

# BrightWater

Wastewater Treatment Facilities Siting Process

---

***Summary of April 2001 Public Workshops***  
***Edmonds***  
***Woodinville***  
***Shoreline***  
***Bothell***

---

King County Department of Natural Resources

May 3, 2001

---



***Clean Water – A Sound Investment***

# CONTENTS

<b>SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Public Workshop Format .....	3
Open House.....	3
Presentation.....	3
Community Discussion.....	4
<b>SECTION 2: WORKSHOP SUMMARIES.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Edmonds Public Workshop .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Odor Control.....	5
Outfall and Conveyance .....	5
Mitigation .....	5
Construction Impacts.....	6
Jurisdictional Authority .....	6
Environmental Impacts.....	6
Community Nomination Process.....	7
Permitting and Land Ownership.....	7
Other Sites .....	7
<b>Woodinville Public Workshop .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Noise.....	7
Odor Control.....	8
Cost/Financing/Fees .....	8
Conveyance/Treatment Process.....	8
Mitigation .....	8
Site Layout/Plant Design.....	9
Jurisdictional Authority .....	9
Other Sites .....	9
<b>Shoreline Public Workshop .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Traffic.....	10
Conveyance and Outfall .....	10
Construction .....	10
Impacts to Residential Property Owners .....	10
Mitigation .....	11
The Environment.....	11
Site Conditions .....	11
Other Sites .....	11
<b>Bothell Workshop .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Thrashers Corner .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Odor Control.....	12
Traffic.....	12
Conveyance .....	12
Mitigation .....	13
Property Acquisition/Values.....	13

Cost/Financing.....	13
The Environment.....	14
Siting Criteria .....	14
Jurisdictional Authority .....	14
Other Sites .....	14
<b>Gun Range</b> .....	15
Use of the Gun Range as a Recreational/Training Facility.....	15
Site Conditions .....	15
The Environment.....	15
Jurisdictional Authority.....	16
Community Nomination Process.....	16
Siting Criteria and Public Involvement .....	16
Other Sites .....	16
<b>Gravel Quarry</b> .....	16
Site Conditions .....	17
Odor Control.....	17
Traffic.....	17
Impacts on Residential Property Owners .....	17
Siting Criteria and Public Involvement .....	18
Other Sites .....	18
 Follow-up.....	 18
 <b>APPENDIX A – ADVERTISING IN SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC WORKSHOPS.</b>	 <b>19</b>
 <b>APPENDIX B – PUBLIC WORKSHOP AGENDA .....</b>	 <b>22</b>
 <b>APPENDIX C – SITING ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROSTER.....</b>	 <b>23</b>

## Section 1: Introduction

In November 1999, King County approved its Regional Wastewater Services Plan. One aspect of this plan includes building a new regional wastewater treatment facility somewhere in north King or south Snohomish County by 2010. King County initiated the public involvement portion of the process to site the new treatment plant, its associated conveyance and marine outfall with a series of three public workshops in June of 2000. Policy siting criteria were developed as a result of input from a variety of sources, including the public. These criteria, after review and revision, were adopted by the King County Council in February 2001 in Ordinance 14043. The criteria were used to select a set of seven proposed candidate sites for further consideration.

While the policy criteria were being developed, refined, and approved, King County worked to identify land areas that might be suitable for the new facilities. Ninety-five areas were identified using existing documentation, an industrial/commercial lands search, and a community nomination process. The 95 sites were analyzed using a set of engineering and environmental constraints that would inhibit the construction or operation of a wastewater treatment facility. Constraints included steep slopes, site shape, landslides, flood zones, etc. This analysis revealed that 38 of the 95 sites were largely unconstrained.

After adoption of the policy criteria, King County applied them to the 38 sites using a set of evaluation questions, to determine how well each site met the criteria. Based on this evaluation, the King and Snohomish County Executives proposed seven candidate sites to be evaluated in greater detail. Table 1 provides a description of the sites under consideration.

The King County Council is scheduled to approve the list of candidate sites in May 2001. As part of this evaluation, King County held four public workshops in the communities where the candidate sites are located. The workshops were held from 6:00-9:00 p.m. at the following locations:

Thursday, April 19, 2001  
Edmonds-Woodway High School  
7600 212<sup>th</sup> Street  
Edmonds

Wednesday, April 25, 2001  
Shorewood High School  
17300 Fremont Avenue North  
Shoreline

Tuesday, April 24, 2001  
Woodinville High School  
19819 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE  
Woodinville

Thursday, April 26, 2001  
Canyon Park Junior High School  
23723 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue SE  
Bothell

**Table 1 – Site Descriptions**

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Public workshop</b>
Edmonds Unocal	City of Edmonds, Snohomish County	Unocal operations; inactive tank farm	Edmonds
Point Wells	Unincorporated Snohomish County	Active Chevron Asphalt Plant	Shoreline
Route 9	Unincorporated Snohomish County	Numerous businesses – light industrial	Woodinville
Woodinville	City of Woodinville, King County	Undeveloped – residential proposed	Woodinville
Gun Range	Unincorporated Snohomish County	Kenmore Gun Range	Bothell
Gravel Quarry	City of Bothell & Unincorporated Snohomish County	Gravel Quarry and undeveloped land	Bothell
Thrashers Corner	City of Bothell & Unincorporated Snohomish	Low density residential & open space	Bothell

The purpose of the public workshops was to inform citizens of north King and south Snohomish counties about King County’s siting process for the new north treatment facilities and to solicit comments from citizens on their issues, concerns, and ideas regarding impacts and opportunities associated with siting a wastewater treatment facility at the proposed locations. This report summarizes the results of the four workshops.

