

**Brightwater Treatment Facility  
Executive Advisory Committee  
Meeting Seventeen  
Northshore Utility District  
August 13, 2002**

**Meeting Report**

**Committee Members**

Angela Amundson  
Peter Block  
Peter Coates  
Deborah Chase  
Kevin Fitzpatrick  
Gary Haakenson  
Peter Hahn  
Corinne Hensley  
Mary Hovander  
Dave Hutchinson  
Scott Jepsen  
Gwenn Maxfield  
Mike Miller  
Paul McIntyre  
David Nunnallee  
Tom Ostrom  
Tom Putnam  
Pete Rose  
Terry Ryan

**Facilitator:** Margaret Norton-Arnold

**Observers**

April MacFie  
Daisy Morris  
Michelle Robles  
Carol Smith  
Glen Jones  
Christy Myre  
Jeanette Knutson  
Margaret Taus  
Linda Gray  
Will Van Ry  
Jeff Treiber  
Todd Morrison  
Tim Smith  
Paull Shin  
Joshua Freed  
Pat Cordova  
Charles Blaine  
Kathy Morris  
Doug Farmer

Jeff Thorp  
Mark Breadley  
Chardel Blaine  
John Quast  
Diane Thompson  
Duane Bowman  
Jeff Wiley  
Lisa Joseph  
Hunter Goodman  
Adam Jude  
Ed Maurer  
Jeanne Edwards  
Diane Brooks  
Bob Sokol  
Rod Dennison  
Janice Freeman  
Maine Tonkin  
Janice Podsada  
Kate Lundford

Gerald Farris  
Robert Freeman  
Laurie Dressler  
June Riggs  
Greg Stephens  
Doug Jones  
William Howald  
Jurgen Sauerland  
David Crawford  
J.F. Janacek  
Don Henderson  
Debby Nicely  
Roger Eberhardt  
Starla Hohbach  
J.K. Alexander  
Barbara Chase  
Judy McAdam  
Lance Dickie  
Tom Newbourne

Carl Kellar  
James Orvis  
Janice & John Zambrino  
KL Thompson  
Stephen Clifton  
Char Crawford  
Randy Sleight  
Melissa Plourd  
Paul & Diane Thompson  
Don Fleming  
Tim Joseph  
Steve Anderson  
John Bush  
Andree Beddoe  
L. Ford  
Dave Mercer  
Carolyn Drake  
Aaron Feik

**King County Executive**

Ron Sims

**Snohomish County Executive**

Bob Drewel

**King County Staff**

Pam Bissonnette  
Christie True  
Erika Peterson  
Stan Hummel  
Jim Simmonds  
Annie Kolb-Nelson  
Yasmin Mudah  
Bob Peterson  
Gary Larson  
Carolyn Duncan

**CH2M Hill Staff:**

Jim Goetz  
John Spencer

**Norton-Arnold & Company**

Yvonne Kraus

## **Meeting Highlights**

King County Executive Ron Sims and Snohomish County Executive Bob Drewel were present at this meeting. The committee heard first from Executive Sims, who announced his preferred alternative system that will be included in the Brightwater Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Executive Drewel followed with a presentation detailing both his support for the Brightwater project and Snohomish County's continued role in the siting process.

## **Presentation: Preferred Alternative**

### **King County Executive Ron Sims**

Executive Sims thanked all Committee members for their work and involvement on this project. He explained that he has selected a preferred alternative at this point for a number of reasons. He noted that nearly three years of technical analysis has taken place, along with a number of opportunities for the public to comment. He said he felt it is important that people know what he is thinking to help alleviate the uncertainty that many are feeling. The Executive noted that a preferred alternative is frequently included in the Draft EIS and stressed that the announcement of a preferred alternative is not a final decision; both sites will continue to be fully analyzed in the EIS. The EIS will analyze a total of three alternative systems, with the final decision on Brightwater anticipated for mid-2003.

Executive Sims said his preferred alternative system is the Brightwater treatment plant at the Route 9 site, with conveyance pipes in a tunnel in King County along 195<sup>th</sup> and 205<sup>th</sup> Streets to a marine outfall at Point Wells.

Executive Sims noted the following advantages regarding his preferred alternative:

### **Route 9 Site:**

- The site is twice as large as the Unocal site, allowing for flexibility in design as well as an extensive landscape buffer.
- The area offers more potential for water reuse, both near the site and along the effluent pipeline.
- The site allows greater flexibility to manage flows during emergencies and maintenance.
- The site provides opportunities to enhance streams and wetlands.
- The site requires less soil removal.

