

# **North Transfer Station Stakeholder Group Compendium**

## **Chapter 2: Pre-Conceptual Design Documents**



## Stakeholder Workshop Documents

### *Pre-Conceptual Design Documents*

Jan. 16, 2008 Summary.....	3
April 18, 2008 Summary.....	9
Jan. 20, 2009 Summary.....	15
April 21, 2009 Summary.....	20
June 4, 2009 Summary.....	25
June 30, 2009 Summary.....	31
Oct. 20, 2009 Summary.....	36



**Meeting Summary**  
**NORTH RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL STATION REBUILD PROJECT**  
Stakeholder Group Meeting 1  
History House, 790 N 34th St, Seattle  
January 16<sup>th</sup> 6:00 to 8:00 PM

**ATTENDEES**

**Stakeholders**

Brandi Gaines  
Paul Willumson  
Michael Jerrett  
Toby Thaler  
Thomas Hobson  
Bill Bergstrom  
Pat Finn  
Eric Johnson

**Seattle Public Utilities**

Tim Croll  
Henry Friedman

**Triangle Associates**

David Harrison  
Jennifer Howell  
Renee Stern

**MEETING PURPOSE**

The purpose of this meeting was to convene the North Recycling and Disposal Station Stakeholder Group to get input on the design and building of a new transfer station in the Wallingford/Fremont community. Stakeholders will also help Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) understand how to engage the larger community in this process.

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

- The next facilitated meeting will take place in February or March. At this second meeting, SPU will address in detail the issues of interest described by the stakeholders.
- Triangle Associates, Inc. will work with the stakeholders to schedule a field tour of more modern recycling and disposal facilities.

**AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION**

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Facilitator David Harrison welcomed the stakeholders and outlined the purpose of the meeting and what SPU hopes to achieve. Stakeholder members introduced themselves.

**PROJECT BACKGROUND**

Henry Friedman, SPU Solid Waste Facilities Project Manager, provided a historical overview of the City’s solid waste system as well as the current functions and status of North and South Stations. He explained that transfer stations are critical to protecting public health and essential to a healthy economy.

SPU’s many goals for the new facility were outlined. Design goals include meeting customer needs, transferring materials in an economical and environmentally sound manner, and providing flexibility for waste stream changes, regulatory requirements and new technologies. SPU intends to minimize adverse impacts, provide benefits to the community and ensure the new facility is

aesthetically appealing. Environmental goals for SPU include complying with regulation and fulfilling the silver LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) criteria.

The design process was reviewed and design and performance specifications were explained. SPU Solid Waste Director Tim Croll stated that for larger projects, SPU has found that the Design-Build process is generally more efficient and cost-effective than the Design-Bid-Build process. In the Design-Bid process, an architecture and engineering firm teams with a construction contractor to compete for the project.

In the design of the new station, SPU will work with the selected firm to ensure that it is fully enclosed, has a compressed entry and improved capacity to get vehicles through at a faster rate. There will also be educational components to the new facility.

### **DISCUSSION OF PROJECT BACKGROUND**

Henry Friedman stated that SPU is interested in receiving feedback on traffic concerns around the station. SPU intends to provide more stalls which will help move customers off the street. One stakeholder asked if SPU has run numbers on cost savings from improved energy use. SPU stated that they haven't run numbers yet, but other groups have. Part of receiving LEED silver points involves conserving electricity.

The construction schedule was discussed. SPU stated that construction at the North station would not begin until 2012 at the earliest. The design process takes about one and a half years and construction of the North is contingent on the construction schedule of the South station. The old Oroweat building may be demolished, but that decision will be up to the chosen contractor. The original building is in good shape, but the south section added on later is not so usable.

The concern was raised about the design-build process and the community involvement and control over the final design would be less using this process than in the design-bid-build process, where the community is able to review the design as it unfolds. How can the City ensure that the design would be compatible with the neighborhood? Moreover, the lag time between the design and construction of the South station and North Station might also be problematic.

Tim Croll responded that it would be ideal if one contractor were assigned to both the North and South stations—part of the City's goal is to have the same quality at each station in addition to equipment and signage; however if there are delays or schedule changes in one station, it may be more cost effective not to link the two projects. Community involvement or a design charette could be required as part of the specifications for the design-build contract.

