

**APPENDIX B**

**Public Involvement Report and Meeting  
Summaries**

---

# **Public Involvement Report**

## **January-April 2003**

### **Solid Waste Facilities Master Plan**

### **Seattle Public Utilities**

## **Introduction**

As requested by the Seattle City Council and described in the Solid Waste Facility Master Plan Scope (April 2002), Seattle Public Utilities has implemented a public involvement strategy to engage multiple stakeholder groups in the development of the Solid Waste Facilities Master Plan. Through the Master Planning process, SPU is defining and analyzing options to meet the city's solid waste management needs for the next 30 years. These options include rehabilitating or rebuilding the city-owned recycling and disposal stations to improve self-haul services and developing an intermodal facility where solid waste can be transferred more directly from collection trucks to rail.

## **Stakeholder Engagement**

SPU met with environmental and community groups, employees, waste haulers, railroad companies, King County, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, and other stakeholders as well as neighbors and the general public, by attending existing meetings, holding meetings with groups, and by phone, and by hosting two rounds of public forums in February and April.

## **What We Heard**

### **Public Forums and Community/Business Group Briefings**

- Concerns with existing facilities  
Comments related to the north and south recycling and disposal stations, in general, focused on known problems, including traffic, odor, litter, noise, appearance, and operations.
- Concerns with potential operation changes
  - Businesses and other customers who currently use the north station are opposed to changes that would require them to use the south station because of the increased time and costs of driving to the south station.
- Suggestions for Improvements
  - Provide buffers or other visual improvements
  - Improve traffic flow and site design
  - Decrease noise and odor
  - Increase recycling and reuse opportunities
  - Factor sustainability into the design and construction of new facilities

- Consider the different locations/environments of the two stations  
The North station in a densely populated neighborhood and the south station in an industrial area. Participants at both meeting locations expressed that these differences merited a different approach to the two stations, particularly in terms of expansion. Despite the different environments of the two stations, participants expressed that improvements, whether remodel or rebuild, should contribute positively to their respective neighborhoods.
- Support for Intermodal Facility  
Participants at both meeting locations supported the concept of a new intermodal solid waste transfer facility to take the burden off of the two existing city-owned facilities, in terms of volume of solid waste and traffic, and to allow for the current facilities to better serve the self-haul customer needs. Concerns related to the development of a new intermodal facility centered mostly on cost of and access to the facility. It was recommended that the Interbay area be considered as a location for the intermodal facility in addition to other sites being considered.

### **Employees Meetings**

Employees shared their thoughts with SPU staff at regular briefings on the master planning process.

- Support Improved Facilities  
Employees in general supported improvements and expansion of the existing transfer stations in order to improve working conditions and customer services.
- Support for Intermodal Facility  
Employees support the creation of a new intermodal facility in order to improve the existing facilities, provided it is sited in an area away from other industrial activities that could pose a hazard to workers. Concerns generally revolve around the potential reduction in truck driving jobs.

### **Customer Surveys**

Customers at both recycling and disposal stations were asked a series of questions, including their current use of the facilities and their opinion on whether certain improvements were desirable and in some cases whether the improvements were worth increased costs.

Responses from 231 customer surveys are summarized as follows:

- Traffic  
Although traffic was a major concern at the public forums, most surveyed customers did not want to pay more for a decreased wait time. Many expressed their preference to choose to use the stations during less busy days and times of day.
- Pre-sorting waste  
87% of customers surveyed said they would pre-sort their waste into different waste types (lumber, metal, gypsum wall board, reuse items, other recyclables) if their fee was reduced.

- Improved facilities  
60% of customers surveyed said they would pay more for improved facilities.

### **Meetings with Waste Haulers**

Waste haulers expressed interest in hauling waste (except self-haul) to existing private stations rather than a new intermodal facility.

### **Meetings with King County**

King County is interested in working cooperatively with the City on intermodal solid waste transfer.

## **Public Involvement Activities and Tools**

### **Public Forums**

Two public forums were held to present information on the Master Planning process and to receive input from stakeholders.

