Brightwater Treatment Facility

Executive Advisory Committee
Meeting Twenty
Northshore Utility District
September 12, 2002

Meeting Report

Committee Members
Angela Amundson
Deborah Chase
Laura Fricke (for Kevin Fitzpatrick)
Gary Haakenson
Peter Hahn
Corinne Hensley
Scott Jepsen
Paul McIntyre
Mick Monken (for Pete Rose)
Tom Ostrom
Tom Putnam
Bob Schillberg (for Peter Block)
Daryl Williams

Facilitator: Margaret Norton-Arnold

King County Staff
Christie True
Michael Popiwny
Debra Ross
Stan Hummel
Gunars Sreibers
Jo Sullivan

CH2M Hill
Dave Evans
Jim Goetz
John Spencer

Norton-Arnold & Company
Yvonne Kraus
Margaret Norton-Arnold

Observers
Kathy Batts
April MacFie
Tim Joseph
Linda Gray

Meeting Overview

The September 12th meeting of the Executive Advisory Committee (EAC) focused on the technologies under consideration for the Brightwater treatment plant. Committee members discussed how technologies would be evaluated, and ultimately selected, for the Brightwater plant.

Comments on Public Involvement

EAC members had the following comments regarding public involvement events associated with Brightwater:

- One member mentioned that the Snohomish County Council has scheduled a community meeting to meet with those who live around the Route 9 site at the Bear Creek Grange on September 12 at 6:30 p.m.
- One member mentioned that the public raised questions at a booth at the Monroe Fair regarding the use of fuel cell technology at treatment plants, and requested more information on this technolgy. It was noted that a fuel cell demonstration project is underway at the South Plant in Renton.

Presentation: Current Work Underway

Christie True

Christie provided a brief overview of the work that is currently underway on the project:

- A great deal of work has been focused on production of the Draft EIS.
- The team is also moving forward on elements of pre-design for both the plant and the conveyance system.
- Preliminary work on property acquisition has been initiated, including appraisals, environmental reviews, and discussions with current property owners. It is possible that King County may actually acquire some properties before the final site selection is made. It was noted that while there is a risk to carry out such work, it makes sense to take advantage of possible opportunities.

Presentation: Technology Considerations

Stan Hummel, King County
Jim Goetz, CH2M Hill

Stan and Jim provided information on the criteria that will be used to select technologies for the Brightwater plant, an overview of how technology decisions will be made, and the various technologies that are currently under consideration.

The presentation focused on secondary treatment technologies. The two technologies under consideration for secondary treatment are: membrane treatment (MBR) and

conventional activated sludge treatment. Conventional activated sludge treatment is currently used at the South Plant. MBR is an emerging technology and has been used successfully in plants with less capacity. An EAC member mentioned that the Tulalip Tribes will be using MBR technology in their new treatment plant.

Conventional technologies will be looked at in the evaluation of the alternatives under consideration in the Draft EIS. These technologies are known and well accepted and are more conservative relative to impacts. Some EAC members suggested that more information on the technologies under consideration be included in the Draft EIS or included in an appendix to the Draft EIS. Staff noted that information on the treatment technologies under consideration will be shared with the public in the October 5 technology seminar.

Members offered the following suggestions and comments during the presentation:

- Be clear about the types of odor control technologies that can be used and why specific types are best suited for certain sites. Explain why bio-filters need more space, and also be clear about the types of chemicals that will be on-site if chemical scrubbing is necessary.
- Explain the difference between the membrane (MBR) treatment technology and the conventional activated sludge treatment technology. Inform people that it is possible that the plant could include a hybrid of these systems. Also explain that even with MBR, the effluent will need to undergo additional treatment before it is suitable for agricultural re-use.
- Provide the public with examples of existing facilities that currently use the MBR system.
- Analyze all technologies in terms of ease of expansion in order to accommodate potential future flows. This analysis should include a review of maintenance cost, energy use, odor control, and replacement costs. Select the technologies that are the most flexible, and that will cause the least amount of disruption to the community if the plant does expand in the future.
- Provide information that compares the relative removal rates of compounds such as BOD and metals between the MBR and conventional activated sludge technologies. Address endocrine disrupter removal as well.

Presentation: Design Guidelines

Michael Popiwny

Michael summarized recent activities related to Brightwater plant design; two design workshops were held over the summer in both the Route 9 and Edmonds Unocal communities. These workshops resulted in a set of design guidelines, which will be used, in turn, to both inform the DEIS and to provide direction for further design of the facility.

Members offered the following comments:

- The workshops conducted to date for the design guidelines are a good start in involving the public in aesthetic design decisions. Further work on design and final design decisions should be left up to the communities that are close to the plant site and conveyance facilities.
- Members suggested that a comprehensive public involvement program be implemented for the conveyance system; it needs to be as equally thorough as the one you have put in place for the treatment plant site. Michael noted that the public involvement plan also includes extensive work with the communities who will be impacted by the conveyance routes. Public meetings were held this summer in the neighborhoods of potential conveyance corridors.

Public Comments

Public comments included:

Concern about the sole source aquifer at the Route 9 site; how will plant construction impact the aquifer, and how might the use of reclaimed water impact the aquifer? Staff responded that King County will protect the aquifer during construction and operation of Brightwater. Detailed information about the aquifer will be provided at the upcoming technology workshop; the EAC will also be reviewing plans for the production and use of reclaimed water at its October 10 meeting.

Concern about the number of soil borings that have been completed at the Route 9 site: it was noted that five borings have been completed at Route 9, while many more were performed for the Unocal site. Will more borings be done at Route 9 before the DEIS is completed? Staff answered that the Unocal Corp. had thoroughly tested the site due to contamination issues and an ongoing clean-up effort that is already underway there. King County is using that historical information for the DEIS. The five borings completed at Route 9 are sufficient to provide the information necessary for the DEIS analysis. More borings will be done to provide more detailed information for designing the facilities.

Next Steps and Announcements

The Brightwater Technology Workshop will be held on Saturday, October 5, 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at Kokanee Elementary School: 23710 57th Avenue SE in Woodinville.

The next EAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 10 at the Northshore Utility District.

The November EAC meeting has been moved from Thursday the 14th to Thursday, November 21. This will be an all-day retreat at the Embassy Suites Hotel in Lynnwood.