The group also addressed the design of the new building. Some stakeholders expressed concern regarding the height of the building and its impact on view corridors. SPU stated that part of the design goal is to maintain the view corridor. In designing the RFP, SPU may stipulate that firms receive extra points if the building could be made slim in the east/west direction. SPU also explained that dumping will be done a flat floor because it allows for more flexibility. One stakeholder expressed concern that when dumping yard waste, his vehicle is unable to reach enough of an angle to effectively dispose of the materials and he has to rake it out of his truck.

Henry Friedman echoed this concern and stated that the garbage truck drivers he had spoken to prefer a drop-off. It may be possible to provide an area with this service.

The issue regarding conducting a full EIS was raised. Both the Wallingford Community Council and the Lake Union District Council have requested that SPU prepare an EIS and not start the Stakeholder process until this was complete. The concern is that SPU has made a decision and is moving forward before it has complete information in front of them. The question was raised whether the City had responded formally to this request.

Tim Croll stated that he appreciated the concern and participation, but does not agree that SPU pre-determined the decision. In addition, he believed the Mayor had responded to the Councils and will make sure the letters have been sent. He also noted that a similar process had already started for the South station and that the intent was share ideas and issues between the two stations. While each station had specific issues of interest and sites, creative ideas could be shared between the two. It was agreed that the materials between the two groups would be shared.

### **STAKEHOLDER GROUP CHARTER AND GROUND RULES**

David Harrison reviewed the stakeholder charter and ground rules outlining the role of the stakeholder group. One stakeholder asked if an environmental group was part of the composition of the group as listed in the ground rules. Jennifer Howell stated that she had not identified an environmental group for Wallingford/Fremont as existed in South Park but would continue to pursue any suggestions from the group to explore participation from a local environmental group.

### **ISSUES OF INTEREST**

During this portion of the meeting, the group identified and expanded on the themes identified earlier during the initial interviews with stakeholders and other community representatives and customers. Topics included environmental, economic, and design issues.

*The following is an expanded list of issues of interest.*

#### **Environmental issues**

- **SEPA Process**
  - View that process should not continue until a SEPA checklist is complete.
  - Concern that SPU has predetermined the best location for a new facility.
  - Suggestion that SPU should look at alternative locations.
  - The size of the facility, the building footprint, and capacity and how that might impact the community need to be evaluated.
    - Will the new station create more noise, traffic, litter, odor?
- **Transportation and traffic impacts**
  - Concern about traffic around the existing site particularly at the intersection of 34<sup>th</sup> and Stone Way.

- Recommendation that SPU describe what traffic impacts may occur based on projected usage and increased recycling—how many trucks, how they enter and leave the site. Will these be changing?
- Recommendation that SPU examine idling cars and impact on greenhouse gas emissions.
- **Traffic management**
  - Prepare a traffic analysis/management plan – look at volume and routing.
    - At present, many people cut through residential streets.
  - Consider improvements such as separating the recycling from the disposal and the garbage trucks from the self-haulers to increase efficiency and allow users to get in and out faster.
  - Note that access to site is difficult
  - Area for queuing needs to be improved.
  - Pedestrians have difficulty crossing entrance area, particularly when trucks are lined up outside.
- **Street Vacation and Design**
  - Concern that vacation of Carr Place makes a bigger barrier in the neighborhood.
  - What street improvements are under consideration?
- **Drainage/surface water**
  - How will roof water be used?
  - How might water be reused at the station?
  - Examine quantity of water – CSOs are a problem.
  - What happens to water used to hose off trucks? Where does debris go?
  - Which LEED certification criteria will be adopted?
  - What are Metro’s requirements for water treatment?
- **Illegal dumping/littering**
  - Littering or debris from self-haulers and trucks is a problem.
- **View corridors**
  - Recommendation that the height should not increase or impact view corridors.
- **Design and landscaping**
  - Beautify the area with artwork, sculpture, and lighting.
  - Consider including a green or living roof.
  - Make the station a showplace for the community.
- **Construction and closure impacts**
  - What will be the neighborhood impacts during construction and how will they be mitigated?
  - Traffic, noise, hours of construction are all of a concern.
  - An interim, local recycling area is desirable.
  - Increased curbside pick-up could be helpful.