In order to inform affected and interested citizens about the meeting, King County advertised the public workshops using a variety of methods, including:

- Paid advertisements in a number of area newspapers
- Mass mailings to residents within approximately a half-mile of each candidate site (a total of 26,000 flyers were sent)
- Press releases and public service announcements to area newspapers, radio and television stations, and city web sites
- A media event to announce the candidate sites.

A complete listing of where and when these advertisements were run is contained in Appendix A of this report.

## **Public Workshop Format**

This section describes the activities that took place at the four workshops. Appendix B contains a copy of the agenda used at the workshops.

### **Open House**

The workshops were held from 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. The rooms were set up with a sign-in table, seven information stations (all staffed and stocked with handouts), and a sit down/presentation area. In addition to the information stations, a court reporter was provided throughout the workshop, as a means for participants to record their comments. The open house was held from 6:00-6:30 p.m. to allow participants to browse through and collect information, as well as to ask questions of project team members. A team member staffed each station. The stations consisted of:

- 1 – Sign-in table** -- participants signed in and received a nametag, meeting agenda, and a comment form. Participants were put on our mailing list upon request.
- 2 -- How we got here/ What's next** – identified the work up to the selection of the seven candidate sites. The station also provided information about the RWSP, criteria development and approval, participants in the decision-making process, siting process timeline, the need for a third plant, and information about the next steps in the process and how to stay involved.
- 3 -- Sites** – provided 30” x 40” aerial view of each site, a siting area map that identified all seven sites, and handouts with detailed information for each site.
- 4 -- Outfall** – provided a map of outfall sites, as well as information on outfall locations, and criteria for outfall site.
- 5 -- Wastewater/Conveyance** – provided general information about how and why we treat wastewater and issues regarding the selection of conveyance routes. Potential route zones (in a graphic format) for each of the seven sites were available for discussion.
- 6 -- Mitigation** – provided a description of mitigation, and included images of facilities that provide examples of mitigation in a range of settings.
- 7 --Video** – a 9-minute video – “Stewards of the Water” – was played on a continuous loop, and provided information about how modern wastewater facilities treat wastewater, protect the environment, and are good neighbors.

### **Presentation**

At 6:30 p.m., a presentation began. King County Wastewater Treatment Division staff provided an overview of why King County needs to pursue the siting and construction of a new wastewater treatment facility to serve north King and south Snohomish counties. They gave an overview of the siting process, criteria development and application, the candidate sites, decision

points and timeline. They pointed out that King County Executive Ron Sims has recommended the Woodinville site be removed from consideration because state covenants will soon be placed on the land that will limit its use to affordable housing. They displayed examples of other treatment plants, and how they have been designed to “fit into” and benefit the communities in which they operate. The presentation was followed by showing of the nine-minute video "Stewards of the Water."

### **Community Discussion**

After the presentation, participants were invited to question presenters and a panel of King County staff and consultant team members about the candidate sites, the siting process, the siting criteria, or wastewater treatment in general. Professional facilitators moderated these town-hall-meeting-style sessions, and recorded questions, as well as comments, from participants. This report includes summaries of the discussions at each meeting.

## **Section 2: Workshop Summaries**

This section of the report summarizes the public comment that was generated at the public workshops for each site under consideration. A number of participants made comments on the comment forms provided, as well as through the court reporter. These comments (received by King County as of May 1, 2001) are incorporated in this report. The original comments are on file with King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Treatment Division. Table 2 provides a summary of the number of comments received through these two mediums.

**Table 2 – Summary of the number of written comments received**

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Comment form</b>	<b>Court reporter</b>	<b>Public workshop</b>
Edmonds Unocal	7	2	Edmonds
Point Wells	5	3	Shoreline
Route 9	1	0	Woodinville
Woodinville	0	0	Woodinville
Gun Range	13	15	Bothell
Gravel Quarry	2	0	Bothell
Thrashers Corner	4	0	Bothell
<b>Total</b>	<b>38*</b>	20	

\* Six additional forms were returned with comments about the Gun Range and the Gravel Quarry

## **Edmonds Public Workshop**

**Edmonds-Woodway High School, April 19, 2001 – 57 participants**

The discussion at the Edmonds workshop produced a number of questions and comments about the Edmonds Unocal site. Comments made about other sites are summarized at the end of this section. A majority of the comments made in regards to the Edmonds Unocal site fell under the following themes<sup>1</sup>:

- Odor control
- Outfall and conveyance
- Mitigation
- Construction impacts
- Jurisdictional authority
- Environmental impacts
- The community nomination process
- Permitting and land ownership

### **Odor Control**

Some comments made by participants were made in the context of the current odor issues associated with the City of Edmond's wastewater treatment facility. Participants noted that it does emit odors that impact those who live and work nearby. They were concerned that as the Brightwater facility ages, as the Edmonds facility has, it would have similar odor problems.

