

North Transfer Station

DRAFT Stakeholder Meeting #3a Summary

March 7, 2011

Institute for Systems Biology • 5:00 to 8:00 PM

ATTENDEES

Stakeholders

David Ruggiero
Paul Willumson
Bill Bergstrom
Eric Johnson
Trish McNeil
Jessica Vets
Pat Finn Coven
Rob Stephenson
Bob Quinn
Erik Pihl
Toby Thaler

Seattle Public Utilities

Nancy Ahern
Tim Croll
Bill Benzer
Ken Snipes
Jeff Neuner

EnviroIssues

Penny Mabie (facilitator)
Alissa VandenBerghe
Emily Reardon

HDR

Dan Costello
Deb Frye (presenter)
Olivia Williams

VanDevanter and Associates

Mark VanDevanter

J R Miller & Associates

Clark Davis (presenter)

Observers

Karl Hufnagel
DJ Dean
Allison Hogue
Tom Cole
Steve Moddemeyer
Sarah Saviskas
Gary Rea
Erika Bigelow
Monica Wagoner
David Hewitt
S. Bukojemsky
Kirby Lindsay
J. Hall
Julie Wattling
Brent Anderson
Tom Aura

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of this meeting was to review additional details and information developed for the five site concepts, develop weighting of criteria for use in down-select from five to two concepts, and review renderings of the architectural themes.

AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION

Welcome and Introductions

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny convened the meeting, asked everyone to introduce themselves, and reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting. She also briefly discussed the process that will be used to reduce the number of concepts from five to two.

Bill Benzer provided updates from Seattle Public Utilities (SPU). In December, SPU met with the Seattle Design Commission (SDC) to review the plans to replace the North Transfer Station (NTS). SPU provided the SDC with the same materials that were handed out at Workshop #2b. The SDC urged SPU to consider what is best for Seattle and to think outside the box. Bill told the group that SPU would return to the SDC at a later date to provide an update and receive more input. Since the last workshop, SPU has also met with the Wallingford Community Council (WCC). The WCC sent SPU a draft letter after reviewing the five concepts and since then they have provided a formal letter that was sent to SPU, City Councilmember Mike O'Brien and Mayor Mike McGinn. According to the letter, the members of the WCC prefer Concept 8/9B out of the four rezone concepts. Bill reported the Court of Appeals upheld the ruling that there is no Environmental Impact Statement needed for this project.

A stakeholder asked how the SDC's recommendations will be incorporated into the stakeholder process and how seriously their recommendations should be taken. Nancy Ahern replied that the SDC's recommendations are not binding; the commission reacted to the materials available at this very preliminary phase of the project. She added that SPU will have more interaction with the SDC in the future. The stakeholder then asked if the SDC's comments could be disregarded. Nancy told the group that the recommendations are considered advice, especially with regard to concept selection.

A stakeholder asked to clarify what will be accomplished by the end of the meeting. Penny replied by the end of the next workshop (on March 14th) the stakeholder group will have recommended two concepts for further development. Tonight will be spent weighting the criteria and learning about the architectural themes that can be applied to the concepts.

Five Concepts

Deb Frye, HDR and Bill Benzer, SPU

Deb Frye provided a brief overview of the five concepts. She also explained the changes made by HDR and SPU since the last workshop. Some of the major changes included that the design team completed a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) analysis and determined that all concepts can reach the LEED goal of Gold certification. A LEED row was added to the summary and decision matrices. The design team also developed the recycling floor plans for each concept and all are available online.

Deb then presented the cost information for each concept. She explained that the biggest factor influencing cost is adding underground operating space.

Bill explained the cost chart. The first line represents the capital costs, including design and construction. Since Concept 10 doesn't include a rezone or any transfer station associated use of the 1550 property or the vacation of Carr Place, there is an estimated net gain of \$5 million from the sale of the 1550 property based on estimated current market value. The cost table also includes the differences in annual operations and maintenance (O&M) costs. A stakeholder asked what causes differences in staffing costs. Bill explained that an example of those differences is the smaller capacity in Concept 10 would require there be more drivers removing the waste. Another stakeholder asked if SPU received any contractor input into the capital costs estimates. Tim replied that HDR estimated the costs.

