that are distant (beyond one-quarter mile).

The site setting encompasses the visual land use and environmental character of the “natural and cultural landscape image” surrounding a site. This site setting is characterized, along with the site, by its relationship to associated view corridors and viewpoints.

12.2.1.3 Conveyance Corridors

The conveyance corridors, which include both influent and effluent conveyance (Route 9 System) and portal sites, pass through a variety of natural and urban landscapes. Visual/aesthetic characterization of the conveyance corridors is complex due to the scope of the proposed routes, size of the portal siting areas, and the wide range of topography, land use, and vegetative elements present within each of the three corridors. The following is a brief discussion of major visual features along the alternative conveyance corridors and a description of the typical types of aesthetic settings through which conveyance passes.

The proposed conveyance corridors pass through mature and emerging suburban communities and residential environments within King and Snohomish Counties. Land use within these communities largely dictates the visual character. The older, more established communities along the conveyance corridor include the Cities of Bothell, Lake Forest Park, and Edmonds.

Shoreline, Kenmore, and Mountlake Terrace include long-established commercial areas, as well as areas where development is increasing in density. Lake Washington provides a major visual landmark along the conveyance corridor, in addition to numerous streams, forested areas, and other natural features that provide visual definition. The highest density of commercial development occurs adjacent to the major roadways in the area, including SR-522 and SR-104. Much of the commercial development along these roadways could be characterized as “strip commercial.”

Portals would be located on sites within the identified 72-acre portal siting areas along the conveyance routes. The density of development of the sites varies, but portals would generally be located in developed areas that contain some open space either in the form of large parking lots, vacant lots, recreational fields or open or wooded private land. In general, existing buildings are five stories or less and most are one to three stories or under 45 feet tall. Most portal siting areas are also bisected in some way by arterial streets. Many of the views into the identified sites would be from those roadways.

Primary and secondary portals are in the same type of affected environments and therefore have not been differentiated within the aesthetic settings categories. There are no common secondary portals between the three alternative conveyance routes. The common primary portals are addressed under the discussion for each Brightwater System.

Because of the range of potential portal sites within the 72-acre portal siting areas, four typical aesthetic settings have been identified for the purpose of this analysis. The

following settings describe the majority of sites within the portal siting areas, based on both aesthetics and land use characteristics:

- Commercial strip
- Business park
- Suburban/rural residential
- Industrial area

See Chapter 11 for specific land use information for the portal sites.

Some typical characteristics of each type of aesthetic setting are described below. Photographs in Figures 12-1 to 12-4 are intended to show a typical aesthetic setting and do not represent an actual proposed portal site:

Commercial Strip (Figure 12-1)

- One-to two-story buildings typically set side-by-side with a uniform setback.
- Setbacks are either minimal, creating a more urban, roadside “strip” or, in more suburban environments, setbacks are maximized to provide parking between buildings and roads.
- Sidewalks and other urban amenities such as benches, street lamps, and trash receptacles are typically provided.
- Signage is often a large visual element of building facades.

Business Park (Figure 12-2)

- Three- to seven-story buildings, typically concrete or steel construction with large areas of glass. Some parks include masonry structures as well.
- Large open parking areas surrounding clusters of buildings.
- Fairly open but consistent landscaping that includes areas of lawn, shrubbery and some trees.
- Some signage often placed on building façade or in entry landscaping.

Suburban/Rural Residential (Figure 12-3)

- One- to three-story buildings typically set partway back on lots that are often similarly sized within a given community.
- Lots vary from quarter-acre suburban to large open or wooded “rural” lots.
- Vegetation varies from dense mature woods in rural areas to more open but mature plantings in established neighborhoods to new and emerging landscapes in newer developments. Vacant lots are wooded, meadow, or a combination.

Industrial (Figure 12-4)

- One- to three-story buildings typically set back on large lots, surrounded by open areas.
- Open areas vary from large open lots to narrow loading zones; paved to gravel, clear to cluttered with storage and equipment.
- Vegetation includes sporadic trees and planting strips.
- Streetscapes are designed for large vehicles, rather than pedestrian activity.

12.2.1.4 Outfalls

The outfall zones are located within Puget Sound. Adjacent shoreline areas are dominated by steep wooded bluffs that rise above sandy beaches. Railroad tracks separate the shoreline from the bluffs. Historic and current industrial land uses have provided locally dominant visual features adjacent to the outfall zone.

12.2.2 Affected Environment: Route 9 System**12.2.2.1 Treatment Plant: Route 9**

Existing aesthetic conditions at the Route 9 site were characterized for the site itself, the site setting, existing view corridors, and major visual landmarks. Figure 12-5 is a key map of the photographically recorded viewpoints of the Route 9 site and setting.

Visual/Aesthetic Characteristics of the Route 9 Site

The Route 9 site is largely an industrial landscape of auto recycling yards, barrier fencing and gates, storage and distribution centers, and manufacturing/distribution buildings and uses (Figure 12-6). This industrial landscape covers approximately 64 percent of the central and southern portions of the site. The northern portion of the site is largely open wetland, grasslands, and mixed forest. Because the site rises from west to east on slopes averaging 10 percent grade with raised terraces, much of the industrial land use is clearly visible from offsite vantages, especially along the SR-9 highway, which runs north and south along the entire length of the site's western property line.

Visual/Aesthetic Setting of the Route 9 Site

The offsite setting west of the Route 9 site is defined by SR-9, intersecting roadways (228th Street SE and 233rd Place SE), and industrial storage yards and small manufacturing buildings visible to the southwest. Houses are located in and around the edges of Little Bear Creek, but are largely screened from the site by trees. To the north,

the visual setting is characterized by rolling open pastureland, including horse paddocks and farm-type buildings. The visual setting to the east of the site is defined by a layer of mixed forest buffer and a hillside within the right-of-way margins of both the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad and SR-522. Farther east are extensive forested ridgelines and ridge side slopes. To the south is a forested grove within the rights-of-way of SR-522 and the BNSF railroad line (which travels along the southern and eastern edge of the site) and the SR-9/SR-522 interchange and bridge. Directly southeast of the site are the forested slopes and ridgeline of the Wellington Hills Golf Course.

Summary of Existing View Corridors and Major Visual Landmarks for the Route 9 Site

Almost all view corridors into the Route 9 site are from viewpoints along SR-9 looking from west to east and from south to north.

At the raised grade of the SR-9/SR-522 Bridge, the site is almost entirely visible (Figure 12-6). This view corridor is oriented northward over the auto recycling yards and extends to the large food manufacturing and distribution buildings in the north central portion of the site. The viewpoint at the 233rd Place SE intersection of SR-9 has a view corridor extending east to the southern auto recycling yards on the site (Figure 12-7). The viewpoint at the 228th Street SE intersection with SR-9 (Figure 12-8) has a view corridor that extends east to the central food manufacturing, distribution, and storage buildings on the site and some internal tree groupings around the auto recycling yards in this area.

Viewpoints and view corridors associated with north and south movement along the SR-9 highway (Figure 12-9) provide several open views to much of the site, including the northern grassland/forested area and upper elevation portions of the auto recycling yards. From 228th Street SE, due to its east/west orientation directly toward the site's central area and elevated approach from the west, there are increasingly distinct site views as the viewer approaches the 228th Street SE and SR-9 intersection (Figure 12-8). However, because of the mature evergreen forest vegetation lining the 228th Street SE corridor, these views of the site are very narrowly defined even at the highest elevations of the street. In addition, the viewer is further away and the viewed site image is proportionately decreased with more distance between the viewer and the site.

Other areas with potential views of the site are either oriented away from the site or are screened by vegetation and landforms. These areas include the SR-522 highway (Figure 12-10), rural residential areas along the Wellington Hills and 75th Avenue SE ridgeline (Figure 12-11), the east facing slopes and ridgeline of the western hills, and the open pastureland to the north of the site.

On the site, the StockPot Culinary Campus, the Opus office and distribution buildings, the auto recycling yards, and the new concrete Opus buildings are visual landmarks that are identifiable to varying degrees while driving along SR-9. The north edge of the site is marked by a wetland and stream area and a large stand of trees, while the southern and

eastern edges of the site are visually delineated by mixed deciduous and evergreen tree masses. Nearby offsite landmarks are limited to the SR-9/SR-522 Bridge and interchange and other SR-9 intersections immediately adjacent to the site.

12.2.2.2 Conveyance: Route 9

The influent corridor, which is the same for both Route 9 corridor options, has a wide variety of interspersed uses within its portal siting areas. The aesthetics of the various neighborhood types and other commonalities between the three alternatives are discussed in the section titled Affected Environment Common to All Systems.

In addition to the aesthetic characterizations described earlier for all systems, the visual character and setting along the effluent portions of the 195th Street and 228th Street corridors include the ridgeline and valley, the rolling terrain, open view corridors from the street rights-of-way, and views framed by mature trees bordering the roadway. Some primary portal siting areas along both of these corridors are within single-family and multi-family residential areas with some commercial and service activities and a few vacant lots interspersed. There are numerous local landmarks such as roadway intersections, major business parks and commercial centers, and community service nodes; both corridors are more densely developed to the west.

Portals Common to Both Route 9 Corridors

Portal Siting Area 11 is a primary portal and the only portal siting area common to all conveyance routes. It is characterized by a mix of commercial and industrial buildings, with storage and parking interspersed between the buildings, and an existing pump station at the center of the 72-acre circle. Views into the candidate portal sites are primarily off NE Bothell Way and Juanita Drive/68th Avenue NE.

Portal Siting Areas 19, 41, and 44 are common primary portals for both Route 9 alternatives. Portal Siting Areas 41 and 44 are both part of the planned influent route. Portal Siting Area 41 is primarily a mix of commercial, office and service uses, and a few recreational parks. Buildings are either relatively large in scale or clustered together (i.e., residential structures). Streets are typically tree lined with parking, parks and/or other open space separating buildings. Identified sites within this area are likely to fit into the commercial aesthetic setting category.

Portal Siting Area 44 is largely single-family residential with mature trees and some larger agricultural structures in the southwest quadrant. Residential areas are denser to the west of 80th Ave NE, particularly along NE 195th Street; however, stands of trees and open space occur throughout the siting area. Identified sites in this portal siting area best fit into the residential aesthetic setting category.

Portal Siting Area 19 is adjacent to Puget Sound, on the border of King and Snohomish Counties. It is bisected by the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad, which

runs along the coastline. The northeast portion of the siting area, on the waterfront, is a flat, industrial site on the south edge of the Chevron Richmond Beach Asphalt Terminal and bulk fuel storage facility at Point Wells. A steep, wooded slope rises to the east of the railroad tracks in the northeast quadrant of the siting area where the setting becomes more residential. The slopes level off to the south, where the aesthetic setting is primarily residential.

There are no common secondary portals between the Route 9–195th Street and 228th Street corridors.

Route 9–195th Street Corridor

Primary Portals

Primary portals along the 195th Street corridor include Portal Siting Areas 5, 11, 19, 41, and 44. Portal Siting Areas 11, 19, 41, and 44 are discussed in the previous section, under Portals Common to Both Route 9 Corridors.

Portal Siting Area 5 is characterized by a mix of single-family and multi-family residential and some neighborhood commercial. Commercial buildings are generally clustered together with parking facing Ballinger Way, which passes through the middle of the siting area and intersects Interstate 5 at its east edge. Residential areas have smaller scale buildings and more trees than the commercial areas and tend to be further from Ballinger Way within this portal area. Each of the candidate sites identified within the siting area is adjacent to Ballinger Way on one side. Candidate sites in this portal siting area fit into the residential or commercial aesthetic setting categories.