### **Outfall and Conveyance**

Participants were concerned about the conveyance pipes and outfall for the Edmonds Unocal site in terms of their location and impact on residents, as well as how they might be impacted by earthquakes and/or landslides. There was concern about outfall construction impacts on residences during drilling for the outfall tunnel and construction. One participant noted the tendency for landslides in the area (with specific reference of USGS maps), and was concerned that future landslides could impact the outfall if it was not sited properly. There were questions about where the treated effluent would enter Puget Sound and whether it would be further out and deeper than the Edmonds wastewater treatment plant's outfall.

### **Mitigation**

In general, there was concern that there would be challenges associated with mitigating all impacts concerning the Unocal site. Some also believed that a facility at the Unocal site offers opportunities to Edmonds. Participant concerns and comments included:

---

<sup>1</sup> Themes identified throughout this document are not intended to be listed in order of importance.

- While mitigation may help the community in general, ferry terminal relocation, and the multi-modal project, it would be difficult to mitigate the impacts to residences immediately surrounding the site.
- The useable acreage of the site may be insufficient to accommodate the plant, its intended expansion, and meaningful space for other uses, such as the treatment facility, ferry terminal, and multi-modal center, and mitigation.
- The mitigation budget may not be sufficient to accomplish the actions intended to minimize impacts related to the construction and operation of the facility.
- The facility is not the best use for the property since many would consider it “prime” real estate with potential for generating tax revenue and residential development.
- A treatment plant on this site could provide an opportunity that, in combination with mitigation, has fewer impacts than other potential uses.
- This site provides an opportunity to accomplish multiple objectives: combine outfalls from existing plants into a longer, deeper outfall, cleanup contaminated soils, and restore/enhance wetlands.

### Construction Impacts

Participants voiced concern related to building the conveyance lines and to length of time needed for plant construction. There were concerns about the type of construction that would be used: if cut and cover, would that mean digging up the streets; if tunneling, could there be vibration that might damage homes. There was also concern regarding pipe reliability and how the County ensures that there aren't sewage leaks.

### Jurisdictional Authority

A number of comments were made regarding King County's authority to site, build, and operate a treatment plant in Snohomish County. Participants wanted to know why King County had the authority to site a wastewater treatment plant in Snohomish County. Some were also interested in how the two counties would work together in the decision-making process. Others voiced frustration over the fact that the one candidate site located in King County (the Woodinville site) has been removed from consideration. The general feeling was that this decision was unfair.

### Environmental Impacts

Some participants were concerned about the magnitude and length of the cleanup that would be necessary on the Unocal site if it were selected. There was also concern about who would be responsible for that cleanup, and how Unocal and King County would manage it. Other concerns focused on the impacts that earthquakes could have on a plant located so close to the water and on the impacts associated with a power shortage or outage at the facility.

## Community Nomination Process

There were questions, and some concern, about the community nomination process. In particular, those commenting were concerned that it was possible for someone to nominate a site outside of their own community, since potential plant impacts would not be experienced by that individual.

## Permitting and Land Ownership

Participants were interested in knowing about Unocal's interest in selling the property, and whether or not Unocal would still be liable for cleanup if they did sell the site to King County.

## Other Sites

One participant wanted to know if King County could both preserve the current use of the Gun Range site and build and operate a treatment plant there.

## ***Woodinville Public Workshop***

### **April 24, 2001 Woodinville High School -- 44 participants**

The discussion at the Woodinville workshop produced a number of comments and questions related to the Route 9 site. There were no comments on the Woodinville site that has been recommended for removal from the process. A summary of comments about other candidate sites is provided at the end of this section. Questions and comments fell under the following major themes:

- Noise
- Odor control
- Cost/financing/fees
- Conveyance/treatment process
- Mitigation
- Site layout/plant design
- Jurisdictional authority

## Noise

Some participants were concerned about noise during construction and operation of the entire system (plant, conveyance, pump stations, etc.). Comments showed concern about the impacts of noise and vibrations on surrounding neighborhoods. There was similar concern about lighting the facility, both during construction and operation. One participant suggested that noise levels need to be considered both near and far away from their sources as sound can travel in different ways and at different levels, and thus have varying impacts within the area. This individual went on to note that sound can travel through the ground as well as through the air. Questions showed concern about residents' ability to have an avenue for recourse if noise impacts are greater than promised by King County. Participants noted that there could be other unanticipated impacts if a plant were built and operated at the Route 9 site, and were concerned how these impacts would be addressed to their satisfaction.

## Odor Control

Some participants were concerned about odor impacts on surrounding neighborhoods. Those commenting said that odor control was important because the site is so close to residential development. Those with questions wanted to know if King County had the budget for the best odor control available and if they could guarantee surrounding neighbors will not be impacted by odor while the odor control systems are operating properly. Others wanted to know if odor control systems would function effectively during peak/high flows.