## Community Issues

- **Compatibility with and integration into the neighborhood**
  - Concern that a transfer station doesn't fit in the community as it exists now.
  - Explain any variances that SPU might be seeking.
  - Make aesthetics a high priority
  - Will aesthetics of the building be compromised in a design-build process? How can SPU ensure that aesthetics are prioritized?
  - Encourage retail along 34th that complements the station (re-use store)
  - Make the city block more useful/appealing to the neighborhood.
    - Consider amenities such as a playground as compensation for vacation.
- **Accessibility/Safety**
  - Improve pedestrian safety on 34th and provide a good crosswalk. Trucks pile up outside and it's hard to walk.
- **Show how a new facility will benefit the community.**
  - New technology, better appearance, safer facility, and improved landscaping are all examples of how a new station will be beneficial.
  - Provide funding for community groups to educate each other on solid waste issues.

## Facility design

- **Green Building**
  - Incorporate green building into the new facility.
  - The look and size of the facility will be important—it should “disappear” or be a showplace for the community.
- **Services**
  - Services such as recovering materials for reuse and recycling and household hazardous waste disposal are important.
    - What plans exist for sorting reusable materials?
  - Provide free drop off area for reusables before proceeding to the disposal station.
  - Provide HHW drop-off so that people don't have to make appointments.
  - Interest in having one place to bring everything (electronics etc.).
  - Process for separation of materials should be similar to what you do at the curb.
- **Access for regular customers/clean green**
  - Recommendation to give priority for clean green haulers to access the site.
  - Provide express lane for dump trucks

## Community outreach

- Community participation in city decisions is important to the community.
- Be clear about how you will use public input—don't waste people's time.

- People who live near the station have the most at stake.
- People who use the station and live in the community want to know what is planned, what the schedule is, and how the station fits into the overall solid waste system and into the Zero Waste Strategy.
  - Community members need to understand how the new facility will benefit the community in a positive way.
- Utilizing a variety of outreach methods such as mailings, list serves, websites, etc. will be most effective.
  - Use direct mail, flyers and door hangers to reach out to residents.
  - Update the project website.
- Station users need to be notified well in advance in order to plan alternatives.

### **Information sharing**

- Share information from both the South and North stakeholder meetings. Distribute meeting summaries to both stakeholder groups.

### **BROADER OUTREACH**

Jennifer Howell reviewed the proposed outreach schedule, noting that the schedule may change depending on whether an EIS was required or not. Stakeholders recommended including direct mail or door hangers to inform the larger community as well as keeping the project website updated. Members did not feel that translating materials into other languages as needed for the South Transfer Station was necessary.

### **ADJOURN**

Meeting participants discussed the option of taking a field tour of a newer recycling and disposal station in Shoreline. Many stakeholders were interested in the tour. Triangle Associates will work with the stakeholders to set up a time that works best for the tour.

Facilitator David Harrison reviewed the outcomes of the meeting, thanked the parties for their participation and adjourned the meeting.



**Meeting Summary**  
**NORTH RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL STATION REBUILD PROJECT**  
Stakeholder Group Meeting 2  
BF Day Elementary, 3921 Linden Avenue North Seattle  
March 18<sup>th</sup> 6:00 to 8:00 PM

**ATTENDEES**

**Stakeholders**

Brandi Gaines  
Paul Willumson  
Toby Thaler  
Bill Bergstrom  
Eric Johnson  
Cathy Tuttle  
Ross Minshull  
Bob Quinn  
Jessica Vets

**Seattle Public Utilities**

Tim Croll  
Henry Friedman

**Triangle Associates**

David Harrison  
Jennifer Howell  
Renee Stern

**Heffron Transportation**

Laura Van Dyke

**Observers**

Norton Davis  
Beverly Davis

**MEETING PURPOSE**

The purpose of this meeting was for SPU to address in detail the issues of interest developed by the Stakeholder Group. Stakeholders were asked to indicate what issues they felt had been addressed sufficiently and what needed further review. Results of this meeting will be incorporated into the environmental review as appropriate and inform the discussion and development of design/RFP specifications.

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

- The next facilitated meeting will take place after the outcome of the SEPA review. At this third meeting, SPU will address outstanding issues of concern and launch a discussion of design and performance specifications.
- SPU will provide the draft SEPA checklist and accompanying information at the earliest possible date for review by the stakeholders prior to its release
- SPU will respond to the following questions/issues raised by the stakeholders and revise the community concern response RFP document:
  - Survey the station and 1550 building and provide the stakeholders with information on the height, bulk and scale of the facilities.
  - Communicate with SDOT regarding the possibility of changing Woodlawn Avenue into a one-way street and/or other ways to deter cut-through traffic.
  - Look into the desired public benefits recommended by the stakeholders such as the building of a community center.
- Following the third stakeholder meeting, SPU will provide briefings to local community organizations and present information on the project.