Secondary Portals

The 195th Street corridor secondary portals (Portal Siting Areas 7, 23, 27, and 45) partially or primarily fit into the residential aesthetic setting. Portal Siting Areas 23 and 45 also have portions that could be categorized as a commercial setting. In addition, Portal Siting Areas 7 and 27 have significant parks and recreational areas and a cemetery that serve as green space. Secondary portals are not expected to be used.

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option

The affected environment for the Route 9–195th Street Corridor IPS Option is the same as that described for Portal Siting Area 41, described under Portals Common to Both Route 9 Corridors.

Route 9–228th Street Corridor

Primary Portals

Primary portals along the 228th Street corridor include Portal Siting Areas 11, 19, 26, 33, 39, 41, and 44. Portal Siting Areas 11, 19, 41, and 44 are discussed above under Portals Common to Both Route 9 Corridors.

Portal Siting Area 26 is characterized by a mix of mostly single-family and multi-family residential, with interspersed parks, recreational spaces, and commercial sites. The siting area is bisected around its southwest quadrant by 228th Street SW, which is flanked by residential properties with a large stand of mature trees, and Lakeview Drive, which has primarily multi-family residential and open space on either side.

Portal Siting Area 33 consists primarily of residential development and open space, either in the form of woods, waterways or agricultural lots, mixed with a few commercial sites. Development is denser to the east of Locust Way. Locust Way and 228th Street SW divide the site into four areas of varied size. Lots to the northeast and along the east edge of the siting area tend to be smaller and clustered together. The larger lots to the west are interspersed with the open areas described above.

Portal Siting Area 39 is also primarily residential with some vacant lots and neighborhood services. This portal siting area is also bisected by arterials, with the smaller lots generally on those streets.

Secondary Portals

Secondary portals along the 228th Street corridor, Portal Siting Areas 22, 24, 30, and 37, are also primarily residential settings. Portal Siting Areas 24 and 37 each have at least one strip of commercial development. Secondary portals are not expected to be used.

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option

The affected environment for the Route 9–228th Street Corridor IPS Option is the same as that described for the Route 9–195th Street Corridor above.

12.2.2.3 Outfall: Route 9

Zone 7S is located in Puget Sound, adjacent to Chevron Richmond Beach Asphalt Terminal. The site character is industrial, with existing tanks along the shoreline and a dock extending into Puget Sound. Railroad tracks separate the Chevron Richmond Beach Asphalt Terminal from a steeply sloped and densely vegetated hillside.

There is no public beach access from the Point Wells facility. Residences along the hillside to the south of Point Wells can view existing site fencing and tanks. Views from the shoreline area in the vicinity of Zone 7S span Puget Sound to include Whidbey Island and the Olympic Mountain Range in the distance. There is no marina in Zone 7S. Users

of the City of Shoreline's Richmond Beach Park can view the outfall zone, although the Chevron Richmond Beach Asphalt Terminal dominates the shoreline view in this area.

12.2.3 Affected Environment: Unocal System

12.2.3.1 Treatment Plant: Unocal

The existing visual/aesthetic conditions of the Unocal site were characterized according to the site, the site setting, and the existing view corridors. Refer to Figure 12-12 showing a key map of photographically recorded views of the Unocal site and setting.

Visual/Aesthetic Characteristics of the Unocal Site

The Unocal site is characterized as an industrialized landscape resulting from the development and ultimate removal of a former bulk fuel terminal or "tank farm," a term that refers to a cluster of storage tanks. Tank terraces, access roads, operations buildings, and pipeline structures were constructed primarily on the north-facing slope of the hillside above Edwards Point. For nearly 80 years, from 1922 to 2001, the tanks of the Unocal bulk fuel terminal tank farm were set within several earthen terraces on the site; the tanks have been removed, but the terraces remain. The City of Edmonds recently purchased a small waterfront portion of the site for a public park. This park is currently in use.

The Unocal site is visible from a variety of viewpoints because there is a 165-foot elevation change from the lowest point near Edmonds Marsh and Willow Creek to the highest point along the southern property line, effectively putting these hillside terraces on display to most northern vantages. The grade of internal site slopes and terraces ranges from shallow to very steep and further defines the man-made terraced character of the site.

Mixed forest vegetation is present on the site's central slopes between the tank farm terraces and the lowland flats to the north. Lower stands of vegetation are also visible on the site's northern and eastern perimeter and in the Edmonds Marsh, Willow Creek, and Deer Creek Hatchery areas. Areas of the site that are cleared, exposed, and non-vegetated cover approximately 32 acres, or approximately 60 percent of the site. A 1,000-foot-long pipeline trestle and dock extends westward from the site, over the railroad line, and out into Puget Sound.

Visual/Aesthetic Setting of the Unocal Site

Wetland and riparian vegetation of Edmonds Marsh and Willow and Shelleberger Creeks are seen immediately to the north of the site. A business park bounds the marsh on the north. The view from the Unocal site to the business park is partially blocked by trees,

but most of the buildings in the business park, nearest the Unocal site, can be seen from the Unocal site. Further away to the north and northwest are the low-rise condominiums of downtown Edmonds and single-family homes on the slopes of the bowl-shaped landform around Edmonds Marsh. SR-104/Edmonds Way and 3rd Avenue South border the site on the east with the mature evergreen woods of Edmonds City Park as a background. South of the site, the City of Woodway and the residential neighborhood around Chinook, Nootka, and Makah streets are blocked from view by tall trees along the ridgeline that borders the site. Where there are views outward from these residences they are primarily oriented to the west over Puget Sound or to the east over south downtown and Edmonds neighborhoods. To the west, the BNSF railroad tracks provide a linear visual feature along the shoreline. Admiral Way, the Edmonds Marina, and associated port/marina views include the roofs of covered moorage and masts of sailboats.

Summary of Existing View Corridors and Major Visual Landmarks for the Unocal Site

The Unocal site is visible from several offsite western, northern, and eastern view corridors and viewpoints. Viewpoints from the south, at the high point of the hillside, are almost exclusively from on or near the site's property line, looking over the site to the more distant Puget Sound and Olympic Peninsula (Figure 12-13).

From the northeast and east along Edmonds Way (Figure 12-14) the site is clearly visible, and from the southeast, also along Edmonds Way, the site is partially visible through the marsh and stream vegetation. Views from this vantagepoint are mostly blocked in summer when all the trees have foliage (view access is increased in winter following leaf drop of marshland deciduous trees and shrubs). The northern edge of Edmonds Marsh between the business park and the Edmonds Marsh interpretive viewpoint (Figure 12-15) allows full views of the site from both cars and pedestrian traffic. From the west, the site is visible from boats and ferries on Puget Sound; from passenger and commercial railroad trains on the BNSF railroad tracks; and from Admiral Way, Edmonds Marina, and Beach Park (Figures 12-16 and 12-17).

Distant view corridors to the site are from City of Edmonds neighborhoods from just above downtown to the east ridgeline (Figure 12-18) and the water (ferries, passenger ships, pleasure craft, and fishing and transport vessels, Figure 12-19). Views from the neighborhoods are more prevalent from mid-slope vantagepoints and from higher vantagepoints north of Edmonds City Park.

There are many visual landmarks in the site vicinity. The site itself is a major landmark due to its visibility as a prominent hillside above the Edwards Point shoreline and Edmonds Marsh and as an historic industrial landscape with "tank farm" terraces and the remaining pipeline trestle extending out of the hillside over into Puget Sound. Other landmarks include the Edmonds Marsh and associated Shelleberger and Willow Creeks and the Port of Edmonds Marina and waterfront. The BNSF railroad tracks provide a linear visual feature along the shoreline. The mature evergreen fir trees of Edmonds City Park dominate views along 3rd Avenue South and SR-104.

12.2.3.2 Conveyance: Unocal

See Chapter 11 for a more complete description of the specific land uses along the Unocal corridor and within each portal siting area.

The Unocal alternative follows the SR-522/Ballinger Way corridor for more of the route than the Route 9 alternatives, and follows the SR-104 corridor at the far west end. The east end of the Unocal route feels less rural than the east end of the Route 9 routes, perhaps due to its closer proximity to the east-west waterways out of the north end of Lake Washington, an area which was developed earlier than the land further to the north. In general the Unocal alternative, like the Route 9 alternatives, passes through both residential areas and commercial districts. Density and commercial activity increase near transportation hubs such as the SR-522/I-405 interchange and the I-5/ Ballinger Way node and city centers such as Bothell at the north end of Lake Washington and Edmonds at the far west end of the route.

Primary Portals: Unocal Conveyance

Portal Siting Areas 3, 7, 11, and 14 are primary portals for the Unocal corridor. See the section titled Affected Environment Common to All Systems for a discussion of Portal Siting Area 11 and common characteristics of the affected aesthetic settings. Portal Siting Areas 3 and 7 are primarily residential settings with some commercial characteristics and some recreational parks. Most of the commercial development in Portal Siting Area 7 is located along Ballinger Way, which crosses southeast to northwest and is flanked by trees to the south. Portal Siting Area 14 includes larger scale buildings associated with business parks and light industry, as well as recreational parks and an open, but partially wooded undeveloped area to the south. Residential, commercial or business park settings would be appropriate categorizations for various sites in these portal siting areas.

Secondary Portals: Unocal Conveyance

The majority of secondary Portals 5 and 13 are commercial strip environment, although a portion of each is residential. Portal Siting Areas 10 and 12 primarily fit into the category of residential aesthetic setting, although small portions of Portal Siting Area 10 can be characterized as commercial strip.

12.2.3.3 Outfall: Unocal

Zone 6 is located in Puget Sound, west of the City of Edmonds. The adjacent shoreline includes Marina Beach Park (a popular city park with beach access), the Edmonds Marina, and a steep vegetated bluff separated from the shoreline by railroad tracks. The view landward from the shoreline is of a steep vegetated bluff. From the park area, views include the Edmonds Marina to the north and the Chevron Richmond Beach Asphalt Terminal to the south. The existing Unocal conveyor dock is a dominant visual feature.

Refer to the discussion of the Unocal site, above, for a description of the views in the vicinity of the outfall zone. Views from the shoreline area in the vicinity of Zone 6 span Puget Sound to include Whidbey Island and the Olympic Mountain Range in the distance.

12.3 Impacts and Mitigation

12.3.1 Treatment Plant Methodology

For the alternative Brightwater Treatment Plant sites, conveyance corridors, and outfall zones, visual and aesthetic characterizations and assessments were conducted through:

- Review and evaluation of historic photographs and descriptions
- Review and evaluation of contemporary aerial photographs
- In-the-field observations and records (photographic and digital images) from both onsite and offsite viewpoints and view corridors over a one-year period beginning in 2001

Aesthetic impacts were further assessed for the Unocal and Route 9 sites by:

- Developing a three-dimensional computer image simulation model of each treatment plant site and then analyzing its aesthetic impacts from each key viewpoint associated with each site. These 3-D models were developed directly from the project description of each facility for each treatment plant site and therefore follow the same level of detail and design development of those descriptions. The 3-D model image is a representation or illustration of a conceptual level treatment plant design—not final design.
- Identifying and analyzing aesthetic impacts generated by the treatment plant in relation to the local jurisdiction’s regulatory standards governing aesthetics and design.
- Examining the compatibility of the treatment plant layout with surrounding land uses and associated viewpoints and view corridors.