## Cost/Financing/Fees

There were a variety of comments and questions about how much the new facilities would cost, how they would be financed, and who would be responsible for their payment. Some, who now have septic tanks, were concerned that they would be forced to hook up to the system, and thus help pay for it. Other simply wanted to know if those not hooked up to the sewer system would have to pay. Other questions focused on the difference in cost for a “utilitarian” facility versus one that made more of an architectural statement. Other participants wanted to know how much of a factor cost would be in selecting a site and if King County was planning for cost uncertainties.

## Conveyance/Treatment Process

There were a number of comments and questions about conveyance, with focus on the differences between cut and cover and tunneling construction. Other areas of concern included the conveyance lines’ affect on local wells and construction impacts. There were also a number of comments and questions regarding the treatment process and its by-products. Participants asked if some sites were more appropriate than others for water reuse. Others were concerned about the plants electricity needs, and whether or not residential needs would be superceded by the plant in the event of shortages. Others were concerned about the impacts of a power outage on the plant’s ability to treat wastewater, and what backup systems the plant would have.

## Mitigation

Participants raised a number of questions and comments regarding mitigation. Questions included:

- What will be done to make the plant fit into the community?
- Could traffic improvements in the area be a form of mitigation?
- How much will King County spend on mitigation, and how much input the community would have in identifying mitigation elements?

Those with comments identified the following opportunities for mitigating plant impacts:

- Preserve the natural state of the property just north of the industrial area. This area is unique because of very large trees and critical wetland areas.
- Build a “light footprint” type plant to fit in with rural environment.

- Develop parks and recreation facilities along with the treatment facility.
- Identify a range of traffic improvement opportunities, including the widening of Route 9.

### Site Layout/Plant Design

Participants identified concerns regarding potential site layout and plant design. Most were concerned about how the plant would fit into the community and wanted King County to identify where the buildings would be located. One participant was concerned that King County might sell off a portion of the site, since it is one of the larger candidate sites, to another user, and thus create a new set of impacts in addition to those associated with a treatment plant. Other participants wanted to know if King County intended to work only with local governments when it came to a more detailed examination of the site and how it might be developed for wastewater treatment, or if they intended to work with the community and residential groups as well. Others wanted to know if King County would still be interested in the site if it could not acquire all the property parcels identified as part of the site.

### Jurisdictional Authority

A number of participants were concerned that this appeared to be solely a King County project, and that Snohomish County, as well as other local governments were not involved at an acceptable level, especially since the Route 9 site is in Snohomish County. Participants wanted to see Snohomish County more actively involved in order to ensure its residents were being represented. Finally, some participants wanted to know if King County had the authority to site and build a plant in Snohomish County, and if the County was prepared to use eminent domain in order to acquire the site.

### Other Sites

There were no comments or questions specific to other candidate sites at the Woodinville workshop.

## ***Shoreline Public Workshop***

### **April 25, 2001, Shorewood High School – 52 participants**

The discussion at the Shoreline workshop produced a number of comments and questions related to the Point Wells site. A summary of comments about other candidate sites is provided at the end of this section. Questions and comments fell under the following major themes:

- Traffic
- Conveyance and outfall
- Construction
- Impacts on residential property owners
- Mitigation

- The environment
- Site conditions

## Traffic

Participants made numerous comments regarding the potential impacts of the plant on traffic and parking in the area. They were concerned about the single, narrow road through Richmond Beach to the site, and whether or not that road could accommodate construction and plant traffic. Because current train traffic is very high, they said, King County should not plan on using rail lines to assist with construction of the plant. Attendees were also concerned that plans for mitigation efforts, such as parks or trails, would create additional traffic and require additional public parking, stating there is not space available for such a use.

## Conveyance and Outfall

Participants voiced a number of concerns related to the construction and operation of the conveyance lines and outfall. They commented that cut and cover construction would have a greater impact on the communities than tunneling construction. They were also concerned about current odor issues associated with the Richmond Beach Pump Station, and wanted to ensure that any new facilities would be built with improved technologies. Some stated that the Richmond Beach Pump Station is not a good neighbor, as it sits on three acres of land and has chain link fence surrounding it. There were questions about the conveyance of both treated and untreated wastewater, with the comment that the Point Wells site would require longer conveyance of untreated wastewater. Another attendee wondered about the potential for water reuse at this site. There were general concerns expressed, as well, about how the outfall will affect water quality and the ability of residents to use and enjoy nearby Saltwater Park.

## Construction

Participants were concerned about the length of time required for construction (estimated four years) and the negative impacts that would have on their area. They were also concerned about the potential impacts from dump trucks, and their associated noise, dust, and traffic impacts.

## Impacts to Residential Property Owners

A number of concerns were expressed regarding the impacts of the plant on the surrounding residential area. Participants stated that none of the other candidate sites have residences in such close proximity to the proposed plant area, and that at West Point the houses are further away from the plant. Of primary concern was the impact the facility could have on property values on surrounding neighbors. Attendees were worried that negative public perception of wastewater treatment facilities would result in a devaluation of their property values over the long-term, and were further concerned that just the possibility of siting a plant in that area would lower their property values. Plant odors are the most worrisome impact related to property values. A number of participants felt that a port, marina or restaurant would be a better use the Point Wells property.

