

**Brightwater Treatment Facility  
Executive Advisory Committee  
Meeting Seventeen  
Northshore Utility District  
April 11, 2002**

**Meeting Report**

**Committee Members**

Bob Bandarra  
Peter Block  
Gary Haakenson  
Peter Hahn  
Corinne Hensley  
Mary Hovander  
Scott Jepsen  
Deborah Knutson  
Gwenn Maxfield  
Paul McIntyre  
Tom Ostrom  
Tom Putnam  
Pete Rose  
Bob Sokol  
Barbara Yarrington (for Mike Miller)

**Facilitator:** Margaret Norton-Arnold

**King County Staff**

Michael Popiwny  
Debra Ross  
Gunars Sreibers  
Christie True  
Erika Peterson  
Stan Hummel  
Gary Larson  
Carolyn Duncan

**Norton-Arnold & Company**

Yvonne Kraus  
Margaret Norton-Arnold

**Observers:**

Joyce Nichols  
Jim Orvis  
David MacFie  
Robert Freeman  
Tom MacBriar  
Thom Enrich  
Diane Thompson

## **Meeting Highlights**

The April 11 meeting of the Brightwater Executive Advisory Committee focused primarily on conveyance issues. The Committee heard a presentation about the conveyance options under consideration, as well as the evaluation process that will be used to narrow those options down to a preferred conveyance alternative. In their discussion after this presentation, EAC members provided the following advice to Brightwater staff:

➤ **King County should make every attempt to use existing public right-of-way for the conveyance lines.**

Committee members urged the County to use existing public property for conveyance facilities wherever possible, noting the complexity and expense of acquiring privately-owned land for this purpose.

➤ **The “Jepsen” conveyance alternative was proposed.**

Scott Jepsen suggested King County consider studying an additional effluent corridor for the Route 9 site. This corridor could transport effluent from the Route 9 plant site to Kenmore by paralleling the influent corridor that was shown to flow from Kenmore to the Route 9 site. Scott noted that from Kenmore, this new effluent corridor could then follow the corridor that was shown as a potential influent line for the Unocal plant site.

➤ **Traffic management during conveyance construction is a major concern.**

Members reiterated the importance of carefully evaluating and managing for traffic impacts during construction of the conveyance system. Gary Haakenson pointed out that potential impacts to ferry traffic along SR 104 are of particular concern, noting that Edmonds is the link to the busiest ferry route in Puget Sound. He asked that the Washington State Department of Transportation evaluate the proposed conveyance routes, and that they provide the EAC with a summary of the concerns they might have regarding conveyance construction along SR 104.

➤ **Reclaimed water must be fully reviewed in the cost/benefit equation.**

EAC members reiterated the importance of reclaimed water to the region. Members urged that the value of reclaimed water be factored into the cost/benefit equation. They noted that its “value” should be defined beyond monetary limits, and should include the long-term benefits to the environment as well as the benefits of decreasing discharges into Puget Sound. Members further urged King County to work closely with local jurisdictions along the conveyance route in order to evaluate all possible options for the use of reclaimed water. For example, the cities could potentially use this water source for the irrigation of parks and other public facilities. Members also suggested that King County install reclaimed water or “purple” pipes at the same time they are building the conveyance system.

➤ **Existing land use plans must be taken into consideration.**

EAC members commented that the proposed conveyance corridors cross a number of jurisdictions. It is important to be aware of, and accommodate, existing land use planning within those areas. Examples included new developments within the City of Kenmore, as well as numerous highway improvement projects that have been scheduled along SR 522.

➤ **Construction efficiency should be a top priority.**

Members urged King County to allow for the co-location of facilities and systems wherever possible. For example, the conveyance pipelines could be designed to accommodate fiber optic cables. It was also suggested that King County look at ways to use its existing pump stations.

➤ **The EIS scoping mailers need to be clear on why the communities along the proposed conveyance corridors should attend the meetings.**

When reviewing the public involvement plans related to conveyance, EAC members advised King County to highlight to those communities why they should be interested in the EIS scoping process. Because Brightwater may not be an issue that most people along the proposed corridors have paid attention to, it is important to emphasize where there are corridors under consideration, and make certain that individuals within those neighborhoods understand why they should participate in the EIS process.