Mitigation measures to address the aesthetic impacts identified are proposed under each of the treatment plant site alternatives. Additionally, mitigation measures identified as “design mitigation options” are described to provide decision makers with different approaches to address visual impacts related to the siting and design of the treatment plant. Each treatment plant site is discussed individually.

Public and agency comments from the SEPA scoping process on descriptions of the candidate treatment plant facilities and sites were used to identify, confirm, and clarify all elements of the environment to be included in the EIS. Additional information was incorporated from King County’s Brightwater Community Design Guidelines Workshops that were conducted for both candidate treatment plant sites. A summary of the workshop process and draft design guidelines for each treatment plant site was included as an appendix to the Draft EIS (Appendix 12-A, Visual Mitigation Concepts: Brightwater

System). This input was used to identify, confirm, and clarify characteristics and qualities of existing conditions, environmental context, and environmental impacts for both sites and to help direct the development of visual mitigation recommendations and mitigation options.

Design mitigation options were developed through a multi-step process, including responding to the site analysis, impact, and design guideline findings of the Brightwater community design workshops. First, the mitigation team explored the social, cultural, and aesthetic background of each of the treatment plant sites. Next, three different mitigation approaches were prepared for the long-term mitigation of each treatment plant site:

- Option 1 – Expose the treatment plant to view by revealing and enhancing the primary elements of the treatment plant and site, including natural resources, landform, buildings, structures, and processes.
- Option 2 – Hide the treatment plant from view, through camouflaging, diminishing, or screening the primary elements of the treatment plant and site.
- Option 3 – Blend both the “expose” and “hide” options into a mitigation design that selectively and compositionally reveals certain structural elements and conceals other elements of the treatment plant and site.

Refinements in Final EIS findings and conclusions are based on review of development regulations and analysis of amended and updated treatment plant site layout and conveyance system planning as well as responses to Draft EIS comments. Each of the aesthetic/visual impact and mitigation analysis 3-D computer simulation figures was also regenerated and analyzed with findings and conclusions recorded.

12.3.2 Conveyance Methodology

Conveyance corridor impacts were assessed through the application of a broad visual review and evaluation of conveyance system impacts on typical aesthetic conditions and characteristics associated with the candidate conveyance route environments.

Mitigation measures to address all the conveyance corridors are combined and discussed under one section. No aesthetic impact mitigation measures are proposed for the outfall sites.

The primary visual impact for the conveyance routes during operation would be the presence of above-ground structures at primary portals. Therefore, assessment consisted of analysis of which building types were proposed for which portal siting areas, and how those siting areas might suggest mitigation approaches.

Four likely aesthetic settings were identified to describe the typical affected environments along the conveyance routes proposed: business park, strip commercial, suburban/rural residential, and industrial. See the Affected Environment Common to All Systems section for further description of the aesthetic settings. These prototypes represent much of the

land use and visual character in the identified conveyance routes and served as a means to apply mitigation to identified impacts. See Table 12-1 for information on the buildings planned and settings identified for each portal.

Table 12-1. Above-ground Structures and Aesthetic Settings of Portal Siting Areas on All Corridors

System	Portal Siting Area	Portal Type	Planned Above Ground Structures	Aesthetic Setting
Route 9				
Common to both Route 9 corridors				
	11	P	Odor Control & Electrical	Industrial; Commercial; Residential
	19	P	-	Industrial; Residential
	41	P	Odor Control & Electrical	Business Park; Commercial; Park
	44	P	Odor Control & Electrical	Residential; Commercial
195th Street corridor only				
	5	P	Odor Control, Electrical, & Dechlorination	Commercial; Residential
	7, 27	S	-	Residential; Open & Community spaces
	23, 45	S	-	Residential; Commercial & Community spaces
228th Street corridor only				
	26	P	Odor Control, Electrical, and Dechlorination	Residential & Commercial; Park
	33	P	-	Residential
	39	P	-	Residential; office park, light industrial
	22, 30,	S	-	Residential; Open/Community spaces.
	24, 37	S	-	Residential; Commercial
Unocal corridor				
	11	P	Odor Control, Electrical, & New Pump Station	Industrial; Commercial; Res.
	7	P	Odor Control & Electrical	Residential; Commercial; Park
	14	P	Odor Control & Electrical	Office Park/industrial
	3	P	-	Residential
	5, 13	S	-	Commercial w/ some Residential, industrial
	10, 12	S	-	Residential w/ some Commercial

P= Primary Portal Site

S= Secondary Portal Site

Diagrammatic sketches of the potential impact of each of the proposed building types, based on footprint and height information, were drawn within the typical aesthetic settings. Mitigation strategies were then applied to the “impact” structures to illustrate one potential way in which the structures could be designed to fit into the settings. The buildings were paired with their most likely setting and each building type and each aesthetic setting is represented at least once. These pairings give an idea of the scale of the buildings’ impacts and a potential design response. Table 12-2 outlines the impact and mitigation figures that have been developed to illustrate typical structures within likely aesthetic settings.

Table 12-2. Conveyance Corridor Typical Impact and Mitigation Figures

Aesthetic Setting	Structure	Impact Figure	Mitigation Figure
Commercial Strip	Odor Control, Electrical and Dechlorination Facilities	12-20	12-21
Business Park	Odor Control and Electrical Facility	12-22	12-23
Suburban/Rural Residential	Odor Control and Electrical Facility	12-24	12-25
Industrial	Odor Control and Electrical Facility and Pump Station	12-26	12-27

12.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems

12.3.3.1 Treatment Plant Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems

Construction Impacts Common to All Systems: Treatment Plant

The description of the aesthetic impacts is specific to the alternatives. While there are impacts that are common to the treatment plants, conveyance corridors, and outfall zones in general, the individual site conditions and corresponding facility plans vary sufficiently to require site-specific analysis. Impacts described in subsequent sections of this chapter for each alternative system include impacts to visual and aesthetic setting, view corridors, and landmarks.

Operation Impacts Common to All Systems: Treatment Plant

The discussion of operational impacts is specific to each site because of the unique nature of each site and its setting. Impacts to aesthetic settings, view corridors, and major visual

landmarks are discussed in subsequent sections of this chapter for each alternative system.

Mitigation Common to All Systems: Treatment Plant

Because of the unique nature of the impacts at each of the treatment plant sites, mitigation of visual impacts is discussed for the individual systems below.

12.3.3.2 Conveyance Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems

Construction Impacts Common to All Systems: Conveyance

Primary Portals

The portal construction sites would be located within the identified 72-acre portal siting areas. Construction sites could present temporarily significant aesthetic alterations, particularly if portal sites are closely surrounded by residential or commercial development. For example, portals and microtunnel pits would be open to view from neighborhoods and/or from local roads as would short distances (100 to 2,500 feet) of open-cut construction methods.

Aesthetic impacts of below-ground construction could include large pits, piles of soil, site lighting, and construction equipment and removal of existing mature vegetation or structures on the construction site. Tunneling would avoid major aesthetic impacts along much of the routes, but other methods of construction within road rights-of-way (primarily open-cut), which might be used to connect to existing sewer systems, would be largely visible from those roadways for the duration of construction.

Those sites with permanent structures would likely have a somewhat higher construction impact—more materials, more above-ground work, and more time to construct the structures. The scale and type of visual impact at each site would depend on site conditions, the scale of the structure, and whether the final structure is above or below ground.

Secondary Portals

Construction impacts for secondary portals are similar to those described for primary portals with below-ground structures in this section; however, impacts would be less because of the small size of the site required (less than one-half acre), and reduced construction duration (six months or less). Secondary portals are not expected to be used at all, and thus would have no construction impacts.

Operation Impacts Common to All Systems: Conveyance

Primary Portals

Potential aesthetic operational impacts to the primary portals are mainly associated with the long-term operation of permanent above-ground facilities. Such permanent above-ground conveyance facilities would be located within the identified portal siting areas (see Table 12-1) and may be located adjacent to view corridors. Figures showing the location of portal siting areas are provided in Chapter 3. Most of the view corridors with the potential to be affected by conveyance operation are within existing roadway, street, or highway corridors. New structures are the principal impact within the portals although the removal of structures and vegetation would also alter the views into and out of the sites.

Three basic building types would be constructed as permanent above-ground structures at primary portals: odor control facilities with an electrical room; dechlorination facilities; and a pump station. Impact sketches for all building types were developed and drawn in the environment type in which they were most likely to be located. Since odor control and electric buildings are planned for each, those buildings are shown in all settings either by themselves or in combination with other structures. The following sections describe the basic visual components of the proposed structures.

Operation impacts to primary portals with no permanent above-ground facilities would be minimal. Aboveground, a small electrical box could be required, approximately 24 inches by 24 inches. There would be some aesthetic impact resulting from removal of trees or structures from the site during construction. Views into or through the site could change and long-term access to below-ground structures could require more open areas or paving than were previously found on the site. Some portals would require access panels set into concrete slabs for long-term operations. These panels would be visible from the immediate site but would have no substantial aesthetic impact, particularly from offsite.

Odor Control Facilities

Odor control facilities have a footprint ranging from 1,400 to 4,400 square feet (sf) within the portal sites and are approximately 20 feet tall. The structures associated with these facilities are primarily for screening views of the scrubbers and/or filters and therefore can be made of a variety of materials.

Since odor control facilities are planned for portal siting areas in each of the four aesthetic environments, these structures are shown in each of the four conveyance impact images (Figures 12-20, 12-22, 12-24, and 12-26). This facility would be located at Portals 11, 19, 41, and 44 on both proposed Route 9 routes, as well as Portal 5 on the 195th Street System, Portal 26 on the 228th Street System, and Portals 7, 11, and 14 on the Unocal System.

Dechlorination Facilities

Dechlorination facilities have an approximately 1,200 square-foot Building footprint and are around 20 feet tall. Storage and control areas could be contained in one building or broken out into multiple structures depending on the scale of the surrounding neighborhood buildings, but all structures would be permanently located within the selected portal site. A dechlorination facility is shown behind an odor control facility in Figure 12-20 and Figure 12-24. Portal 5 on the 195th Street System and Portal 26 on the 228th Street System would have such dechlorination facilities.

New Pump Stations

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option

A new pump station would be located at Portal 41 for the Influent Pump Station (IPS) option for the Route 9 Systems. The IPS option includes eliminating the influent pump station from the Route 9 Treatment Plant site and relocating it to Portal 41. The pump station at both sites would be approximately 35 feet tall, and would be set within an approximately 2- to 3-acre area to allow for 45- to 65-foot setbacks from other properties. The pump station building footprint would be approximately 10,000 square feet. Additional buildings including odor control (6,000 square feet), standby power (11,000 square feet), and electrical substation (16,000 square feet) would also be located on the pump station site. Although the buildings would be large relative to the other proposed conveyance structures, they would be closer in scale to the buildings in the vicinity of Portal Siting Areas 41 and the setbacks provide opportunities for aesthetic mitigation. A pump station is shown behind an odor control facility in Figure 12-26.

Unocal Influent Pump Station

A new pump station would be located at Portal 11 for the Unocal System. The pump station building would be approximately 12,000 square feet and would be 20 to 35 feet tall, set within an approximately 2-acre area to allow for 45- to 65-foot setbacks from other properties. Additional buildings would include odor control (4,400 square feet), standby power (4,500 square feet), and electrical substation (16,000 square feet) on the pump station site. Although the pump station building is large relative to the other proposed conveyance structures, it is closer in scale to the buildings in the vicinity of Portal Siting Area 11 and the setbacks provide opportunities for aesthetic mitigation. A pump station is shown behind an odor control facility in Figure 12-26.