## Mitigation

If the new wastewater treatment facility is built at Point Wells, participants suggested the following kinds of mitigation be included:

- An above or below grade crossing of railroad tracks is needed to reduce chance of accidents with trains.
- Increased opportunities for trails and natural areas east and west of the tracks, as well as improved beach access.
- Estuarine restoration.
- More sidewalks in the area to make it safer for walking.
- Rail removal of biosolids would be preferred in order to reduce truck trips within the area.

Participants asked if there would there be mitigation to address the concerns of residents who would not be direct neighbors of the facility, but who still could be impacted by its operation at Point Wells (e.g. neighbors to the south) and if the facility could be built underground to reduce visual and odor impacts and to provide for other uses above ground.

## The Environment

Participants raised a number of environmental issues for consideration. Specifically, there was concern about possible impacts on Bald Eagles nesting in the area. There were also a number of questions related to the environmental permits necessary to build the facility, and how King County intended to comply with these permitting requirements.

## Site Conditions

Participants identified a number of issues regarding the current conditions of the site. There was concern, for example, about the relatively small amount of useable space at Point Wells, and whether or not this would make the plant too much of a “tight fit,” with little room for expansion. Other attendees were concerned about the kind of contamination likely to be on the property at this time, and King County’s ability to both clean up, and build on, this site. Concerns about site reliability were also mentioned, specifically the potential impacts of earthquakes and soil conditions. Tsunamis and liquefaction could severely damage the facility because the site is only eight feet above high tide. The soft, sandy soils prevalent on the site may not provide a reliable foundation for the construction and operation of the facility.

## Other Sites

There were no comments or questions specific to other candidate sites at the Shoreline workshop.

## **Bothell Workshop**

**April 26, 2001, Canyon Park Junior High School – 415 participants**

The Bothell Workshop was held to discuss three candidate sites, Thrashers Corner, the Gun Range, and the Gravel Quarry. Due to the number of participants, the discussion portion of the meeting was conducted in two groups, one focusing on the Thrashers Corner site, and another focusing on the Gun Range and Gravel Quarry sites. Summaries of participant comments and questions are provided for each of these sites separately. A summary of comments about other candidate sites is provided at the end of each site's section.

### **Thrashers Corner**

Participants who spoke at the Thrashers Corner discussion expressed widespread opposition to siting a wastewater facility at this location, making comments on the following themes:

- Odor control
- Traffic
- Conveyance
- Mitigation
- Property acquisition/values
- Siting criteria
- Jurisdictional authority

#### **Odor Control**

Many participants voiced concern about the impact odor could have on the community if a treatment facility was sited at Thrashers Corner. This concern focused on the percentage of time the plant would smell. Many participants cited other treatment plants as examples of facilities that smell, and wanted to know how that would be prevented in this case. Participants asked if the plant would smell as it gets older and what recourse the community would have if there are odor, or other unforeseen problems, after the plant is built.

#### **Traffic**

Participants raised a number of concerns regarding traffic, a primary concern in the area. Participants expressed specific concern about traffic impacts during construction, including the number of trucks accessing the site as well as the noise and dust construction activities generate. They suggested that many of the area's roads are in need of improvement, including Filbert Road. They also expressed concern that treatment plant operations would increase traffic, adding to its impacts. Finally, they clearly stated that additional roads off of SR 527 are undesirable.

#### **Conveyance**

Participant comments about conveyance lines focused primarily on concern regarding their reliability. Participants were concerned about spills or overflows and the impacts such an event

could have on the surrounding area. There was also concern about the ability to clean up such a spill if it took place. Many noted that a spill from a facility at Thrashers Corner would have tremendous impact on the site's wetlands and on surrounding residents who rely on wells for drinking water, as well as cause long-lasting odor problems. Others noted that the site's distance from the Puget Sound would make the conveyance lines expensive to build, and to maintain since they would rely on pump stations. Participants also wanted to know what size pipelines would be used and in which streets they would be installed.

### Mitigation

In general, participants favored the preservation of the existing open area for open space or parkland. However, there was widespread belief that siting a treatment facility was not a means for this preservation. There was concern that the site is not big enough for a plant, and mitigation for a park, wetlands, and site neighbors. Participants stated that recent growth and development in the area has put a premium on open space, which makes the Thrashers Corner area deserving of a park, not a treatment facility, at the proposed location. One participant stated that while identifying ideas that would make a facility at Thrashers Corner more compatible with the community is extremely difficult, it should be the community's focus, because not doing so could mean they lose out on valuable mitigation opportunities.

### Property Acquisition/Values

There was a great deal of concern with regards to property acquisition and property values. Many participants owning property or living within the site's boundaries—whose property would have to be acquired -- made comments about how they would be personally impacted, should the Thrashers Corner site be selected. Others, living in proximity to the site, said that a treatment facility there would severely affect their property values. Participants expressed concern about King County's ability to keep commitments and pay full value for property. One participant stated "It is incomprehensible to consider a site that will involve the removal of 14 families and all that they have created on their properties, both material and intangible." Some landowners of property on the site expressed concern about the scheduling of visits by representatives of King County to their properties. Others believed that those dislocated would not be able to find similar properties that are not already slated for development. Other participants commented that those on septic systems would be exposed to negative impacts but not to benefits. Those in the area wanting or trying to sell property now expressed concern that they have been negatively affected through the selection of Thrashers Corner as a candidate site as potential buyers are less likely to buy or to pay asking price.