February Forums: Introduction to Master Plan Process and Identification of Issues

- February 11, Wallingford
- February 13, South Park (Spanish translator)

April Forums: Preliminary Options and Identification of Related Issues

- April 15, Wallingford
- April 17, South Park (Spanish translator)

### **Employee and Labor Meetings**

Henry Friedman, project manager, and other SPU staff attended SPU employee meetings as well as labor/management meetings to share information on the current stage of planning and to receive input. In addition, Henry has had informal conversations with various staff members when visiting the recycling and disposal stations.

Quarterly Meetings of All Employees

- March 12

Labor/Management Monthly Meetings

- February 25

### **Solid Waste Citizen Advisory Committee Briefing(s)**

SPU identified the Solid Waste Citizen Advisory Committee (SWAC) as an initial point of review and involvement for the planning process. Henry Friedman attended four SWAC meetings in 2002 to obtain early input from committee members.

- May 15
- June 19
- September 18
- December 18

## **Community and Business Council Briefings**

Henry Friedman attended several meetings of community and business councils in the areas surrounding the city-owned recycling and disposal stations in January and February prior to the first public forum. Henry delivered short briefings at these meetings to inform the local groups about the planning process, including the upcoming public forum, and solicited input from attendees.

- Lake Union District Council (January 6)
- Greater Duwamish District Council (January 22)
- Fremont Neighborhood Council (January 27)
- Fremont Chamber of Commerce (January 29)
- Wallingford Community Council (February 5)
- Ballard/Interbay/Northend Manufacturing and Industrial Center Action Committee (February 12)

## **Other Stakeholders**

Henry Friedman, project manager, met with the following stakeholders on several occasions.

- King County staff
- Port of Seattle
- Solid waste/recycling haulers: Waste Management Incorporated and Rabanco
- Rail companies: Burlington Northern Santa Fe and Union Pacific Railroad Company
- Other authorized haulers: Seattle Housing Authority and University of Washington

## **Transfer Station Survey**

SPU developed and implemented a survey of transfer station customers. The purpose of the survey was to receive input from customers on how they use the current facilities, what aspects they feel are important to improve, and what level of cost increases to customer they felt were reasonable for these improvements. The survey was carried out at both the North and South Recycling & Disposal Stations on March 28 and 29. Input was received from 231 customers.

## **Fact Sheets**

SPU developed fact sheets to correlate with the information presented at the public forums. These fact sheets were available at the public forum and at the SPU website.

Fact Sheet 1: Solid Waste Facilities Master Plan (English/Spanish)

- The background of the planning process
- The life cycle of the various forms of waste (Where does it go when it leaves your curb?)
- Challenges of the existing situation
- Conceptual changes to the solid waste facilities.

Fact Sheet 2: Evaluation of Options

- Five preliminary options for facility improvements
- How the preliminary options were selected
- The screening criteria for evaluating the options

## How We Got the Word Out

### Advertisements

SPU advertised the February and April public forums city-wide. Display ads were placed in the following publications prior to each forum.

- Seattle Times/Post Intelligencer
- Seattle Weekly
- Daily Journal of Commerce
- Northwest Asian Weekly
- Beacon Hill/South District Journal
- West Seattle Herald/White Center News
- North Seattle Herald Outlook
- Seattle Sun (April only)

### News Releases

SPU submitted news releases prior to the February and April forums in more than 35 news outlets including:

Seattle P-I	South District Journal	King County Journal
Seattle Times	Associated Press Wire	South Seattle Star
Daily Journal of Commerce	Ballard News Tribune	KING TV
Puget Sound Business Journal	West Seattle Herald	KOMO TV
Seattle Weekly	White Center News	KIRO TV
South County Journal	Highline Times	Northwest Cable News
Capitol Hill Times	Des Moines News	KCPQ TV
	Federal Way News	KUOW Radio
	The Seattle Sun	KPLU Radio

### Door Hangers and Fliers

SPU distributed about 2,500 door hanger fliers to households and businesses within about a mile of each station. The fliers invited residents and business owners to the April public forums and provided information on the five preliminary options for improvements to the city's solid waste facilities. Fliers announcing the February public forums were posted in local businesses and neighborhood gathering spots. Prior to both rounds of forums fliers were distributed at the north and south stations. The fliers contained information about the upcoming forums, the planning process, the Master Plan website, who to contact with questions, and how to provide input.