Secondary Portals

Operation impacts associated with secondary portals that are used for tunnel access would be similar to operation impacts for primary portals with no permanent above ground facilities, as described previously in this section; however, impacts would be less because of the small size of the site required and reduced construction duration. Secondary portals are not expected to be used.

Proposed Mitigation Common to All Systems: Conveyance

Construction Mitigation Common to All Systems

Tunneling for a majority of the conveyance route avoids the need to mitigate visual impacts for most of the route. The identified short-term aesthetic impacts of other types of construction in the road rights-of-way may be mitigated by fencing off construction from the surrounding area. Replacing the affected surface to better than pre-construction conditions and to conform to all current jurisdictional regulatory requirements would mitigate long-term impacts of construction within roads.

Mitigation of short-term impacts at the portal sites would include leaving a buffer of existing vegetation where possible or providing fencing or other visual barriers to the construction sites.

Operation Mitigation Common to All Systems

The need for mitigation of long-term visual impacts of below-ground structures after initial repair of the ground surface would include landscaping the surface as appropriate to the specific site, and potential development of portions of sites that do not require access. Whether or not public access would be allowed through the sites would be decided on a site-specific basis, with input from property owners, communities, and local jurisdictions.

Permanent facilities are likely to occur within the four typical aesthetic settings identified earlier: commercial, business park, suburban/rural residential, and industrial. The long-term impacts associated with those portal facilities would be mitigated differently based on local context. Several factors would be considered as a starting point for designing the facilities, including the surrounding buildings, density, style, scale, materials, and proportions; topographic patterns; setbacks; and patterns of vegetation and development, local design regulations, and community input.

Local zoning code and building requirements that could affect the final configuration of any permanent above-ground facilities and the associated aesthetic/visual outcome and resulting impacts include:

- Building design standards and setbacks
- Scale, character, and qualities of adjacent and surrounding land use
- Removal of mature forest, garden, or street vegetation
- Disruption of the visual continuity of the streetscape or area character

King County would coordinate with local jurisdictions to design to applicable requirements for construction sites and permanent facilities.

The mitigation approach for all above-ground conveyance facilities would include the following:

- Plan layouts and develop the massing for permanent facilities to fit within existing patterns and scales of development.
- Reference or complement typical materials, textures, colors and styles of the setting.
- Where possible, retain existing vegetation, with emphasis on perimeter areas of the site.
- Vegetate the site interior, such as parking areas, building foundation areas, and any other area where maintaining clearance is not critical for operations (such as air intake and exhaust locations).
- Incorporate public art into facility design where appropriate.
- Attempt to place operational equipment, access points, louvers, exhausts, and other operational elements on the sides of the building least visible to the public to minimize their aesthetic impact.
- Use environmentally responsive siting and building methods as appropriate to minimize the long-term effects on the surrounding natural systems.

Potential Mitigation Common to All Systems

The following are more setting-specific examples of means to mitigate the impacts of above-ground structures within the four typical aesthetic settings.

Potential Mitigation in Commercial Strip Setting

Potential measures to reduce visual impacts in the urban commercial setting include:

- Design the street frontage to blend with urban context, including layers of urban elements leading to the building (pedestrian-scaled street light poles and lamps, benches, sidewalk patterning, planters, and seat walls).
- Integrate security measures such as structured screen walls, lighting, and fencing similar to neighboring properties.

Figure 12-21 illustrates how these measures might be realized for mitigation of odor control and dechlorination facilities in a commercial strip setting.

Potential Mitigation in Business Park Setting

Potential measures to reduce visual impacts in the Business Park setting include:

- Develop boulevard street frontage improvements and “corporate” image using planted edges and interiors consistent with the surrounding environment.
- Develop site landscape in character with business park landscape design.

Figure 12-23 illustrates how these measures might be realized for mitigation of an odor control facility in a business park setting.

Potential Mitigation in Suburban/Rural Residential Setting

Potential measures to reduce visual impacts in the Suburban/Rural Residential setting include:

- Set back and break up building and process facility forms into smaller elements, reducing impact of scale.
- Use materials and colors that reflect a suburban rural residential setting and/or that blend into the surrounding natural environment.
- Emphasize retention and enhancement of vegetation to integrate the site with the neighborhood.
- Blend security features into vegetation or use art and residential scale materials to minimize aesthetic impact.

Figure 12-25 illustrates how these measures might be realized for mitigation of odor control and dechlorination facilities in a residential setting.

Potential Mitigation in Industrial Setting

Potential measures to reduce visual impacts in the industrial setting include:

- Setbacks from building and division of process facilities into smaller elements, reducing impact of scale.
- Use of materials and colors that reflect an industrial setting and/or that blend into the surrounding natural environment.
- Patterning of security features (fences, gates, and vegetation) to improve the overall aesthetics of the area.

Figure 12-27 illustrates how these measures might be realized for mitigation of an odor control facility and a pump station in an industrial setting.

The views shown are prototypical rather than specific due to the number of potential portal sites within each portal siting area and as described under Conveyance Methodology at the beginning of the Impacts and Mitigation section.

12.3.3.3 Outfall Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems

Construction Impacts Common to All Systems: Outfall

Installation of the outfall pipelines could result in some visible sediment plumes near the shoreline, but the aesthetic impact would be temporary. The outfall pipes would be buried beneath the ground surface or seabed to –80 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) and would not be visible from the shoreline or the surface of Puget Sound.

Operation Impacts Common to All Systems: Outfall

There would be no long-term aesthetic impacts associated with the operation of the outfall within either Zone 6 or 7S. The outfall would be located several thousand feet offshore, and there would be no visible plume or any other visual evidence of its existence on the water surface.

Proposed Mitigation Common to All Systems: Outfall

Construction in upland areas could be visually screened with fencing and/or vegetation during the construction period, if the construction area is visually prominent. Where possible, existing vegetation would be left in place along the perimeter of the site to provide a buffer. Measures described above for conveyance facility construction mitigation could be considered as well for upland outfall construction areas. Following construction, the area would be revegetated and/or restored to eliminate any long-term visual impacts. Offshore construction would not require mitigation measures. Outfall operation would not require mitigation.

12.3.4 Impacts and Mitigation: Route 9 System

12.3.4.1 Treatment Plant: Route 9

Construction Impacts: Route 9 Treatment Plant

There would be some short-term aesthetic impacts visible from some SR-9 highway viewpoints associated with construction activity. During the initial phases of construction, impacts would occur associated with site clearing, excavation, and grading. Later, construction equipment such as construction cranes and framing would be visible.

Operation Impacts: Route 9 Treatment Plant

Three-dimensional computer simulation images of the treatment plant were developed using the viewpoints established for the affected environment description. Figure 12-28 identifies the various viewpoints from which aesthetic impact images were prepared and studied for the Route 9 site.

Standards, including height, bulk, articulation, setbacks, and landscaping for new construction are found in the Snohomish County Unified Development Code, Title 30. Examination of the proposed facility layout in context with surrounding uses and zoning indicates consistency with the regulations regarding aesthetic issues. Bulk, setback, and industrial use screening standards are met (including adjacency to residential zones) with the exception of a few height impacts:

1. Building setbacks as established by the Snohomish County Unified Development Code, Title 30 Urban Land Use Zone Category, provide for no setback with industrial adjacency and 50 feet for residential adjacency. The proposed Route 9 facility site plan exceeds these minimum standards by several feet.
2. The maximum building height of 50 feet is exceeded in a few cases, by 5 to 15 feet, where process structures or equipment will extend above the established height limits.

Although the site is not located in the City of Woodinville and cannot be “governed” by its codes and standards, the Route 9 site is within Snohomish County’s unincorporated UGA and partially within Woodinville’s UGA. King County would, where not in conflict, also apply the appropriate City of Woodinville aesthetic and community design standards to the project site and facility design as found in Woodinville Municipal Code Chapter 21, Zoning Code: Chapter 21.12 Development Standards, and the City of Woodinville Industrial Design Guidelines. The proposed Route 9 facility layout and site have a very high capacity to meet and exceed these guidelines and achieve the intended design goals they define.

Apart from short-term construction related visual impacts and a few height impacts, no significant regulatory aesthetic impacts were identified for the Route 9 site.

Aesthetic Setting, View Corridors and Visual Landmarks

Figures 12-29 through 12-32 indicate that only nearby views from SR-9 would be affected by operation of the Brightwater Treatment Plant. Clustered treatment plant buildings and structures at the central and southern portions of the site would be visible. The middle to upper rooflines and facades would be the predominant views from SR-9. Buildings and structures would be set against a largely offsite vegetated backdrop of the SR-522 right-of-way and hillside forest.

Potential views from within the rural residential and industrial areas along the west side of SR-9 are either oriented away from the site or screened by Little Bear Creek and/or property vegetation.

There are visual/aesthetic impacts associated with the Route 9 proposal; however, they are positive in character and extent. The net effect of the development of the Route 9 site would be to present a more organized and unifying visual image compared to the random and scattered industrial image that is currently present. The treatment plant would be consistent with the industrial land use image established for the site.

The treatment plant would change major visual landmarks, most specifically those of the auto recycling yards that currently dominate the visual landscape of SR-9 in the vicinity of the treatment plant site.

Proposed Mitigation: Route 9 Treatment Plant

Short- and long-term mitigation measures have been prepared that address impact findings and conclusions established for the Route 9 treatment facility and site.

Construction Mitigation: Route 9 Treatment Plant

Short-term construction impacts would be reduced by the following measures:

- Retain and protect existing vegetation on perimeter in non-construction areas.
- If possible to coordinate with overall project construction, grade perimeter areas of the site along SR-9 to final design grade and plant interim or permanent vegetation to help screen construction activities from pedestrians, vehicles, and nearby rural residences along SR-9 view corridors.

Operation Mitigation: Route 9 Treatment Plant

The major aesthetic impact of the proposed treatment plant at the Route 9 site is the large scale of the facility in relation to existing residential uses and natural landscape settings in the vicinity. To reduce the scale of the treatment plant at this site, the following measures could be implemented:

- Reduce the size of buildings, structures, and walls as much as possible (height, mass, bulk, and scale). Specific exceptions to a limited number of building height impacts must be addressed in the permitting process.
- Break up large building walls and facades.
- Utilize color schemes consistent with a selected image palette coordinated with all plant and site elements, including buildings, process facilities, site infrastructure, and onsite and surrounding landscape.

- Enhance existing perimeter vegetation with plant materials that increase both the short-term and long-term screening function of this existing vegetation.
- Limit offsite glare, material reflectivity, and light in order to reduce and/or selectively enhance the visual focus on the facility.
- Provide landscape improvements in concert with treatment plant infrastructure to create a varied, attractive, and community friendly appearance.
- Reduce the overall apparent bulk of the facility by interrupting the plant elements with vegetation.
- Incorporate public art into facility design with the maximum public visual access possible.

Potential Design Mitigation Options: Route 9 Treatment Plant

To further mitigate visual impacts of the facility, one of the following design mitigation options could be implemented. To illustrate these design mitigation options, one viewpoint with particularly high visibility, the view to the north from the SR-9/SR-522 Interchange, was selected (see Figure 12-28, map viewpoint No. 1).