Bill then explained the Net Present Value (NPV) row, which calculated the future dollars for the project. A stakeholder asked if bond costs were accounted for in the NPV. Tim replied that the interest from bonds matches inflation, which is included in the estimate. Another stakeholder reminded the group that bonds were used for capital costs only and not operating costs. Tim added that the NPV is used to compare the concepts easily. A stakeholder asked if these costs are what SPU expected and has budgeted. Bill said that Concept 2, 8/9A, and 8/9B are just about at the budget in the city's Capital Improvement Projects. Concept 12 is above what is budgeted and Concept 10 is below.

A stakeholder asked the group to consider the cost of future reconfiguration to match changes in the future waste and recycling needs. He also asked SPU and HDR to capture those changes somehow, if it is possible. He added that some sites seem to be more amenable to change than other concepts. The stakeholder believed that Concept 2 should be easier to reconfigure since it's flat and open as opposed to Concept 12 which is compact and stacked. Tim replied that there would be a lot of speculation in those assumptions. Clark Davis asked the stakeholder to clarify if he meant building out parts of the property. The stakeholder replied that building out the property was what he meant.

Nancy reminded the group that these costs are based on 0% design and in very preliminary stages – this is not meant to be a tight cost estimate. It's more than likely that the costs of all concepts could move in the same direction across the board. A stakeholder commented that it's encouraging the cost estimates are within the reasonable expectations.

A stakeholder asked what caused the differences in capital costs. Bill replied that since Concept 2 is at grade, there isn't as much earthwork or support necessary which makes the construction cost much lower than the other concepts. Dan Costello added that any slight change in the location of the building can cause fluctuations in cost due to the varying grades of the property.

Another stakeholder asked how these costs compare to the South Transfer Station. Jeff Neuner replied that the South Transfer Station cost approximately \$46 million. A stakeholder noted that the South Transfer Station was much larger than this project. An observer asked if operational efficiencies were factored into the O&M costs. Bill replied that the efficiencies in the scale houses were incorporated into the costs.

Decision Criteria Weighting

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny introduced the process that will be used to help the stakeholder group make their recommendation on concepts to move forward. Last November, when the stakeholder group narrowed nine concepts to five concepts, an informal voting procedure was used. Now, with the goal of selecting just two concepts and eventually one concept the team has provided a procedure. The hope is to accomplish a defined evaluation process that will produce a way to value the subjective and nonselective elements.

Next week, concepts will be scored and then each score will be weighted based on this discussion. That will produce a "value score" which will be compared to cost. For this step, the group will weigh the criteria based on its importance to stakeholders and their constituents. This will provide a basis for discussion. Penny reminded the group that this is not a decision tool – it's still up to the stakeholders to view the results of the value score and the cost comparison and make a recommendation.

Penny then explained the worksheet and asked the stakeholders to fill out the worksheet with their opinions.

A stakeholder asked if there would be a separate design process with the design builder selected for the project. Tim replied that it would be a separate process to decide what the building will actually look like.

Penny showed the stakeholder group the results of the weighting process.

Criterion	Weight
Long-term Environmental Efficiency of Station/Zero-Waste Flexibility	27%
Neighborhood Impacts and Aesthetics	24%
Community and Environmental Amenities	19%
SPU and Hauler Operational Efficiency	17%
Self-Haul Customer Experience	13%

Penny explained that mathematically, what is shown in these results is that the most important criteria to the stakeholder group as a whole is long-term environmental efficiency of the station/zero waste flexibility. Penny asked the group if they believed the results were representative of the group. A stakeholder replied that the weights seemed accurate and that they represented the community. Another stakeholder added that it is a testament to the neighborhood and the community that we put zero waste flexibility was weighted more than neighborhood impacts and aesthetics.