### Letters of Invitation to Customers

SPU mailed letters of invitation to the April forums to over 600 regular customers who have accounts at the recycling and disposal stations.

### Communication with Stakeholders

SPU developed a list of over 90 stakeholder groups. These groups received letters of invitation as well as early forum notices to post to their newsletters and website calendars and to distribute to their own email lists. Individual stakeholders, including owners of property around the

stations and individuals who attended the first forums, were also contacted by letter, phone or email.

### **Website**

SPU developed a webpage on its website that contains both information on the planning process, the process schedule, both fact sheets, and contact information for questions and input.

**Summary**  
**Public Outreach/Input**  
**Solid Waste Facilities Master Plan**  
Seattle Public Utilities  
**January/February 2003**

Seattle Public Utilities kicked off the initial phase of its Solid Waste Facilities Master Planning Process with public outreach activities in January and February. SPU engaged the public in planning the future of Seattle's solid waste facilities by attending existing community/business council meetings and hosting two public forums. SPU staff attended five community/business council meetings in the areas surrounding the North and South Recycling and Disposal Stations to announce upcoming public forums, deliver a short briefing and record comments. (See list of briefings below.) SPU hosted public forums in Wallingford on February 11, 2003 and in South Park on February 13, 2003.

Attendees received a presentation on the solid waste facilities planning background, process, and schedule as well as a description of existing conditions at City facilities. Attendees were asked to comment on their concerns with existing facilities as well as what the City should consider when developing future facility needs ranging from remodeling or rebuilding the existing recycling and disposal stations to creating a new solid waste intermodal facility.

SPU received comments on these issues at the briefings, the two Forums, and from comments mailed or emailed. Comments related to the north and south recycling and disposal stations, in general, focused on known problems, including traffic, odor, appearance, and operations. Suggestions for improvements included providing buffers or other visual improvements, adding more collection options, and improving traffic flow and site design. Concerns related to the development of a new intermodal facility centered mostly on cost of and access to the facility. Generally, comments on this issue were favorable, particularly with regard to the potential for related improvements to the existing transfer stations.

Comments collected during this initial phase are summarized below.

## **Comments/Issues**

### **EXISTING TRANSFER STATION CONDITIONS – NORTH**

#### **Traffic**

- Wait lines often are backed up into the street.
- Access to transfer station is poorly designed. Not clear which way to turn.
- Truck traffic/traffic flow is a problem.
- Commercial collectors could go elsewhere.



- Truck access to station restricts public parking along street in front of businesses on North 35<sup>th</sup> Street
- Weigh collections trucks on entrance only.

### **Litter/Dumping**

- Trash is not removed from stations every night.
- Litter from self-haulers is strewn in neighborhoods surrounding station.
- The transfer station helps minimize illegal dumping in the neighborhood.
- Suggest a periodic (1-2 times per week) sweep of the 35th Street approach.

### **Air Pollution**

- Dust and particulates are a problem for immediate neighbors.
- Especially at peak use times.

### **Noise**

- Noise pollution

### **Location**

- Current location is convenient.
- Move the transfer station away from neighborhood.

### **Vermin**

- There is a rat problem in the neighborhood.

### **Recycling**

- Recycling needs are very high

## **EXISTING TRANSFER STATION CONDITIONS – SOUTH**

### **Traffic**

- The length of lines and wait time are way too long.
- A line should be designated for contractors or commercial vehicles.
- Traffic would improve if collection trucks didn't need to weigh out.
- Separate free and paying customers, so free customers don't have to wait.

### **Litter**

- Litter from uncovered loads is a problem around the station.

### **Location**

- Transfer station is an amenity.

### **Operations**

- Staff has extremely good attitude; current operations make it rough on staff.