Option 1: Route 9 “Expose” Design Mitigation Option

- Reduce scale of buildings, structures, and walls (height, mass, bulk and scale) while still enhancing the gateway characteristics of the SR-9 corridor.
- Consider building structure, details, and landscape patterns that tie the plant layout and building design to the agricultural, industrial, or timber roots of the surrounding area.
- Provide landscape improvements consistent with selected local historic and cultural references.

Figure 12-33 illustrates the effect of the “Expose” design mitigation option at Route 9 site.

Option 2: Route 9 “Hide” Design Mitigation Option

- Provide dense perimeter vegetation screen around the entire perimeter of the facility. Vegetation should be consistent with the natural vegetation of the Little Bear Creek watershed/habitat and surrounding forested hillsides. Another vegetation screening approach would be to combine the natural vegetation screening with agricultural vegetation patterns, such as poplar rows and cedar stands.
- Limit public visual access to the facility by either limiting the means for public access, such as trails through or near the facility, or buffering such access.

- Design stormwater detention and treatment systems to resemble natural water systems in the area (wetlands, ponds, swales) to provide a more naturalistic buffer.

Figure 12-34 illustrates the effect of the “Hide” design mitigation option at the Route 9 site.

Option 3: Route 9 “Blend” Design Mitigation Option

- Blend the “exposed” facility with the introduction of rural landscape and/or natural vegetation patterns and groupings.
- Provide dense and mixed (evergreen/deciduous and large and small) native landscape plantings at lower, middle, and upper elevations along outer edges of building terraces and facility perimeters.
- Provide vegetation within the site that reinforces the patterns and textures of treatment plant buildings and site layout.
- Utilize colors, textures, and landforms consistent and compatible natural landscape of the surrounding hillside and Little Bear Creek watershed/habitat.

Figure 12-35 illustrates the effect of the “Blend” design mitigation option.

12.3.4.2 Conveyance: Route 9

Impacts common to both the 195th Street Corridor and the 228th Street Corridor are discussed below, followed by the corridor-specific discussion.

Construction Impacts: Route 9 Conveyance

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical construction impacts for primary and secondary portals along the Route 9 corridors. Surface impacts would occur in the vicinity of microtunnel pits and any areas of open-cut construction. Open-cut or microtunnel construction would be used at Portals 11, 41, and 44 to connect to the existing sewer system; however, no significant aesthetic impacts are expected.

Operation Impacts: Route 9 Conveyance

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical operation impacts for primary and secondary portals along the Route 9 corridors. Portals 11, 41 and 44 would house odor control facilities if either the 195th or the 228th corridor is selected. See Figure 12-22 for the potential impact of an odor control facility at Portal 41, and Figure 12-24 for the potential impact of an odor control facility at Portal 44. Portal 19 would house a transition structure and a sampling station. These are both below-ground structures.

Dechlorination facilities at Portal Siting Area 5 (for the 195th Street corridor) or Portal Siting Area 26 (for the 228th Street corridor) would have an approximately 1,200 square-foot footprint and would be approximately 20 feet tall. Storage and control areas could be contained in one building or broken out into multiple structures depending on the scale of the surrounding neighborhood buildings, but all structures would be permanently located within the selected portal site. A dechlorination facility is shown behind an odor control facility in Figure 12-20.

Potential Mitigation: Route 9 Conveyance

See the discussion under Mitigation Common to All Systems: Conveyance, for typical mitigation strategies along the Route 9 corridors. See Figure 12-21 for a potential mitigation strategy for an odor control facility at Portal 11. See Figure 12-23 for a potential mitigation strategy for an odor control facility in Portal 41. See Figure 12-25 for a potential mitigation strategy for an odor control facility at Portal 44.

12.3.4.3 Route 9–195th Street Corridor

Construction Impacts: Route 9–195th Street Corridor

Primary and Secondary Portals

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical construction impacts for primary portals along the Route 9 corridors. The dechlorination facility and odor control would be a specific impact to Portal 5 for the 195th Street corridor.

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option

Construction of the IPS at Portal 41 would have similar visual impacts as those described for a new pump station under the Impacts Common to All Systems section. With the construction of the IPS, impacts related to dust, noise, and truck traffic would be increased in the first two years above that expected for portal construction because of the increased construction activity associated with the pump station. At the treatment plant site, there would be a corresponding decrease in construction-related aesthetic impacts.

Operation Impacts: Route 9–195th Street Corridor

Primary and Secondary Portals

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical operation impacts for primary portals along the Route 9 corridors. The dechlorination facility and odor control at Portal 5 described above would be potentially visible from Ballinger Road NE and the commercial center on the north/east side of that street.

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option

Typical impacts of the IPS at Portal 41 would be similar to those described for a new pump station under the Impacts Common to All Systems section. The pump station building would be approximately 10,000 square-feet and would be configured as a three-story, above-grade structure. The building would be a cast-in-place concrete building with a selected façade to match the business park facilities already in the area. In addition, the odor control building (6,000 square feet), standby power building (11,000 square feet), and electrical substation (16,000 square feet) would be of similar design with all three stories above-grade or less in height.

The long-term visual impacts of the IPS and accompanying above-ground structures would depend on the ease with which the structures could blend into or be hidden from the surrounding community, but impacts are not expected to be significant. Above-ground structures will be of similar height as surrounding buildings and would be designed to blend architecturally with surrounding land uses and to incorporate the aesthetic character of the adjacent neighborhoods.

Relocating the IPS to Portal 41 would provide a corresponding reduction in bulk and scale impacts at the treatment plant, reducing the overall mass of the treatment plant facilities for neighbors and passing motorists. Reducing the number of structures at the treatment plant also provides the opportunity to provide more open space.

Proposed Mitigation: Route 9–195th Street Corridor

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical mitigation strategies along the Route 9 corridors. See Figure 12-21 for a potential mitigation strategy for both an odor control and a dechlorination facility in a commercial district.

12.3.4.4 Route 9–228th Street Corridor

Construction Impacts: Route 9–228th Street Corridor

Primary Portals

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical construction impacts for primary portals along the Route 9 corridors. The dechlorination facility would be a specific impact in Portal Siting Area 26 if the 228th Street alternative were selected.

Secondary Portals

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical construction impacts for secondary portals along the Route 9 corridors.

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option Impacts would be the same as those described for the Route 9–195th Street Corridor Option.

Operation Impacts: Route 9–228th Street Corridor

Primary Portals

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical operation impacts for primary portals along the Route 9 corridors. The dechlorination structure at Portal 26 would potentially be visible from Lakeview Drive or 228th Street SW (see Figure 12-24). Trees toward the residential neighborhoods on potential sites in the identified siting area make it unlikely that the structures would be visible from most nearby neighborhoods after construction is complete, assuming trees can be protected during construction.

Secondary Portals

See the discussion under Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems, Conveyance, for typical operation impacts for secondary portals along the Route 9 corridors.

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option Impacts would be the same as those described for the Route 9–195th Street Corridor IPS Option.

Proposed Mitigation: Route 9–228th Street Corridor

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical mitigation strategies along the Route 9 corridors. See Figure 12-25 for a possible residential mitigation strategy for odor control and dechlorination facilities at Portal 26.

Portal 41 Influent Pump Station Option

The mitigation measures associated with the Route 9–228th Street Corridor IPS Option are the same as those described for the Route 9–195th Street Corridor IPS Option.

12.3.4.5 Outfall: Route 9

Construction Impacts: Route 9 Outfall

Offshore construction of the outfall would be visible from residences on the hillside above the Chevron Richmond Beach Asphalt Terminal. Views of the construction site could be seen by residences to the south of the outfall construction zone, south of Richmond Beach Park. Topography would block the views of the construction zone to the north of Point Wells, although ferry riders could likely see the construction equipment, as would any boat traffic in the vicinity. There are no public beaches in the vicinity, but users of the shoreline area could view the construction area. Onshore construction areas would be visible by many of the same individuals.

Operation Impacts: Route 9 Outfall

Operational impacts associated with the Zone 7S outfall are the same as those described under Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems: Outfall.

Mitigation: Route 9 Outfall

Proposed mitigation associated with the Zone 7S outfall are the same as those described under Impacts and Mitigation Common to All Systems: Outfall.

12.3.5 Impacts and Mitigation: Unocal System

12.3.5.1 Treatment Plant: Unocal

Construction Impacts: Unocal Treatment Plant

Three-dimensional computer simulated images were developed using the same viewpoint locations established for the affected environment description of the Unocal site.

Figure 12-36 identifies the various viewpoints from which aesthetic impact images were prepared and studied.

Short-term and construction-related aesthetic impacts would result at the Unocal site. The removal of existing vegetation from the interior side slopes and upper hillside areas of the site would generate temporary views of a denuded hillside from all viewpoints studied.

The grading of the site and other construction activity on and around the hillside would be exposed to all viewpoints within downtown Edmonds, affected neighborhoods, and the waterfront during the construction period.

Operation Impacts: Unocal Treatment Plant

Examination of the modeled impact images (Figures 12-37 through 12-43) for the 54-mgd and combined 72-mgd sub-alternative/Unocal Structural Lid sub-alternative at the Unocal treatment plant indicates that the proposed facility would not be fully consistent with the aesthetic and visual compatibility goals and site development standards of the City of Edmonds. The City of Edmonds Comprehensive Plan's Downtown Waterfront Activity Center Area presents goals of extending downtown westward to the shore, promoting compatible land use and park-like shoreline features, and reinforcing "Edmond's attractive, small town pedestrian oriented character" and City of Edmonds MP 1 and MP 2 zones. Several buildings (maintenance and electrical substation) and process structures (digesters, thickening and dewatering, and filtration) exceed the maximum 35-foot height standard of these zones. Under a P (Public Use) zone, the maximum structure height standards of 25 feet would be exceeded (there is provision for a conditional use, allowing heights up to 60 feet). In any of these zones, the aesthetic and visual qualities of the treatment plant and site plan would be reviewed under Architectural Design Review criteria established in the City of Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC). The treatment plant would not be consistent with 4 of the 17 Architectural Design Review (ADR) criteria (ECDC, Chapter 20.10.070), including:

1. ADR Criteria A.6: Structures – "...size and height of structures to be compatible with the character and existing views of the surrounding area."
2. ADR Criteria B.1: Site treatment – "...avoid large cuts and fills and impervious surface areas."
3. ADR Criteria B.1: Site treatment – "...minimize removal of and other changes to vegetation."
4. ADR Criteria C.1: Other criteria – "...should not conflict with existing and planned character of the nearby areas."

Even though some additional site area would be used for increased facility processing capacity, aesthetic impacts from the 72-mgd treatment plant sub-alternative, described in Chapter 3, would follow closely those modeled and evaluated for the 54-mgd treatment plant at the Unocal site.

Lidding at the site could be done to accommodate a multimodal transportation facility. Aesthetic impacts of the lid sub-alternative follow closely those modeled and evaluated for the 54-mgd treatment plant at the Unocal site. The principal additional aesthetic impact associated with this sub-alternative is the continuous horizontal band that would form the outer edge and façade of the lid structures (30 and 40 feet in depth by approximately 2,400 feet in length) along the lower northern perimeter of the proposed facility. The band would occur at a relatively constant elevation of 50 feet for the lid platform and an elevation of 56 feet for the visible edge (top of band).

The Lid sub-alternative was developed with all transportation facilities, including parking, at the 50-foot lid level (proposed ferry pier elevation) or higher. It also would create an additional type of structure and resulting image, specifically the lid and its 30- to 40-foot-high perimeter edge and facade.