A stakeholder said he felt the need to represent the rest of the City. He said that Wallingford has about 3,000 people in it and criteria related to the Wallingford community received 43% of the weighting (this includes the neighborhood impacts and aesthetics and the community and environmental amenities criteria). But the operational efficiency criteria (includes SPU and hauler operational efficiency and self-haul customer experience), which affects the 600,000 residents of Seattle, only received 30% of the weighting. A stakeholder added that the reason the neighborhood and community criteria are so high is that the location of the station is wrong – it should be sited in Interbay. If the station were in Interbay, the neighborhood wouldn't be an issue. Another stakeholder added that many Seattleites drive past the transfer station on N. 34th Street to get to Gasworks Park and other parts of the neighborhood. One stakeholder noted that it's not just self haulers that are affected by an inefficient station; it's all the rate payers in the city.

Another stakeholder commented that it seems that the city's environmental and efficiency goals can be met by some of the goals of the neighborhood. Other stakeholders seconded him and said the zero-waste goals are a positive benefit to Seattle

Penny asked SPU if they were satisfied with the results. Nancy Ahern said she was happy with the 30% that operational efficiency and self-haul customer experience received. She pointed out the need to balance efficiency, the environment and the neighborhood. Nancy also said the results were very informative.

Penny then asked the stakeholders if they were okay with the results as they stand. Several stakeholders expressed concern that the SPU and Hauler Operational Efficiency wasn't given a higher weighting but

they could all live with the results. One stakeholder noted that SPU and Hauler Operational Efficiency and Neighborhood Impacts and Aesthetics are interrelated because they impact one another. Backups and idling caused by an inefficient station can be a detriment to the neighborhood.

Another stakeholder commented that the stakeholder group as a whole has come a lot closer together than they were at the beginning. All of the stakeholders agreed to keep the results as they were.

Penny handed out the scoring worksheet and asked the stakeholders to score each concept against the criteria.

A stakeholder asked if the community meeting room would have outdoor windows and outside access. Bill replied that some of the concepts had community meeting rooms with outdoor windows but none had outside access due to security issues. The stakeholder mentioned that a lot of people were very positive about the meeting room and viewing area until they found out it wouldn't be available after 5 p.m. The Wallingford Community Council felt that that shouldn't be considered an amenity.

Introduce Architectural Themes

Clark Davis, JR Miller

Clark Davis presented some architectural themes and flyover models of each of the concepts. He explained that the purpose of the presentation was to preview the themes, and that more in-depth discussion would occur at the next workshop. Clark also asked stakeholders and observers to bring their values and preferences to the next workshop so they can be discussed and dissected.

Clark showed the themes and flyovers for each of the concepts.

A stakeholder asked if it would be possible to see a walking view around the perimeter. Mark VanDevanter said it was possible, but explained it would take some time to get the street level shots. An observer asked if the neighborhood view was left out and the flyover only showed the perimeter of the station. Mark said a limit to showing a walking view was that the visualization was based on aerial photographs of the area and that pictures of the sidewalk view were not readily available, particularly of the concepts.

An observer asked if there were any opportunities to incorporate the SDC's suggestions into these themes. Clark responded that there is a huge range of what could be done, but we would have to work with SPU on the feasibility of the options. He then reminded stakeholders to bring all of their ideas to the next workshop. Penny suggested the stakeholders mark up their copies of the architecture views and reminded the stakeholders that their suggestions will help inform the design guidelines not to design the station. A stakeholder asked if SPU could put the flyovers on their website. Olivia Williams with HDR responded that the files are very large. Bill said SPU would look into putting the flyovers on the website.

A stakeholder asked if the green space will be accessible to the public. Tim replied that the green areas (except the green roofs) on the site plans are currently planned to be accessible. Another stakeholder reminded the design team of the importance of community-supported energy systems. She said she was happy to see plans for solar panels on the roof but wanted the community to own a piece of it.

NEXT STEPS

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny reminded the stakeholders to fill out their individual scoring worksheets before the next stakeholder workshop. She also told the stakeholders if anyone is not able to attend the meeting they can send their scores in and they will be included in the down-select process.

The next stakeholder workshop will be held at 5:00 pm on March 14, 2011 at the Institute for Systems Biology (837 N. 34th St.). At the meeting, the stakeholder group will score the criteria and will discuss which concepts they recommend to move on for further development. All stakeholder workshops are open to the public.

For more information visit: www.seattle.gov/util/transferstations