- Hours of operation are too limited; should be extended beyond work hours on weekdays.
- Operations are cumbersome for self-haulers.

**Odor**

- The facility is odorous.

**Design**

- Building is too small.
- Not set up well for recycling.

**FUTURE TRANSFER STATION COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS– NORTH**

**Building design**

- Maintain current station roof height.
- Maintain current size of site.
- Improve building aesthetics.
- Improve the appearance of the north side of station to shield neighbors.
- Create a roof garden (damper noise, improve air, attract wildlife).
- Can state-of-the-art facility fit on the existing site?
- Enclose facility to create controlled environment (noise, air)
- Replace fence surrounding facility with a wall and landscaping to improve aesthetics.

**Odor**

- Constantly remove waste with a vacuum and water spray system to draw dust and smell away from the facility. This would create a more pleasant and safer work environment. (See Boeing, Paccar and other large painting facilities solutions.)

**Noise**

- Use fire-retardant foam inside to absorb harmonics and sound deadening panels to re-direct flow of sound.

**Environmental Education**

- Provide environmental education.
- Consider using existing school facilities for educational programs, instead of occupying adjacent off-site building.
- Add visual reminders to encourage recycling.

**Access**

- Vehicle access via old rail bed.
- Maintain primary entrance on 34th Street.
- Consider providing a separate entrance and exit.
- Allow walk-in deliveries.

- Coordinate flow of traffic with other projects in the area.

#### **Uses**

- Don't increase the use of present facility. Reduce pressure on station.

#### **Planning**

- Coordinate with South Wallingford Draft Plan
- Consider a No-Build option that takes the transfer station out of the neighborhood.

## **FUTURE TRANSFER STATION COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS– SOUTH**

#### **Site/building design**

- The south station is in a good location.
- Consider moving non-recycling facilities (truck maintenance, offices) at the south station to another location to provide more room at facility for recycling and reuse.
- Need a much larger recycling/reuse facility.
- Building is too small. Lengthen station to create more stalls.
- Site-line mitigation/landscaped buffer to improve appearance of station.
- Retrofit.
- Create a two-entrance facility, so that self-haulers that do to need to be scaled can go through more quickly.
- Enclose facility and provide air control and ventilation.
- Separate recycling, garbage and yard waste traffic.
- Direct access to HHW and recycling – no waiting behind waste self-haulers.
- Two-sided disposal pit access.
- Provide noise control.
- Provide sidewalks near facility.
- Need better signs showing how to get to the facility and entrance.
- Make neighborhood friendly.
- South station is on a good site to expand.
- Acquire neighboring property.
- Improve landscaping or berm to improve aesthetics.
- Expand facility into adjacent King County property to provide more services, such as recycling, reuse, public education, etc.

#### **Education**

- Provide public education to increase source reduction.
- Expand outreach to non-English speaking communities with materials printed in Amharic, Cambodian, Tigrinian, Vietnamese, Russian and Korean.

#### **Ownership**

- Maintain public ownership of facility.

### **Expand Reuse and Recycling Opportunities**

- Partner with thrift stores; provide ability to separate out reusable items on-site free of charge, prior to the pit.
- Increase recycling opportunities.

### **Household hazardous waste (HHW)**

- Expand HHW facility – more hours and easier drop off options.
- Consider making it easier and friendlier for small contractors to dispose of small amounts of HHW.
- Hazardous waste collection system needs major overhaul. So much gets dumped down the drain because proper disposal is too expensive and/or inconvenient.

## **POTENTIAL NEW INTERMODAL STATION**

### **Pollution**

- Protect against adding pollution to an already polluted area (Harbor Island/Duwamish River)

### **Access**

- Coordinate with Alaskan Way Viaduct planners
- Important to have the option for barge access.
- Should be designed with good access for the trucks.

### **Costs**

- Would increase opportunity to control costs.
- Consider the additional costs of constructing and operating an additional facility.
- Consider potential of taking on liability for Harbor Island clean-up costs, if land is purchased there.

### **Design**

- Research other facilities to ensure most appropriate design/equipment.