## **AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION**

### **WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW AND RECAP**

Facilitator David Harrison welcomed the stakeholders, led introductions and outlined the purpose of the meeting.

#### *Reflections on the Shoreline Transfer Station*

David Harrison asked the stakeholders that attended the field tour of the Shoreline Recycling and Disposal Station to share their impressions with the group.

Stakeholders made the following comments regarding the newly built Shoreline station:

- The station is very clean.
- The wall is a big negative because it's too small and there is not enough room for vehicles to back up.
- The building design is appealing, but too industrial for the North station.
- Misting system, capping garbage was impressive.
- Wished clean green could go into the main pit. Didn't like the pit section at north end with safety chain.
- Like the truck washing system and natural lighting.
- Air flow was good.
- No clear way to monitor water collection.
- Electricity from solar panels could be increased.
- Bird mitigation seemed an afterthought.
- Liked all the room available for sorting but aren't using it.

#### *Project History*

David Harrison briefly reviewed the project history to correct an misunderstanding in the Wallingford Wallpaper newsletter to clarify that SPU had always intended to rebuild the North and South Stations in conjunction with the proposed intermodal facility near Georgetown, and Beacon Hill. The Council directed SPU to rebuild the existing facilities and continue to contract for intermodal transfer. The ordinance is included in stakeholder's notebooks.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

David Harrison then led the group through the table that SPU had prepared to outline how they anticipate responding to issues of interest raised by the stakeholders at the previous meeting or in the community interviews.

#### *SEPA*

One stakeholder requested that the full traffic data and analysis be made available. SPU promised to send that when it is completed. Reports on noise, air quality, and visual impacts will also be made available on the SPU website.

A stakeholder pointed to a letter from the Lake Union District Council and asked how this SEPA process fits within the context of phased review and the zero waste strategy. The current program is different than when SPU first decided to proceed. SPU stated that the Council set a

new goal regarding zero waste; looked at station configuration alternatives and decided to build a larger NRDS and SRDS rather than a third station at the railhead. SPU's planning for the South and North stations is consistent with the Council's Resolution 30990 to support waste reduction and recycling. Furthermore, the examination of alternative sites hinges on the SEPA threshold determination. If the SEPA threshold determination is one of non-significance, then alternative sites will not have to be considered. One of the goals of the meetings with stakeholders is to identify and address community issues.

#### *Building Size and Height/View Corridors*

The group discussed the height of the current and future facility. SPU stated that they are in the process of surveying the building to determine its current height. SPU also plans to demolish the 1550 Building and replace it with a new recycling and administration facility. Several stakeholders expressed concern that this was the first they had heard from SPU that the 1550 Building would be demolished. SPU explained that the building is not suitable to meet all the future needs. The contractors may reuse some of the building materials in the 1550 building in an effort to receive LEED silver points. It was asked that SPU survey the 1550 building in addition to the current station and SPU agreed.

Several stakeholders emphasized that the height, bulk and scale of the new facility are important to the community. SPU stated that they will assign points to design-build teams that are able to find creative solutions to height, bulk and scale issues on the site.

#### *Traffic Management*

One stakeholder asked if it would be possible to make Woodlawn Avenue a one-way street. Station customers often cut through Woodlawn to reach the facility resulting in unwanted neighborhood traffic. SPU stated that they would ask SDOT about this issue. Laura Van Dyke from Heffron Transportation mentioned that making Woodlawn a one-way would not change any of their conclusions regarding traffic impacts. She also stated that it is possible that if Woodlawn became a one-way street, then the next street over may become a cut-through. SDOT may have other suggestions to deter cut-through traffic such as traffic circles.

#### *Transportation and Traffic Impacts*

Henry Friedman from SPU introduced Laura Van Dyke of Heffron Transportation. Heffron was hired by SPU to perform a transportation study and examine transportation scenarios for low, medium and high traffic volume.