The mass and height of a 72-mgd plant would be similar to that of the 54-mgd plant, except there would be additional structures on the northern perimeter of the site. As a result, structures would be closer to the public view.

Aesthetic Setting

Figures 12-37 through 12-43 illustrate most nearby and distant views that the site would present: large building masses and long, linear and horizontally dominant structures, particularly those buildings and structures at the upper and mid levels (such as initial stage treatment process buildings and supporting retaining walls). The collective aesthetic effect of the treatment plant would be to focus attention on this hillside. The treatment plant would be visible from many key civic/public and neighborhood vantagepoints within the City of Edmonds' downtown and hillside neighborhoods and Puget Sound.

The view from the hilltop and Pine Street/Chinook Road, Figure 12-37, would remain intact, except that a security barrier may obscure the foreground view of the treatment plant and some of the waterfront/marina. Views of the City of Edmonds, Puget Sound, and the Olympic and Cascade Mountains beyond would not be affected.

Facilities on the lower level would be largely screened from offsite viewpoints by existing vegetation. Some of the taller facilities at this lower level would extend higher than perimeter tree canopies and would present long roofline and façade profiles as indicated by the nearby and distant viewpoints identified in Figures 12-41 through 12-43. A large percentage of this lower level vegetation is deciduous, resulting in increased visibility of the facility during winter months.

Existing View Corridors

Following construction, the treatment plant would change the most recent view of the long-standing industrial tank farm, which presented a largely non-vegetated terraced hillside landscape, to a more linear and horizontally massed industrial processing facility (Figures 12-38 to 12-43). Nearby pedestrian and vehicle view corridors within Edmonds Way, Admiral Way, Harbor Square/Marsh Overlook, and Edmonds Marina Beach Park

would be affected. The City of Edmonds, through its Community Development Code and Architectural Design Review Criteria, defines the importance of visual access to and protection of the visual quality of these areas. Views of the treatment plant from distant vantagepoints within Edmonds neighborhoods (Figure 12-42) and from Puget Sound view corridors would also be affected. Although distance allows for a diminishing of the impact by providing a larger visual field, the treatment plant would continue to be clearly visible.

Major Visual Landmarks

The treatment plant would become a major visual landmark. Its position on the Edwards Point hillside that helps form the southern part of the City of Edmonds waterfront “bowl” would be highly visible over Edmonds Marsh from Edmonds Way, Marsh Overlook, Admiral Way vantagepoints and from the Port of Edmonds Marina, Edmonds waterfront, and Puget Sound. The treatment plant would present a large, linear, and horizontally massed industrial/public infrastructure backdrop to downtown Edmonds as it replaces an existing industrial landmark, the Unocal tank farm, that until recently was integral to Edwards Point, Edmonds Marsh, and the City of Edmonds for 80 years.

The Unocal Treatment Plant would, through the scale and mass of the project, not in all respects comply with the City of Edmonds basic planning goals and design guidelines to have any development on this site “fit in and be harmonious with the planned and existing character of the nearby area.” However, significant landscaping and buffering are proposed to mitigate aesthetic impacts.

Proposed Mitigation: Unocal Treatment Plant

Construction

The short-term construction impacts, while temporary, are unavoidable. To reduce the impacts during construction, the following mitigation measures are proposed:

- Retain and protect existing vegetation in perimeter, non-construction areas.
- Install temporary sight barriers along pedestrian/vehicle contact points (such as along Woodway street intersections with the extended Pine/216th Street roadway and along the western perimeter of the site adjacent to the BNSF railroad tracks and Admiral Way view corridors).
- Manage associated visible activity and visual access to construction facilities and equipment during nighttime periods from the City of Edmonds Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.

Short-term aesthetic impact mitigation measures can be applied for some of the nearby viewpoints and view corridors, including the Pine Street and Woodway street corridors, where temporary site screen fencing or barriers could be erected to reduce construction activity impacts on pedestrians and vehicles in this area. Many of the other nearby and

distant viewpoints and associated view corridor impacts could not be reasonably mitigated due to scale of construction activity and the exposed orientation and visual prominence of the site.

Operation

Long-term mitigation measures would be taken to reduce or minimize impacts to the aesthetic/visual environment of the Unocal site, resulting in greater consistency with the City of Edmonds Community Development Code standards and Architectural Design Review criteria. These measures include some or all of the following:

- Address all of the Design Review criteria in facility layout, grading, building design, and detailing in order to minimize impacts.
- Vary the length, relief, depth, and texture of building and retaining wall facades as well as vary the height and texture of roofs, roof lines, and retaining walls to avoid long, massive, unbroken and monotonous buildings. Also distribute buildings and structures onsite, leaving space breaks or apparent breaks between buildings and structures.
- Make adjustments to lower building/structure height to reduce view access to them.
- Identify existing vegetation that can be retained, especially along the site perimeter. Enhance perimeter vegetation with plants that increase the short-term and long-term screening function of the existing vegetation.
- Visually interrupt large building and retaining wall elevation planes/facades.
- Limit offsite glare, material reflectivity and light to reduce the visual focus of the facility.
- Identify key existing and planned character patterns of the surrounding area that can shape the character of treatment plant site layout, building and structure form, and landscape treatment. See mitigation approaches below.

The major aesthetic impact of a treatment plant at the Unocal site would be the large scale and prominence of the facility in relation to existing uses and natural settings in the vicinity. In addition to mitigation measures described above, the following measures could be implemented to reduce the scale of the treatment plant at the Unocal site:

- Incorporate the regulatory mitigation described above.
- Enhance the landmark characteristics of this hillside.
- Utilize color schemes consistent with selected image palette and which blend with surrounding landscape or context.
- Provide landscape improvements together with treatment plant infrastructure to create a varied, attractive, and community friendly appearance.

- Incorporate public art into facility design with visual public access to it.

Potential Design Mitigation Options: Unocal Treatment Plant

To further mitigate visual impacts of the Unocal treatment plant, one of the following design mitigation options or elements of these options could be implemented. To illustrate these options, one viewpoint with particularly high visibility, the view looking southwest from Edmonds Way, was selected. Three-dimensional images were prepared for each of these options: the “Expose,” “Hide,” and “Blend” Mitigation options.

Option 1: Unocal “Expose” Design Mitigation Option

- Install plant structures and retaining walls to highlight key structural and building forms and to reduce appearance of bulk and mass.
- Generate historically referenced (waterfront transportation, maritime, and/or lumber-shingle mill structures) roof and building structure patterns and details based on the industrial history of the site, the maritime context of the area, and the commercial and civic plans of the City of Edmonds.
- Develop a color scheme consistent with a commercial/civic/maritime palette and which blends with surrounding landform and forest/marsh landscape.
- Provide landscape improvements consistent with an urban maritime, waterfront transportation, commercial development, a civic facility, and/or park elements.

Figure 12-44 illustrates the effect of the “Expose” design mitigation option; only landscaping has been added to the view to present this mitigation option. Further differentiation of building forms and details and an increase of building perimeter setbacks with associated expansion of landscape buffers would allow for the visual establishment of this treatment plant into the urban maritime and natural hillside and shore landscape context.

Option 2: Unocal “Hide” Design Mitigation Option

- Install plant structures and retaining walls to fully screen the facility and redefine the hillside.
- Although not part of the proposed action, incorporate a partnered community facility such as defined by the sub-alternative for multimodal transportation lids. The lidding in this case would aid in the “creation” of a lower hillside terrace, thus allowing for a greater ability to mitigate the impacts of facility scale and prominence and “give back” in some form part of the hillside character.
- Utilize a color scheme that blends with the surrounding landform and forest/marsh landscape.
- Provide landscape improvements consistent with the hillside forest and marshlands.

- Integrate vegetation into the roofs on key structures, with emphasis on perimeter edge plantings.

Figure 12-45 illustrates the effect of the “Hide” design mitigation option in an urban maritime and natural landscape context using landscape and the lid sub-alternative. It is evident from this illustration that even with a lid terrace and extensive perimeter landscape that a true “hiding” of the facility is not feasible.

Option 3: Unocal “Blend” Design Mitigation Option

- Introduce natural vegetation patterns and groupings.
- Provide dense and mixed (evergreen/deciduous and large/small) native landscape plant materials at lower, middle, and upper elevations along outer edges of treatment plant terraces and perimeters.
- Expose portions of structures while hiding larger masses and identifiable treatment structures.
- Utilize colors and textures consistent and harmonious with the natural colors of rock faces and vegetation of the surrounding hillside and marsh.
- Integrate vegetation into the roof structures of key building components, with emphasis on perimeter edge plantings.

Figure 12-46 illustrates the effect of the “Blend” design mitigation option in an urban maritime and natural landscape context.

12.3.5.2 Conveyance: Unocal

Construction Impacts: Unocal Conveyance

Primary Portals

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical construction impacts for primary portals along the Unocal corridor. Surface impacts would occur in the vicinity of microtunnel pits and any areas of open-cut construction. Open-cut or microtunnel construction would be used near Portal Siting Areas 11 and 14 to connect to the existing sewer system.

A new pump station would be required at Portal 11 near the existing Kenmore Pump Station site for this alternative and would have the visual impacts of both above- and below-ground construction as described earlier. In addition, Portals 14 and 7 would house odor control facilities, creating construction impacts described under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems.

Secondary Portals

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical construction impacts for secondary portals along the Unocal corridor.

Operation Impacts: Unocal Conveyance***Primary Portals***

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical operation impacts for primary portals along the Unocal corridor. There are no identified aesthetic impacts to landmarks along the Unocal corridor. None of the natural and cultural landmarks of southwest Snohomish County and northwest King County would be visually blocked or aesthetically diminished by conveyance facilities. Odor control structures may be visible from the properties immediately surrounding the selected 2-acre sites in both portals 7 and 11 or from Ballinger Road NE in Portal 7. The only additional impact would be visual impact of the new pump station at Portal 11 if this alternative were selected.

The pump station would be 20 to 35 feet tall, an approximately 12,000 square-foot building set within an approximately 2-acre site to allow for 45- to 65-foot setbacks from other properties. Additional buildings including odor control (4,400 square feet), standby power (4,500 square feet), and electrical substation (16,000 square feet) would also be located on the pump station site. Although the building is large relative to the other proposed conveyance structures, it is closer in scale to the typical buildings identified within Portal Siting Area 11 and the setbacks provide opportunities for aesthetic mitigation. Although Portal Siting Area 11 is a primary portal common to all three conveyance alternatives, and the odor control facilities to be located at Portal Siting Area 11 are common impacts for all three potential conveyance routes, the pump station would only be built here if the Unocal System were selected. A pump station is shown behind an odor control facility in Figure 12-26.

Secondary Portals

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical operation impacts for secondary portals along the Unocal corridor.

Proposed Mitigation: Unocal Conveyance

See the discussion under Conveyance Impacts Common to All Systems for typical mitigation strategies along the Unocal corridor.

Potential Mitigation: Unocal Conveyance

See Figure 12-25 for potential mitigation of an odor control facility in a residential environment. See Figure 12-23 for a potential mitigation strategy for a business park environment.