### **Traffic**

- Moving bulk of waste only once is a good idea, especially with respect to traffic.

### **Good Idea**

- Especially if it reduces pressure on present recycling & disposal stations.
- Definitely need more facilities.

### **Location**

- Consider Interbay area, but not north of Ship Canal.

### **ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS/COMMENTS – NORTH**

- Provide free coupon for curbside pick up---make the coupon last longer.

### **ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS/COMMENTS – SOUTH**

- Source reduction is the future.
- Important to continue to encourage waste reduction and recycling rather than increase capacity of facilities.
- Increase recycling/reuse education on the front end.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS ON PUBLIC INFORMATION TECHNIQUES**

#### **Community Groups/Councils/Associations**

- Community Newsletters/Calendars
- Email/E-lists
- Website notices
- Business Association

#### **Flyers**

- Signs/flyers at transfer stations
- Flyers at local coffee shops
- Notice on garbage cans

#### **Utility Bill inserts**

#### **Local newspapers**

**Community/Business Council Meetings Attended by SPU**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Lake Union District Council	1/6/03	12
Fremont Chamber of Commerce	1/29/03	
Fremont Neighborhood Council	1/27/03	24
Wallingford Community Council	2/5/03	18
Greater Duwamish District Council	1/22/03	8
Ballard Interbay		

**Public Forums**

<b>Forum</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Wallingford	2/11/03	8
South Park	2/13/03	13

**Summary of Public Outreach/Input  
Solid Waste Facilities Master Plan  
Seattle Public Utilities  
April 2003**

Seattle Public Utilities hosted two public forums in April: Tuesday, April 15 in Fremont and Thursday, April 17 in South Park. Sixteen people attended each meeting.

**Common Themes**

Several themes emerged at both the north and south meetings. Participants at both meetings acknowledged that the different locations/environments of the two stations, the North station in a densely populated neighborhood and the south station in an industrial area, merited a different approach to the two stations, particularly in terms of expansion. Despite the different environments of the two stations, participants expressed that the facilities, whether remodeled or rebuilt, should contribute positively to their respective neighborhoods. Participants supported a new intermodal facility to take the burden off of the two existing facilities, in terms of volume of garbage and traffic, and to allow for the current facilities to better serve the self-haul customer needs. Participants backed improvements to the current stations, such as decreased traffic, noise and odor, increased recycling and reuse opportunities, and factoring sustainability into the design and construction of new facilities.

**Fremont Meeting Themes, April 15, 2003**

Most comments on the proposed options at the meeting in Fremont, April 15, 2003 focused on the fact that the North Recycling & Disposal Station is bordered by a residential neighborhood. Participants urged the city to use care in the design of a new facility and to focus on ways to be a “good neighbor”. While participants supported improvements that an expanded facility would provide, such as decreased traffic, building setback from residences, increased recycling and reuse facilities, most had concerns about expanding the facility beyond the existing footprint. Neighboring residents expressed their desire to maintain their current views above and around the facility and supported sustainability components of a new structure.

**South Park Meeting Themes, April 17, 2003**

The meeting in South Park on April 17, 2003 had a different tone and set of issues surrounding the South Park community. South Park residents attending the meeting noted the difference between the semi-industrial location of the South station and the residential location of the North station, requesting that planners take the differences in the two communities into account when putting together a design scheme. Participants supported expansion of the South station to accommodate additional recycling and reuse activities. A straw poll of people attending the meeting in South Park indicated support for a new intermodal facility due to the perceived benefits of moving the commercial waste transfer to another facility where it would be compacted, rather than at the two neighborhood stations. There was a request that the City of Seattle take the “long view” of a 30 to 50 year time frame in planning for its solid waste facilities, providing flexibility and room for growth in a plan.