Ms. Van Dyke presented highlights of their analysis. The study was based on construction of a new transfer station building on the existing site; expansion of the site's recycling facilities within the vacated portion of Carr Place N, construction of new employee facilities and offices on the property east of Carr Place; and parking in the SPU-owned parking lot northeast of N 35th Street/Carr Place N. As part of the study Heffron documented background (Existing and No-Action) transportation conditions, added projected NRDS trips for three traffic scenarios (high, medium, and low) and evaluated transportation changes with the Action condition.

Heffron concluded that there would be no significant adverse transportation impact as a result of the project. The net change in site-generated trips is projected to be slightly higher with the

Action condition compared to the No-Action condition, ranging from 14 to 40 daily trips depending upon the analysis day and the traffic scenario. This change is mostly due to an increase in SPU employees making daily trips. Heffron further concluded that there would be no adverse impacts to any off-site intersection or roadway due to the project and driveway intersections would operate at LOS C or better during the PM peak hour in 2030. On-street queuing impacts would not be an issue since number of scales and transfer building stalls would increase with project and there would no significant impacts to roadway network due to vacating Carr Place.

Ms. Van Dyke stated there would be no transportation impacts during the closure and rebuild of NRDS since existing station traffic will be diverted to other facilities during construction. Parking for construction workers will be onsite or in the SPU-owned parking lot northeast of N 35th Street/Carr Place N. As no adverse transportation impacts were identified, no transportation mitigation would be required.

One stakeholder asked how many trips were made today on average at the North station. Ms. Van Dyke cited 1100 vehicle trips (each vehicle generates two trips—one coming and one leaving) on average per day. Peak days average 1370 vehicle trips. Another stakeholder asked about the net effect of queuing improvements at the station. Heffron stated that it is difficult to estimate. SPU will include queuing reduction as a performance requirement for the design contractor. The group will further discuss performance goals for reduced queuing in the next meeting.

Ms. Van Dyke stated that traffic around the station is higher during the week, but that queuing is longer on weekend. Heffron used the weekday data for traffic analysis, but noted that weekend data should be used for the queuing analysis. Traffic volumes on 34<sup>th</sup> were taken into account and during the peak hour there is an average of 565 vehicles per hour.

#### *Street Vacation*

SPU noted that vacation of the Carr Place North allows SPU to use utility funds to provide a public benefit in compensation for removing the public right-of-way. SDOT states that there is no specific formula in determining the appropriate benefit and SPU has some flexibility in working the community to meet their needs. SPU mentioned that the South stakeholder group has made many requests for public benefits such as litter pick-up, creation of a viewing room, coffee shop, new sidewalks, etc.

One stakeholder asked about the traffic impacts as a result of the vacation of Carr Street. Laura Van Dyke stated that traffic volume on Carr Street is low, about 90 cars per day and vacating the street would not present a significant adverse impact. Another stakeholder asked if this would impact pedestrian safety. Heffron reviewed historical accident data surrounding the site and did not identify a safety problem with the vacation of Carr.

#### *Desired Public Benefits*

The facilitator asked the stakeholders to briefly consider what public benefits they might like to see as a result of the street vacation. Their responses included:

- Purchase the 3500 Interlake building on behalf of the community of south Wallingford

- Build a community center
- Create a playground and walking path near the facility
- Ensure that views are not obstructed by the building of the new facility
- Create bike lanes
- Invest more money in quality art work
- Provide area to watch fireworks
- Community pea patch
- Create a park near Woodlawn
- Provide open and accessible avenues for learning about resources and zero-waste
- Include meeting spaces, resource centers, viewing areas

### *Illegal Dumping*

The group reviewed issues concerning illegal dumping. One stakeholder stated that the 3500 Interlake building is where many people illegally dump materials. Gasworks Park is also a common place for illegal dumping. SPU will post additional warning signs about covered load requirements along arterials used to access the site. SPU will also perform weekly litter patrols in areas near the station.

### *Construction Impacts*

While the North station is closed, Seattle residents will be encouraged to use the South station or the Shoreline station. The duration of construction is estimated to last about 18 months.

### *Aesthetics*

It was asked if vegetation could grow on the building. SPU stated that it is a possibility. The building may not be made of metal and the fencing will be improved. One stakeholder stated that sound is an issue and it would be appreciated if fencing could be used to reduce sound.