➤ **King County needs to be careful when communicating about chlorine.**

During the discussion, a member noted that, in the past, King County has stated publicly that there would be no chlorine used at the new Brightwater plant. Staff responded that there would be no gaseous or liquid chlorine used, but that hypochlorite could possibly be used at the plant. Hypochlorite, a chlorine-based compound, is a more concentrated form of household bleach and is commonly used as a disinfectant. Members emphasized that the County needs to be careful, and honest, in its communication with the public about the potential use of this product.

## **Presentation: Evaluation of Conveyance Alternatives**

### **Gunars Sreibers**

As mentioned previously, the focus of this EAC meeting was on conveyance. Gunars Sreibers provided the committee with an overview of the proposed conveyance system for Brightwater, including the routes under consideration, as well as the pipes, pump stations, portals, and other facilities required for the conveyance system. All EAC members were provided with a copy of Gunars' presentation.

In addition to the EAC advice highlighted above, the discussion following the presentation included:

Members wanted to know whether tunneling and/or cut-and-cover were under consideration for the conveyance systems from the Route 9 site. Gunars answered that both were currently under consideration. The final determination of a preferred method will be based on soils, water, and other factors.

Gunars further noted that the number of wetlands mapped to-date along the routes includes all classes of wetlands. More information will be provided through the EIS process.

The question of a "per mile" cost for deep tunneling vs. cut-and-cover was raised. The County has completed some soils borings along the proposed corridors, and recognizes there are a number of issues to take into consideration when choosing the most appropriate

construction method, including high water tables, different soil types, and geologic formations. At this point, however, it appears that the initial estimates developed in Phase Two of the Brightwater project continue to hold: tunneling is likely to be less expensive than cut-and-cover. The lower cost is primarily attributed to the fact that there are fewer surface disruptions when deep tunneling is used.

### **Presentation: Public Involvement for Conveyance**

#### **Erika Peterson**

Erika presented the public involvement plan related to conveyance. She noted that the EIS scoping notice, which will be mailed in mid-May, includes information on the proposed conveyance corridors. In addition to the EIS scoping meetings, members of the public can attend special conveyance meetings over the summer, access information on the website, and request a presentation for their community or business group.

### **Presentation: Potential for Lake Washington Discharges**

#### **Christie True**

In response to questions that arose at the March 21 EAC meeting regarding the possible discharge of effluent into Lake Washington from the Route 9 plant site, Christie distributed a technical memo entitled 'Overview of reuse planning to date and considerations for discharging highly treated effluent into Lake Washington from the Route 9 location of the Brightwater Treatment Plant'. Christie noted that through the planning and evaluation efforts that led to the adoption of the Regional Wastewater Services Plan, it was determined to build the Brightwater Plant with a marine outfall into Puget Sound. Nevertheless, King County recently looked at a freshwater discharge option as a result of questions and comments received from the EAC, as well as from the general public.

She mentioned the following issues that were considered regarding discharging to Lake Washington:

- **Permitting:** Regulatory requirements are so stringent that discharge into Lake Washington would be extremely difficult to pursue at this time.
- **Costs:** The costs for a Lake Washington discharge would range from \$100-\$800 million more than current cost estimates for both of the Brightwater plant sites under consideration.
- **Public involvement:** To date, the Brightwater siting process has only discussed marine outfalls with the public and stakeholders. A possible discharge to Lake Washington would add new stakeholders to the process and it would be necessary to have the time to notify and solicit input from these stakeholders.
- **Schedule:** Due to the regional sensitivity about a wastewater discharge to Lake Washington, adding a freshwater discharge could delay the project an additional 18 – 24 months.

An EAC member asked: if tertiary treatment is going to be required in the future anyway, wouldn't it be more prudent to make the investment for that level of treatment now?

Christie responded that “tertiary” is difficult to define; it can include any level of treatment beyond secondary, and there are many options to pursue in order to attain that level of treatment. It may be that ammonia removal is the next regulatory requirement, for example, and the County will certainly make that investment should the regulations change. At this point it is difficult to predict the direction in which the regulations might move, however, so the County is not in a position to determine where, and how, to make the most appropriate investments in additional treatment technologies.

### **Next Steps**

The next EAC meeting will be held on Thursday, July 11<sup>th</sup> 2:00 p.m., at the Northshore Utility District. The meeting will focus on odor control technologies, as well as the regulatory land use drivers that are applicable to the Brightwater facility. EAC members are urged to attend the EIS scoping meetings, which will be held in June. The schedule for these meetings will be mailed the committee in mid-May.