## DETAILED COMMENTS

---

### NORTH STATION

#### **Facility Design: Aesthetics, Visual Corridors, and Sustainability**

- Aesthetics is a very important consideration at the North station.
- Consider a green roof. (grass or a garden)
- A better, more attractive facility that improves the neighborhood and increases the home values is worth paying for.
- The station could be vastly improved by being turned into a "green" building. Wrapping the structure with what equates to a large trellis supporting climbing plants would bring about marked aesthetic and environmental benefits. Also by converting the existing roof to a "green" roof would help to cool the immediate micro-climate around the center and provide a excellent example of sustainable building practice with this time release water retention system.
- Since the City wants to recycle and reduce waste, you should consider the amount of waste that will be created if you rebuild. Look at the waste stream as a category.
- Neighbors will be supportive of a new building that is constructed to meet sustainability criteria, such as a Silver LEED rating.
- A new building could have a deeper setback away from residences.
- The compactors should be located furthest from homes.
- Maintaining view corridors and building height are important to the neighborhood.

#### **Traffic**

- On busy weekends, the idling vehicles create noise and air pollution. Re-route the traffic away from residences on the north side of the facility.

#### **Intermodal Option with Existing Facilities Rebuilt on the Existing Footprints**

- Include an option that combines building a new intermodal facility with remodeling or rebuilding the recycling & disposal stations on their existing footprints.
- If you do not decide to relocate the facility, you should consider the additional impacts of expanding the site. It is preferable to rebuild on the existing footprint and off-loading some of the impacts on a new intermodal facility.

#### **Different Considerations for the North and South Stations**

- Because the North station is in an increasingly dense neighborhood it requires different considerations than the South station.
- The plan should emphasize efforts to make the North station a good neighbor.

#### **Siting of the North Station**

- The North station has difficult access, is too small, and creates odor, noise and vehicle exhaust. Since the station is adjacent to a high density neighborhood, you should reconsider relocating the station somewhere else like the Ballard industrial area.



### **Alternative Options**

- Consider a waste to energy plant
- Material Recovery Facilities are becoming common in California and should be considered here.

### **Rat Problem**

- Consider ways to eliminate the existing rat problem at the North station. Although the garbage is supposed to be removed nightly, there are nights when it is not.

## **SOUTH STATION**

### **Facility Design**

- Separate scales for yard waste and garbage.
- Look at other stations that are working well.

### **Traffic**

- Separate traffic lines for recycling and solid waste.
- Consider adding more scales to improve traffic flow and decrease wait times.
- Consider a reservation system.
- Diverting commercial trucks to the South station would have very low residential impact.

### **Intermodal Option: Necessity, Design, Location and Partnering**

- Intermodal needs to be built.
- Look at waste flow to determine size of facility needed.
- Intermodal should be designed to be a modifiable/changeable facility.
- King County would incur cost to use the new intermodal, reducing the overall expense. Consider contracting with them before building the facility.
- Adding King County waste stream into system does not make economic sense and, adds to existing transportation issues, increases impacts to infrastructure.
- King County is planning to build a similar facility, please coordinate.
- The Harbor Island site does not have barge or additional rail.
- Barging is slower, less realistic than rail.

### **Different Expansion Options for the North and South Stations**

- Very little property is available for expansion at the North station. It is not very realistic to look at major expansion there.
- Expansion at the North station may be too controversial. Consider community resistance as another hidden cost.
- Expanding the South station to provide improved services makes sense.
- Relocate vehicle maintenance facility to a more central location to provide more space at the South station.

**Siting of Existing Facilities**

Look at real estate other than the existing facilities (e.g. Long Paint property is for sale).

**Alternative Options**

- Consider alternative options like producing methane gas and diesel oil from waste.

**Rebuild Options**

- Container traffic remains the same without the addition of an intermodal station.
- New facility should be built before demolishing existing stations.

**Recycling/Reuse**

- Consider the opportunity for public/private partnerships to pull recyclable/reusables out of the waste stream at stations.
- Since the Mayor wants to increase recycling rate to 60%, consider the possibility that the volume of garbage may decrease.
- Municipal solid waste decreased at Rabanco in the last year.
- Make construction and demolition waste available for recycling/recovery.

**Timeframe**

- Consider 30-50 year time frame for the facilities in the plan.

**Costs**

- It is difficult to determine how effective the options are without cost estimates.