### *Building Design*

The group discussed in more detail aspects of building design. One stakeholder emphasized that the longevity of materials is important to consider when constructing the new facility. SPU agreed and stated that the design lifetime of the building is estimated to be around 50 years, depending on how it is used and maintained.

Tim Croll asked the stakeholders if they would prefer to see the new facility or obstruct it from view. One stakeholder stated that he would prefer the building to be set down low to hide it from view. Another stakeholder maintained that it could be a showcase facility integrated into the community. The stakeholders agreed that neighbors on the north side seek a muted presence with regards to the new facility, but that the south side facing 34<sup>th</sup> could be more of a showcase.

One stakeholder voiced his concern regarding building a public space on the site. He urged caution in bringing people to an industrial site and stated that playgrounds or other public areas near the station may pose a safety risk.

Other comments regarding building design included:

- Include a drop-off for household batteries and florescent light bulbs.

- Consider rolling scales, radio frequency detection or other ways to increase efficiency.
- Allow frequent customers and clean green to use an account card and express lane.
- Build-in flexibility for waste-stream changes
- Encourage recycling

### *Community Outreach*

Jennifer Howell reviewed recent community outreach activities for the project. A public open house for the South Transfer Station is scheduled for March 25<sup>th</sup> from 6-8pm at the South Park Community Center. SPU will discuss plans for the South station and address any public questions or comments. A flyer and direct mail piece was distributed throughout the South Park community and the south stakeholders were encouraged to participate. An open house will be scheduled for the North station after meeting three is completed by the north stakeholder group. The schedule will depend on if an EIS is needed.

One stakeholder suggested that SPU brief local groups and councils to present information on the project. SPU agreed to visit the Wallingford Chamber of Commerce, Lake Union District Council and Fremont Community Council following the third stakeholder meeting. At these meetings, SPU can discuss the nature of public benefits and ideas for the design of the new facility.

### **ADJOURN**

Facilitator David Harrison reviewed the outcomes of the meeting. He stated that SPU would send information regarding the SEPA checklist as soon as possible. If there is no EIS, then the checklist will be used as the scorecard for meeting three. At meeting three, the group will revisit the issue of public benefits, further discuss the height, bulk and scale of the facility, and launch a discussion of design specifications. Mr. Harrison then thanked the parties for their participation and adjourned the meeting.



**Meeting Summary**  
**NORTH RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL STATION REBUILD PROJECT**  
Stakeholder Group Special Meeting  
Hamilton Elementary, 4400 Interlake Ave North, Seattle  
January 20<sup>th</sup> 6:00 to 8:00 PM

**ATTENDEES**

**Stakeholders**

Bill Bergstrom  
Toby Thaler  
Paul Willumson  
Pat Finn  
Cathy Tuttle  
Bob Quinn

**Observers**

Shawn Mulanix  
Rob Gala  
Norm Davis  
Erik Pitl  
John Teutsch  
Erika Bigeton  
Ted Lockery  
Katherine Braydon  
Mary Heim  
Richard Floisand

**Seattle Public Utilities**

Tim Croll  
Henry Friedman  
Jeff Neuner

**Triangle Associates**

David Harrison  
Jennifer Howell  
Renee Stern

**MEETING PURPOSE**

The purpose of this meeting was for SPU to provide an update on the status of North and South Recycling and Disposal Stations and for the stakeholders to decide whether or how they would like to proceed in reconvening the North Stakeholder Group.

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

- The stakeholders asked for a two-week delay to discuss the idea of reconvening the North Stakeholder Group. If feedback from the stakeholders is positive, a meeting will be scheduled in February or March to confirm if the group would like to proceed.

**AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION**

**WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW AND RECAP**

Facilitator David Harrison welcomed the stakeholders, led introductions and outlined the purpose of the meeting. He reminded the group that the North Stakeholder Group process had been suspended during the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) appeal. Since the last meeting, a hearing examiner issued a decision that did not overturn the Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS). This decision has been appealed to the Superior Court where it will be likely heard this spring or summer.

David added that a four meeting process was originally proposed to engage the neighborhoods near the North Station and create a formal record of exchange between stakeholders and community. The North Stakeholder Group has had two meetings. David noted that this meeting is not the third meeting, but is instead a chance for the stakeholders to discuss and decide how to proceed given the status of the SEPA appeal.