12.3.5.3 Outfall: Unocal

Construction Impacts: Unocal Outfall

Offshore construction of the outfall would be visible from the shoreline within the City of Edmonds Marina Beach Park, from the Port of Edmonds Marina, from the City of Edmonds Fishing Pier, and from ferry and boat traffic in the vicinity. The view would be of a barge with construction equipment. Residences on the bluff above the Unocal site with water views would also see the construction activity. The impact would be temporary. Construction areas onshore would be visible to many of the same individuals. Views of existing upland marine shoreline would be altered to that of a construction site during the construction period.

Operation Impacts: Unocal Outfall

Operational impacts for the Unocal Outfall in Zone 6 would be the same as described in Operational Impacts Common to All Systems: Outfall.

Mitigation: Unocal Outfall

Mitigation for the Unocal Outfall would be the same as described in Proposed Mitigation Common to All Systems.

12.3.6 Impacts: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would result in continuation of current visual characteristics at the treatment plant, conveyance facility, and outfall sites. Because of the different existing character of these sites, the impact of the No Action Alternative is described separately for each treatment plant site below.

Conveyance, outfall site, and corridor settings (Figures 12-1 through 12-4) illustrate the continued growth and development of suburban residential neighborhoods and services, roadway improvements, and infill urban development (especially for those western and I-5/SR-99/I-405 corridor communities). Thus aesthetic and visual settings would evolve as an outcome of this growth and development.

12.3.6.1 Route 9 Site

The affected environment photographs, Figures 12-6 through 12-11, show existing aesthetic characteristics and qualities of the Route 9 site. These characteristics and qualities would likely be maintained or extended incrementally with new development under the No Action Alternative.

The Route 9 site consists of a group of parcels with various industrial uses at various stages of development. These parcels are located at an historic transportation route and regional transportation node (SR-9/SR-522). Although many of the southern parcels of the site are auto-recycling and construction storage yards, each parcel has separate and unique topography, fencing and gates, yard lighting, vehicle storage organization, and setbacks from the SR-9 corridor. The site's central parcels are newly built industrial park and buildings (StockPot Culinary Campus and OPUS). This development pattern along the corridor results in what can be perceived as a random and cluttered visual image. The aesthetic character of the southern sections further contrast with the Little Bear Creek natural habitat, rural residential pastures on the west side of SR-9, and the forested hillside of Wellington Hills to the south. This contrasting image is visible predominantly from SR-9, but also from the SR-9/SR-522 interchange bridge. The site's most northern parcels are predominantly pasture framed by mature woodland.

12.3.6.2 Unocal Site

The affected environment photographs, Figures 12-13 through 12-19, show existing aesthetic characteristics and qualities of the Unocal site.

The Unocal site on Edwards Point is a focal landform for the downtown, marina, and residential neighborhoods of the City of Edmonds. The site is a former industrial tank farm landscape with terraced, asphalt spill basins that shape the exposed hillside slopes. Edwards Point has stands of mature mixed-forest vegetation that frame the site, making it a "green" backdrop to the surrounding waterfront, marshland, and park environments. Remnant conveyance pipeline and trestle structures are a visual reminder of the former tank farm use. These continue to be visible from waterfront viewpoints.

Given the existing land use and zoning designations on the Unocal site, if the Brightwater Treatment Plant is not built, the site would likely be redeveloped with mixed residential and commercial development at a moderate to high density, with structure heights generally at 35 feet. Views would change from all vantagepoints. Without development plan drawings or images, no detailed determination can be made at this time as to what the specific aesthetic impacts would be. Assuming the likely development of residential and commercial uses would be in keeping with City of Edmonds land use plans and development guidelines and standards, the aesthetic impacts would be generally positive and would not be in conflict with the City's important aesthetic values of development compatibility with town character and environmental setting, extension of downtown to the waterfront, and provision of access to waterfront and Puget Sound views.

12.3.7 Cumulative Impacts

Development of the Brightwater Treatment Plant at the Unocal site would add a significant structure to the area and would provide a visual focal point along the waterfront. The view would replace remnant tank farm terraces and, while design strategies would help to minimize the visual impact, a treatment plant would present a visual image of a large developed site and would contribute to a large scaled “industrialized or urban infrastructure image” in the area. This would be especially true if the treatment plant were to be combined with a multimodal transportation facility such as Edmonds Crossing.

At the Route 9 site, the treatment plant would be a continuation of the increasingly developed nature of this industrial landscape in the area. Combined with Washington State Department of Transportation SR-9 improvements and habitat development and enhancements to Little Bear Creek, the Route 9 treatment plant would provide a consistent and harmonizing image to this important multi-community crossroads node and gateway, and thus would have a cumulatively positive aesthetic impact.

The conveyance corridors are within rapidly developing areas. Communities in the portal siting areas are anticipated to continue to grow at a similar pace. The cumulative impact of conveyance structures in these areas will depend on compatibility with future development plans for specific sites. Designed with appropriate mitigation measures, the conveyance structures have the potential to have a positive aesthetic impact to most candidate portal sites.

12.4 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Short-term unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts associated with construction activities would occur during the construction phase for both the Unocal and Route 9 sites and could last up to 6 years, including site preparation and final landscaping (see Chapter 3 for details on duration of construction). These impacts would be temporary and would end when construction of the project is completed.

Unocal, due to its visual prominence, would expose to view many stages of construction activity and facility development. Route 9, due to its layout, topographic positioning and surrounding land use, has a greater capacity to eliminate or reduce much of the offsite visual access to construction activity. Conveyance facilities would generate some unavoidable shorter-term adverse aesthetic impacts during construction, largely around portal sites, particularly if construction requires removing existing mature trees and community structures (without the immediate benefit of long-term mitigation planting and facility design).

Long-term unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts have been identified for the Unocal site and are discussed under Operation Impacts: Unocal Treatment Plant. Although facility and site design would be directed at achieving consistency with applicable local regulations, policies, and codes and minimizing impacts to the greatest extent possible, there would be a significant and permanent change to the look and character of this prominent hillside. The treatment plant would present a large and prominent facility in its place through major alterations in the site's shape, topography, and vegetation pattern and through the introduction of large-scaled retaining structures and process buildings.

No long-term unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts would occur at the Route 9 site. Route 9 site qualities and facility layout provide for the means to eliminate and minimize the potential for significant long-term adverse aesthetic and visual access impacts. The Route 9 site has the capacity to provide deep and effective screening through earthen berms and vegetation, to topographically orient treatment plant facilities away from view corridors, and to retain and enhance extensive stands of existing mature buffer vegetation.

There are no long-term unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts anticipated along the conveyance corridors. The scale of the proposed facilities is compatible with the scale of other structures in the identified portal siting areas. The permanent above-ground facilities proposed could be successfully mitigated with landscape and architectural treatments.

12.5 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

Table 12-3 summarizes impacts and mitigation for aesthetics.

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation
		<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See individual system. 	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See individual system.
	Treatment Plant	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See individual system. 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See individual system.
Common to All Systems	Conveyance	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term aesthetic impacts will occur where conveyance facilities are constructed or cut and cover pipe construction methods are used. Portal sites could present temporarily significant aesthetic alterations, particularly if portal sites are closely surrounded by residential or commercial development. Construction impacts for sites with and without permanent facilities include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Large open pits o Piles of soil o Construction site lighting o Construction equipment o Removal of vegetation and/or structures 	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation for construction impacts on sites with and without permanent facilities include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Maximizing the use of tunnels and minimizing the amount of open cut construction. o Leaving an existing buffer of landscape around construction site where possible. o Using fencing or other visual barriers to conceal construction sites.

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems (cont.)

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation
Common to All Systems (cont.)	Conveyance (cont.)	<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term impacts for portal sites without permanent above-ground facilities include removal of structures, mature vegetation and/or other community resources. There would be additional long-term aesthetic impacts for portal sites with permanent above-ground facilities. 	<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All permanent facilities would be designed to blend aesthetically with each surrounding neighborhood. The mitigation approach to any impacted site conditions would include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan layouts to fit within existing development pattern (scale and character). Reference or complement typical materials of the setting. Where possible, retain existing vegetation, especially large trees and plants on the perimeter. Vegetate site interior, such as parking areas, building foundation walls, and any other area where maintaining clearance is not critical for operations. Incorporate public art into facility design. Utilize “sustainable design” siting and building as appropriate. Tailor this approach to each site according to its unique aesthetic characteristics.
	Outfall Zones	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Installation of the outfall pipelines would be visible for the on-land construction area and could result in some visible sediment plumes near the shoreline for the waterward construction area. 	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-land construction areas could be visually screened with fencing and/or vegetation during the construction period. Where possible, existing vegetation will be maintained to provide a buffer.
		<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be no long-term impacts associated with the operation of the outfall at either Zone 6 or 7S. 	<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation is required.
Route 9–195th Street System	Treatment Plant	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be short-term aesthetic impacts from SR-9 viewpoints relating to construction equipment, site clearing and grading and building framing. 	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing vegetation would be retained and protected on the site perimeter in non-construction areas.

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems (cont.)

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation
Route 9–195th Street System (cont.)	Treatment Plant (cont.)	<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed facility layout would be consistent with Snohomish County regulations regarding height, bulk, setbacks and industrial use screening for new construction. A height variance may be required for the solids handling building. Nearby views from SR-9 will be affected; the mass and bulk of clustered buildings and structures at the central and southern portions of the site could be visible. The net effect of treatment plant development would be to present a more organized and unifying visual image compared to the random and disorganized industrial image that is currently present. However, its industrial scale presents a contrast to some of the existing and surrounding residential and natural habitat environments. 	<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize site topography, shaped landform and earthen berms to screen and further mitigate specific project visual impacts. Reduce the size of buildings, structures and walls as much as possible. Break up large building wall and structural facades. Utilize color schemes that are consistent with selected image palette and that blend with surrounding landscape or context. Plant perimeter vegetation with dense and/or evergreen screening plant materials. Limit offsite glare, material reflectivity and light in order to reduce and/or selectively enhance the visual focus on the facility. Provide landscape improvements that create a varied, attractive and community-friendly appearance.
		<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts are as described under Construction Impact Common to All Systems, above. 	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Construction Mitigation Common to All Systems, above.
	Conveyance	<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts are as described under Operation Impact Common to All Systems, above. Dechlorination facility at Portal 5 (1,200 sf, 20 feet tall). Odor control facilities at Portals 5, 11, 41, and 44 (1,400-2,400 sf, 20 feet tall). 	<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Operation Mitigation Common to All Systems, above.
	Outfall Zone 7S	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Impacts Common to All Systems. 	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Mitigation Common to All Systems.

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems (cont.)

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation
Route 9–195th Street System (cont.)	Outfall Zone 7S (cont.)	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Impacts Common to All Systems. 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Mitigation Common to All Systems.
	Treatment Plant	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the Route 9–195th Street System. 	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the Route 9–195th Street System.
		<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the Route 9–195th Street System. 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the Route 9–195th Street System.
Route 9–228th Street System	Conveyance	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts are as described under Construction Impact Common to All Systems, above. 	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Construction Mitigation Common to All Systems, above.
		<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts are as described under Operation Impact Common to All Systems, above. Dechlorination facility at Portal 26 (1,200 sf, 20 feet tall). Odor control facilities at Portals 11, 26, 41, and 44 (1,400-2,400 sf, 20 feet tall). 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Operation Mitigation Common to All Systems, above.
	Outfall Zone 7S	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to Construction Impacts Common to All Systems. 	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Construction Mitigation Common to All Systems.
		<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to Operation Impacts Common to All Systems. 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Operation Mitigation Common to All Systems.

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems (cont.)