### Cost/Financing

Participants raised concerns about who is going to pay for the new treatment facility and how much it would cost, with specific concern for those not hooked up to the system.

## The Environment

Many participants were concerned about potential impacts the facility could have on the environment if sited at Thrashers Corner, with specific concern for wetlands, endangered, and other species, and the loss of trees. Participants stated that wetlands and streams are located throughout the site and that the site includes habitat for a variety of species. Participants also stated it is not possible to construct and operate on this site without adversely affecting the environment, including endangered species (salmon). North Creek was cited as an example where mitigation is not working. Finally, participants believed that environmental issues alone should remove this site from consideration.

## Siting Criteria

Participants showed a great deal of concern regarding the factors that were considered in the selection of the proposed candidate sites. In general, participants wanted to know if the criteria were weighted, and how much public input counted in the selection process. For instance, could the community say “no” to having a treatment plant? Participants pointed out that the Thrashers Corner brochure does not adequately represent the degree to which a treatment facility at this site could potentially impact the area’s schools and neighborhoods. Participants suggested the criteria be changed so that sites with people currently residing on them are removed from consideration.

## Jurisdictional Authority

Participants expressed concern that Snohomish County and Bothell elected officials are not representing the area and the concerns of its residents.

## Other Sites

Participants made a number of comments about other sites. There was widespread belief that other sites, such as the Unocal Site, which is an abandoned industrial site, would have fewer impacts associated with it because there is no need for King County to acquire residential property and there are no schools nearby. Participants also thought that cleaning up and redeveloping an industrial site for wastewater treatment made more sense than developing cleaner, open space, which is at a premium because of the region’s rapid development.

Many participants thought it unfair that the Woodinville site was removed from the selection process early. Many also thought it unreasonable to remove the site because owners had building permits for a future development when owners/residents of Thrasher’s Corner properties have current permits and/or development of their properties and currently occupy those properties. Many participants also thought it unfair that there are no King County sites under consideration and requested that a King County site be put back on the candidate list as a replacement for the Woodinville site.

## **Gun Range**

The majority of participants who spoke about the Gun Range at the Bothell Public Workshop were in strong opposition to the use of the Gun Range as a site for the new Brightwater treatment facility. Copies of 220 e-mails sent to various elected officials from the Wildlife Committee of Washington opposing the Gun Range site were given to staff. Questions and comments can be categorized into the following themes:

- Use of the Gun Range as a recreational/training facility
- Site conditions
- The environment
- Jurisdictional authority
- Community nomination process
- Siting criteria and public involvement

### **Use of the Gun Range as a Recreational/Training Facility**

Many of those attending the meeting were members of the gun club. They were concerned about the potential loss of the Gun Range as a recreational facility, and explained that it would be difficult to build a new gun range in a different location. They also questioned the application of the siting criteria in terms of recreational facilities, wondering why golf courses and parks had been eliminated from consideration early on, while the Gun Range had remained under consideration. Other comments related to the importance of the Gun Range as a training facility for law enforcement officials from throughout King and Snohomish County. Meeting participants also cited the level of attendance/enjoyment at the Gun Range and the ongoing high safety record at the range as reasons for dropping that property from further consideration.

### **Site Conditions**

A number of those commenting at the meeting were concerned about the steep slope on the Gun Range property. They believed that it would be impossible to pump wastewater up or down the slope as required to move either treated or untreated effluent through the system. They were also concerned about the high cost associated with the pump stations that would be required for a treatment plant at this site.

### **The Environment**

In addition to site conditions, a number of those in attendance were concerned about environmental issues related to the Gun Range site. For example, there is an osprey nest on the site, which would require protection. Swamp Creek also runs very close to the Gun Range property. Attendees were concerned that if there was a leak from the plant, or from one of the conveyance pipes, Swamp Creek could be polluted.

## Jurisdictional Authority

There were a number of questions and comments about the relationship between King County and Snohomish County, and the ultimate decision authority over a final plant site. Attendees were concerned that Snohomish County had no real voice in the decision process, since the decision will ultimately be made by King County Executive Ron Sims. Because they do not vote directly for King County officials, meeting participants did not believe their concerns would be adequately listened to and addressed. Concerns over jurisdictional authority appeared to be widespread and related to other aspects of the siting process. For example, a number of individuals questioned how the siting criteria had been developed, and whether or not that process could be trusted to result in an unbiased, fair decision. Some participants stated that a rumor had been circulating that King County intended to purchase both the Gun Range and Gravel Quarry, build the plant on the gravel quarry site, close the Gun Range, and re-open it as a park.

## Community Nomination Process

Several in the audience questioned the community nomination process. They wondered who had nominated the Gun Range, and why the nomination of just a single individual could hold precedence over a large group of people who clearly do not want the Gun Range to be considered. They believed that it had been unfair to include the Gun Range in the list of candidate sites based on this single nomination.