### **195<sup>th</sup> and 205<sup>th</sup> Conveyance Corridors:**

- The 195<sup>th</sup> and 205<sup>th</sup> conveyance corridor provides an excellent alignment between the treatment facility and the outfall location.
- Using this corridor helps to allocate impacts equally between King and Snohomish Counties.
- All corridors allow for deep tunneling options, which will minimize construction and traffic impacts to the communities along the conveyance routes.

### **Point Wells Outfall:**

- Currents at the Point Wells outfall site provide for excellent mixing of waters within Puget Sound.
- It avoids impacts to eelgrass and shellfish beds.
- The outfall will be very deep and far shore – at least 500 feet deep and 3000 feet from shore.

### **Presentation:**

#### **Snohomish County Executive Bob Drewel**

Executive Drewel also thanked the committee and King County staff for their work, noting that the Brightwater site selection process has been undertaken with extraordinary transparency and openness. He explained that Brightwater must be built in order to serve future generations of both counties, and reiterated his support for construction of the facility. Executive Drewel emphasized that he has no site or system preference at this time; Snohomish County will continue in its watchdog role, and is committed to a fair, impartial and complete project-review oversight role throughout the siting process. Executive Drewel also noted that if the ultimate choice is the Highway 9 site, Snohomish County will exercise complete and independent authority throughout the permitting process.

Executive Drewel mentioned that Snohomish County will make sure that mitigation is done beyond the minimum to address the needs of today's residents and future residents. Executive Drewel asked that all residents remain deeply involved and engaged in the Brightwater project.

### **Committee Comment**

One member wondered what the appeal process would be for an EIS. The response was that the EIS would need to be appealed through King County's hearing examiner's office, and the if parties were not satisfied with the results, they could then appeal to Superior Court.

In response to another question, it was noted that the three alternatives that will be studied in the EIS are:

- Alternative 1) Treatment plant at Route 9 site with the conveyance corridors through Lake Forest Park and along 195<sup>th</sup> over Lake Ballinger Way and up to 205<sup>th</sup> to the Point Wells outfall (*preferred alternative*).
- Alternative 2) Treatment plant at Route 9 site with the same influent corridor through Lake Forest Park but with the effluent conveyance along 228<sup>th</sup>, through Mountlake Terrace to 205<sup>th</sup> and over to the Point Wells outfall.
- Alternative 3) Treatment plant at Unocal site with conveyance under Bothell Way and Ballinger Way NE up to a marine outfall at Edwards Point near the Unocal site.

In response to a question about portals, the project team responded that portals are large holes that allow for access to the conveyance tunnel as it is being bored, and that they are also used to haul out dirt from that tunnel. After construction, portal areas will be restored or even enhanced. Communities along the conveyance corridors will be consulted regarding possible site enhancements.

Committee members asked how the announcement of a preferred alternative might affect public involvement. In response, it was noted that the public involvement program that has been outlined will continue to be implemented. A series of public meetings will take place after the Draft EIS is issued in mid-October; public workshops on conveyance have taken place throughout the summer and two are scheduled in September. Meetings will also continue with the two community task forces that have been formed around the Route 9 and Unocal sites. Briefings and speakers bureau events take place on an ongoing basis. Staff reassured members that they would be working with the affected communities around the plant site, conveyance corridors, and marine outfall.

Concerns were expressed about Brightwater's influence on expanded growth: will Brightwater cause urban growth boundaries to be moved? In response, it was noted that Brightwater is being designed only to handle wastewater flows from the growth that is already anticipated to occur in the region. While urban growth boundaries may be changed in the future, Brightwater will not be the cause of that change.

Committee members also wondered if there was potential for the construction costs at Route 9 to rise unexpectedly. Executive Sims answered that costs are expected to remain close to the estimated \$1.3 billion for the Route 9 system. Revised cost estimates are expected to be available at the same time the Draft EIS is issued.

Committee members urged the project team and the Executives to remain committed to state-of-the-art odor control, and suggested that project designers go well beyond the lowest common denominator in order to make this treatment system a national model. Executive Sims assured members that the plant will be built to the highest possible standards, well beyond the minimum.

One committee member praised the Executives for the thoroughness of the site selection process to date; noting that process has been fully open, accessible, and fair. Another member thanked Executive Sims for his willingness to identify a preferred alternative, noting that it was time for the region to move forward in both site selection and construction of Brightwater.

### **Next Steps**

The next EAC meeting will be held on September 12, 2:00 p.m. at the Northshore Utility District.