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation
Unocal System	Treatment Plant	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of existing vegetation from the interior side slopes and upper hillside areas of the site would generate temporary views of a denuded hillside from all viewpoints. Grading of the site and other construction activity on and around the hillside would be exposed to all viewpoints from downtown Edmonds, affected neighborhoods and the waterfront. 	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing vegetation in perimeter, non-construction areas would be retained.
		<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed treatment plant would become a major visual landmark, highly visible from many key civic/public and neighborhood vantagepoints within the City of Edmonds' Downtown and hillside neighborhoods and Puget Sound. As was the case with prior site development, community views would focus on this hillside site and the treatment plant. Nearby and distant views to the site would present large building masses and long, linear and horizontally dominant structures, particularly those buildings and structures at the upper and mid-levels (such as initial stage treatment plants and supporting retaining walls). Several buildings may exceed the height standard of the Edmonds Zoning and Community Development Code and may require a variance or conditional use permit. 	<p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to achieve consistency with the Edmonds Community Development Code standards and Architectural Design Review criteria include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address Design Review criteria in facility layout, grading, building design, and detailing. Vary the length, relief, depth, and texture of building and retaining wall facades as well as the height and texture of roofs, rooflines, and retaining walls. Adjust lower building/structure height to reduce view access to them. Identify existing vegetation to be retained, especially along the site perimeter. Enhance perimeter vegetation with plants that increase both the short-term and long-term screening function of the existing vegetation. Identify key existing and planned character patterns of the surrounding area that can shape the character of treatment plant site layout. Interrupt large building wall and retaining wall elevation planes/facades. Limit offsite glare, material reflectivity, and light to reduce the visual focus of the facility.

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems (cont.)

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation
Unocal System (cont.)	Treatment Plant (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Image modeling of the 54-mgd and combined 72-mgd sub-alternative/Unocal Structural Lid sub-alternative indicates that the proposed facility would not be fully consistent with the aesthetic and visual compatibility goals and site development standards of the City of Edmonds' Comprehensive Plan's Downtown Waterfront Activity Center Plan. • The mass and height of a 72-mgd plant would be similar to that of the 54-mgd plant, except there would be additional structures on the northern perimeter of the site; as a result, structures would be closer to the public view. • The principal additional aesthetic impact associated with Unocal Structural Lid sub-alternative is the continuous horizontal band that would form the outer edge and façade of the lid structures (30 and 40 feet in depth by approximately 2,400 feet in length) along the lower northern perimeter of the proposed facility. The band would occur at a relatively constant elevation of 50 feet for the lid platform and visible edge elevation of 56 feet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Utilize color schemes consistent with selected image palette and which blend with surrounding landscape or context. o Provide landscape improvements together with treatment plant infrastructure to create a varied, attractive, and community friendly appearance. o Incorporate public art into facility design with visual public access to it.
	Conveyance	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts are as described under Construction Impact Common to All Systems, above. 	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Construction Mitigation Common to All Systems, above.

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems (cont.)

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation
Unocal System (cont.)	Conveyance (cont.)	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts are as described under Operation Impact Common to All Systems, above. Odor control facilities at Portals 7 and 11 (3,400-4,400 sf, 20 feet tall). A pump station would be located at Portal 11. 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Operation Mitigation Common to All Systems, above.
	Outfall Zone 6	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to Construction Impacts Common to All Systems. 	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Construction Mitigation Common to All Systems.
		<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to Operation Impacts Common to All Systems. 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Operation Mitigation Common to All Systems.
No Action Alternative	Treatment Plant	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be no construction impacts associated with the Brightwater Treatment Plant. 	<u>Construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation is proposed.
		<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Route 9 site: The existing zoning and development pattern would likely result in continued development of mixed manufacturing, industrial and storage yard uses, presenting a random and cluttered visual image. Aesthetic impacts of future development cannot be determined at this time. 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation is proposed.

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems (cont.)

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation	
No Action Alternative (cont.)	Treatment Plant (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unocal site: Given the existing land use and zoning, the site would likely be redeveloped with mixed residential and commercial development. Views would change from all vantagepoints. Aesthetic impacts of future development cannot be determined at this time. Assuming the likely development of residential and commercial uses in keeping with City of Edmonds land use plans and development guidelines and standards, aesthetic impacts would be generally positive and would not be in conflict with the City’s important aesthetic values of development compatibility with town character and environmental setting, extension of downtown to the waterfront, and provision of access to waterfront and Puget Sound views. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mitigation is proposed. 	
	Conveyance	<u>Construction</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be no construction impacts associated with the Brightwater conveyance system. 	<u>Construction</u>
		<u>Operation</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portal sites and conveyance corridor settings would experience continued growth and development of suburban neighborhoods and services, roadway improvements and infill urban development (especially for those western and I-5/99/I-405 corridor communities). The aesthetic and visual character of these areas would evolve as an outcome of this growth and development. 	<u>Operation</u>
Outfall Zones	<u>Construction</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be no construction impacts associated with the Brightwater outfall. 	<u>Construction</u>	

Table 12-3. Summary of Potential Aesthetics Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Brightwater Systems (cont.)

Brightwater System	System Component	Impacts	Mitigation
No Action Alternative (cont.)	Outfall Zones (cont.)	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The aesthetic and visual character of the outfall zones is not expected to significantly change from current conditions. 	<u>Operation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation is proposed.

The figures for this chapter are provided as separate files on this web site.

[Click here to view.](#)

LIST OF FIGURES

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Figure 12-1 | Typical Commercial Strip Aesthetic Setting |
| Figure 12-2 | Typical Business Park Aesthetic Setting |
| Figure 12-3 | Typical Suburban/Rural Residential Aesthetic Setting |
| Figure 12-4 | Typical Industrial Aesthetic Setting |
| Figure 12-5 | Key Map for Route 9 Site Views |
| Figure 12-6 | View 1: Looking North Toward the Route 9 Site From SR-522/SR-9 Interchange |
| Figure 12-7 | View 2: Looking East to Southern Portions of the Route 9 Site, Over SR-9, From 233rd Place |
| Figure 12-8 | View 3: Looking East Across SR-9 at the Route 9 Site From 228th Street SE Intersection With SR-9 |
| Figure 12-9 | View 4: Looking South From SR-9 to Northern and Central Part of the Route 9 Site |
| Figure 12-10 | View 5: Looking Southwest to the Route 9 Site from SR-522 |
| Figure 12-11 | View 6: Looking West to the Route 9 Site, Over SR-522, From 75th Avenue SE Ridgeline |
| Figure 12-12 | Key Map for Unocal Site Views |
| Figure 12-13 | View 1: Looking Northwest Over the Unocal Site From Pine Street and Chinook Road |
| Figure 12-14 | View 2: Looking Southwest From Edmonds Way Over Edmonds Marsh to the Unocal Site |
| Figure 12-15 | View 3: Looking South to the Unocal Site From Edmonds Marsh Viewpoint |
| Figure 12-16 | View 4: Looking Southeast to the Unocal Site Through Fenced Parking, Over Rail Line and Edmonds Marsh, From Admiral Way |
| Figure 12-17 | View 5: Looking East to the Unocal Site, Along Existing Chain Link Fence and Pipe, and Over Rail Line, From Edmonds Marina Beach Park |

- Figure 12-18 View 6: Looking West to the Unocal Site Over Edmonds Neighborhood From Alder Avenue and 9th Street
- Figure 12-19 View 7: Looking Southeast to the Unocal Site From the Upper Deck of Washington State Ferry as it Passes by the Existing Edmonds Marina
- Figure 12-20 Potential Impact of Odor Control and Dechlorination Facilities in Commercial Strip Aesthetic Setting
- Figure 12-21 Mitigated Odor Control and Dechlorination in Commercial Strip Aesthetic Setting
- Figure 12-22 Potential Impact of Odor Facility in Business Park Aesthetic Setting
- Figure 12-23 Mitigated Odor Control and Dechlorination Facilities in Business Park Aesthetic Setting
- Figure 12-24 Potential Impact of Odor Facility in Suburban/Rural Residential Aesthetic Setting
- Figure 12-25 Mitigated Odor Control Facility in Suburban/Rural Residential Aesthetic Setting
- Figure 12-26 Potential Impact of Odor Control Facility and Pump Station in Industrial Aesthetic Setting
- Figure 12-27 Mitigated Odor Control Facility and Pump Station in Industrial Aesthetic Setting
- Figure 12-28 Key Map for Route 9 Site Impact Views
- Figure 12-29 View 1: Impacts of 54 mgd Plant - Looking North Over the Route 9 Site From SR-9/SR-522 Interchange
- Figure 12-30 View 2: Impacts of 54 mgd Plant - Looking East to Southern Portions of the Route 9 Site, Over SR-9, From 233rd Place
- Figure 12-31 View 3: Impacts of 54 mgd Plant - Looking East to the Central Portions of the Route 9 Site From Intersection of SR-9 and 228th Street SE
- Figure 12-32 View 4: Impacts of 54 mgd Plant - Looking South to Northern Portions of the Route 9 Site From SR-9
- Figure 12-33 Option 1, Typical Route 9 "Expose" Design Mitigation Option: View 1 Looking North Over the Route 9 Site From SR-9/SR-522 Interchange
- Figure 12-34 Option 2, Typical Route 9 "Hide" Design Mitigation Option: View 1 Looking North Over the Route 9 Site From SR-9/SR-522 Interchange

- Figure 12-35 Option 3, Typical Route 9 "Blend" Design Mitigation Option: View 1 Looking North Over the Route 9 Site From SR-9/SR-522 Interchange
- Figure 12-36 Key Map for Unocal Site Impact Views
- Figure 12-37 View 1: Impacts of 72 mgd Plant - Looking Northwest Over the Unocal Site From Pine Street and Chinook Road
- Figure 12-38 View 2: Impacts of 72 mgd Plant - Looking Southwest From Edmonds Way Over Edmonds Marsh to the Unocal Site
- Figure 12-39 View 3: Impacts of 72 mgd Plant - Looking South to the Unocal Site, Over Edmonds Marsh, From Interpretive Viewing Deck
- Figure 12-40 View 4: Impacts of 72 mgd Plant - Looking Southeast to the Unocal Site Through Fenced Parking, Over Rail Line and Edmonds Marsh, From Admiral Way
- Figure 12-41 View 5: Impacts of 72 mgd Plant - Looking East to the Unocal Site, Along Existing Chainlink Fence and Pipe, and Over Rail Line, From Edmonds Marina Beach Park
- Figure 12-42 View 6: Impacts of 72 mgd Plant - Looking Southwest to the Unocal Site, Over Edmonds Neighborhood, From Alder Avenue and 9th Street
- Figure 12-43 View 7: Impacts of 72 mgd Plant - Looking Southeast to the Unocal Site From Upper Deck of Washington State Ferry as it Passes by the Existing Edmonds Marina
- Figure 12-44 Option 1, Typical Unocal "Expose" Design Mitigation Option: View 2 Looking Southwest From Edmonds Way Over Edmonds Marsh to the Unocal Site
- Figure 12-45 Option 2, Typical Unocal "Hide" Design Mitigation Option: View 2 Looking Southwest From Edmonds Way Over Edmonds Marsh to the Unocal Site
- Figure 12-46 Option 3, Typical Unocal "Blend" Design Mitigation Option: View 2 Looking Southwest From Edmonds Way Over Edmonds Marsh to the Unocal Site