## Siting Criteria and Public Involvement

A number of attendees raised questions about the siting criteria overall, and particularly about the way in which public/community concerns would be weighted against the other siting criteria. They wondered if strong community opposition, for example, would persuade King County to look elsewhere for a treatment plant site, even if the other criteria would appear to be rated favorably for that site.

## Other Sites

Participants commented that the Edmonds Unocal site is a better choice than the Gun Range because it would require fewer conveyance lines and because there is not a current use of the site.

## Gravel Quarry

In general, workshop attendees voiced strong opposition to the use of the Gravel Quarry for the wastewater treatment facility. Their comments and concerns can be categorized according to the following themes:

- Site conditions
- Impacts on residential property owners

- Odor control
- Traffic
- Jurisdictional authority
- Siting criteria and public involvement

### Site Conditions

Meeting participants were concerned about both the steep slopes and the soil conditions on the Gravel Quarry site. Those living on the lower edge of the property say they already have problems with loose gravel and sand migrating onto their residential properties. They believed that the construction of the treatment plant would be impossible in these kinds of slope and soil conditions. They were also concerned that any spills from either the plant or its conveyance pipes would be highly detrimental to the surrounding area, since untreated wastewater could move easily through the loose sand and gravel on the site. In addition, they were concerned about the high cost associated with the number of pump stations needed to move both treated and untreated wastewater through these steep slope angles.

### Odor Control

Many attending the meeting were concerned about how the plant would be designed and operated to prevent odors from dispersing to nearby properties. They did not believe that the County could design an odor control mechanism that would be adequate to protect the neighborhood.

### Traffic

Several comments were raised regarding traffic issues on 228<sup>th</sup>. Because that roadway has experienced considerable construction over the past several years, meeting attendees did not want it to be further impacted by construction or operation of the plant. They were concerned about possible traffic delays, as well as overall impacts to the road once the plant would be under operation.

### Impacts on Residential Property Owners

Those who have homes in close proximity to the Gravel Quarry were particularly concerned about the impacts of the plant. In addition to odor and traffic issues, property owners were concerned about their property values. They were concerned that those values would go down over the long term if a treatment plant is actually constructed in their area. They were also concerned that their values would go down now, simply due to the perception that a treatment facility may be built in their area. They wondered how King County would compensate them for this loss of property value.

## Siting Criteria and Public Involvement

A number of attendees raised questions about the siting criteria overall, and particularly about the way in which public/community concerns would be weighted against the other siting criteria. They wondered if strong community opposition, for example, would persuade King County to look elsewhere for a treatment plant site, even if the other criteria would appear to be rated favorably for that site.

## Other Sites

Those making comments about other sites said that they believed the Edmonds Unocal and Point Wells sites to be more desirable than the Gravel Quarry because they were at a lower elevation; rail and barge access to them would minimize traffic impacts; and do not currently have open space or natural area value.

## ***Follow-up***

All meeting participants who added their name to the mailing list will receive copy of this report. They will also receive project newsletters and other public notices throughout the process, as well as have the opportunity to participate in future public meetings.

A current list of Siting Advisory Committee members can be found in Appendix C of this report. For more information about the Committee, its role in the siting process, and its schedule of meetings, which are open to the public, please contact Debra Ross of the King County Wastewater Treatment Division at (206) 684-1344.

## Appendix A – Advertising in Support of the Public Workshops

Listed below are the papers in which an advertisement was placed to inform the public about the Public Workshops held on April 19, 24, 25, 26, 2001.

Newspaper	Dates ads were run
The Edmonds Paper	April 12
The Enterprise Newspapers	
Edmonds	April 12
Shoreline	April 19
Lake Forest Park/Lynnwood	April 12
Lynwood	April 19
Mill Creek	April 19
Northshore Citizen	April 19
Eastside Journal	April 15
Seattle Times/PI	April 15
Woodinville Weekly	April 17
Everett Herald	April 15

Shown below is a copy of the advertisement that was placed in these newspapers:

### CAN A SEWAGE PLANT BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR?



You may be surprised to know that wastewater plants can be built with public gardens, wildlife habitat, sports fields and art!

To keep up with growing population, King County needs to build a new wastewater treatment facility to serve north King and south Snohomish counties. Seven sites have been proposed. One will be selected in early 2003.

Please come to a public workshop to learn more and to discuss these proposed sites with us. Each meeting will focus on one to three sites.

Check the Brightwater Website for more information:

<http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wtd/brightwater/>

*Working for your neighborhood and the environment!*

PROPOSED SITE:	WORKSHOP LOCATION:
<b>Edmonds Unocal</b> In Edmonds, surrounded by Pine Street, Edmonds Way, and the marina.	<b>Thursday, April 19, 2001</b> Edmonds-Woodway High School 7600 212th Street SW Edmonds
<b>Route 9</b> Located east of the intersection of 228th Street SE and Highway 9, close to Highway 522.	<b>Tuesday, April 24, 2001</b> Woodinville High School 19819 136th Avenue NE Woodinville
<b>Woodinville</b> South of NE North Woodinville Way and west of NE Woodinville-Duvall Road.	<b>Wednesday, April 25, 2001</b> Shorewood High School 17300 Fremont Avenue North Shoreline
<b>Point Wells</b> On the Puget Sound shoreline, between the City of Shoreline and the Town of Woodway.	<b>Thursday, April 26, 2001</b> Canyon Park Jr. High 23723 23rd Avenue SE Bothell
<b>Near Bothell: Gun Range</b> This site includes the Kenmore Gun Range, north of 228th Street SE, between 4th Avenue W and 14th Avenue W.	<b>WORKSHOP TIMES:</b> Open house: 6:00 p.m. Presentation: 6:30 p.m. Community discussion groups: 7:00-9:00 p.m.
<b>Gravel Quarry</b> This site includes the Fruhling Gravel Quarry, south of 228th Street SE and east of 11th Avenue W.	
<b>Thrashers Corner</b> South of 208th Street SE, between Highway 527 and 9th Avenue SE.	

If you have questions or to request reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities, please call John Phillips at 1-888-707-8571.

Public Service announcements and press releases were also distributed to a number of area newspapers, television and radio stations, and websites. These included:

**Newspapers**

The Seattle Times  
The Seattle Post-Intelligencer  
South County Journal  
Morning News Tribune (Tacoma)  
The Weekly  
Monroe Monitor  
Kirkland Courier  
Issaquah Press  
The Valley Record  
Redmond-Sammamish Valley News  
Mercer Island Reporter  
West Seattle Herald  
Renton Reporter  
Kent Reporter  
Vashon-Maury Island Beachcomber  
Voice of the Valley  
Enumclaw Courier-Herald  
Daily Journal of Commerce  
Puget Sound Business Journal  
The Edmonds Paper  
The Enterprise Newspapers  
The Northshore Citizen  
The Eastside Journal  
The Woodinville Weekly  
The Everett Herald

**Television**

KOMO-4  
KING-5  
KIRO-7  
KCPQ-13  
Northwest Cable News

**Radio**

KIRO Newsradio 710  
KOMO radio  
KSER 90.7  
KVI  
KPLU  
KUOW  
KCMU  
KLSY  
KJR  
KLSY

KJR  
KEZX

**Websites**

The City of Bothell  
The City of Edmonds  
The City of Shoreline  
The City of Woodinville

# Appendix B – Public Workshop Agenda



Wastewater Treatment Facilities Siting Process

## Public Workshop Agenda

Thursday, April 19  
6:00 - 9:00 p.m.

Edmonds-Woodway High School

Wednesday, April 25  
6:00 - 9:00 p.m.

Shorewood High School

Tuesday, April 24  
6:00 - 9:00 p.m.

Woodinville High School

Thursday, April 26  
6:00 - 9:00 p.m.

Canyon Park Jr. High School

### 3 WAYS TO COMMENT

Facilitated **Community Discussions** with other members of your community

Submit **Written Comments** using the form provided.

**Record your comments** one-on-one with a court reporter

**6:00 p.m. Open house**

**6:30 p.m. Welcome**

— Margaret Norton-Arnold, Facilitator

**6:35 p.m. Presentation**

- Project goals, description, and process
- Christie True & Michael Popiwny, King County

**7:00 p.m. Community Discussion**

**8:45 p.m. Next steps**

- What's next
  - How you can be involved
- Michael Popiwny

**9:00 p.m. Adjourn**



## Appendix C – Siting Advisory Committee Roster

### North Treatment Facility Project Siting Advisory Committee Roster *as of March 7, 2001*

**Bill Anderson**  
Commissioner  
Silver Lake Water District

**Deborah Chase**  
Councilmember  
City of Kenmore

**Deanna Dawson**  
League of Women Voters of Snohomish County

**Merle Hayes**  
Vice Chairman  
Suquamish Tribal Council

**Douglas Jacobson**  
City Manager  
City of Lake Forest Park

**Wayne Kaske**  
Mayor  
City of Brier

**Steve Koho**  
Manager  
Edmonds Wastewater Treatment Plant  
City of Edmonds

**Paul McIntyre**  
Commissioner  
Alderwood Water District

**Michael Noblet**  
Mayor  
City of Bothell

**Tina Roberts**  
Mayor  
City of Lynnwood

**Daryl B. Williams**  
Environmental Liaison  
The Tulalip Tribes

**Kinnon Williams**  
Commissioner  
Northshore Utility District

**Peter Block**  
Councilmember  
Woodway Town Council

**Peter Coates**  
King County Labor Council

**Kevin Fitzpatrick**  
Regional Manager  
Water Quality  
WA State Department of Ecology

**Corinne Hensley**  
Pilchuck Audubon Society

**Scott Jepsen**  
Mayor  
City of Shoreline

**Deborah Knutson**  
Executive Director  
Economic Development Council of Snohomish County

**Richard Leahy**  
City Administrator  
City of Mukilteo

**Mike Miller**  
Master Builders Association

**Tom Putnam**  
Puget Soundkeepers Alliance

**Pete Rose**  
City Manager  
City of Woodinville

**Terry Ryan**  
Mayor  
City of Mill Creek

**Greg Wingard**  
Washington Environmental Council