Stakeholder group member Toby Thaler addressed the group and stated that he anticipates a ruling on jurisdictional issues would be made by April 1<sup>st</sup>. He added that the City will need time to put a record together and the legal arguments would likely take place this summer with a decision made by judges hopefully by September.

SPU then provided an update on the status of the North and South Station Rebuild Projects and the group then discussed whether to reconvene the group. Members of the community present were also invited to ask questions about the project.

#### **UPDATE ON STATUS OF THE NORTH TRANSFER STATION**

Tim Croll, Seattle Public Utilities provided a brief update on the status of the North Transfer Station Project. He noted that another step in the process was to change the zoning of the 1550 Building which is currently zoned commercial. Current regulations require that industrial zoning in order to have recycling in conjunction with a transfer station. City may ask for a rezone to allow recycling on that part of the property. The Department of Planning and Development (DPD) would ask the City Council for a spot re-zone of the area. SPU also will request a street vacation of Carr Place, which provides an opportunity for the City to provide benefits to the community in return. A street vacation provides the City with more flexibility in providing a benefit that is not a direct mitigation of a project impact. SPU anticipates working with the stakeholder group and the larger community on recommendations for public benefits.

#### **UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE SOUTH STATION**

David Harrison explained that the stakeholder process was completed for the South Recycling and Transfer Station (SRDS). Four stakeholder meetings were held and stakeholders provided their ideas both for the design of the new facility and community benefits for street vacation. A final open house was held for the South Park community which allowed citizens to ask questions and provide input into the rebuild of the station.

SPU made many commitments to the South stakeholder group and responded to over 60 issues of concern. SPU committed to pick up litter and patrol the area around the station and throughout much of South Park for illegal dumping. SPU also agreed to first advertise in the South Park community for any local jobs at the station. With regards to traffic, SPU promised to route garbage trucks to avoid using the South Park Bridge unless the route includes areas on both sides of the bridge or the 1st Avenue Bridge is up. This will help minimize garbage truck traffic in the center of South Park.

Since concluding the stakeholder meeting process, SPU has remained in contact with the South stakeholders so that they can provide feedback on the selection of the design-build team for the new facility. SPU has narrowed down the selection of a proposed design-build team to four

teams and plans to issue the final Request for Proposals in March or April. Following site preparation and clean up, it is hoped that by winter of 2010 construction will have started on the new South station. It may take a total of 2 years to complete the new transfer station from the start of construction.

#### **DISCUSSION ON RECONVENING NORTH STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

The stakeholder group weighed the pros and cons of proceeding with the stakeholder process. Tim Croll proposed that the stakeholders should continue the process. SPU would like the opportunity this year to develop a package of community benefits for the Wallingford/Fremont area. He stated that he does not perceive a downside to proceeding with the stakeholder process given that it does not impact the SEPA appeal. He also noted that this year is a good time to negotiate with the City given that it is between federal election years and the Council is supportive of the project.

The question arose about the economic impacts of not proceeding with the process. Tim Croll stated that he can't say if the economic environment it will be much worse later, but reiterated that this year is a good time to negotiate with the City. He also noted that in general, construction prices only go up over time and that any alternative site would be more expensive than the current site. The distance and time of issuing the Request for Proposals (RFP) could be shortened by the actions of the stakeholder group. Henry Friedman of SPU added that delays can increase the cost of the project in a number of ways such as making expensive repairs on an out-of-date facility.

The comment was made that SPU could have avoided the SEPA lawsuit and delays if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) had been done a year ago. The rationale for the appeal is to ensure that the city evaluate the environmental impact of the project and consider alternatives before moving forward. Henry Friedman, SPU, responded that SPU had conducted several indepth environmental studies prior to determining that a full-EIS was not required.

Stakeholders and members of the public discussed the issue of full community engagement during time of the SEPA appeal. The concern arose that many community members will not participate in the process until the lawsuit is resolved.

One stakeholder noted that the station is old and out-of-date and she stressed that the sooner the community starts addressing noise, toxins, and other issues, the better off the community will be.

A member of the Wallingford Community Council (WCC) stated that a meeting will be held on February 4<sup>th</sup> to engage the community and find out how citizens would like to proceed with the public involvement for the rebuild of the North transfer station. An online survey will also be distributed to Wallingford community members to assess opinions.

Toby Thaler, who represents both the Fremont Neighborhood Council and the plaintiffs in the appeal of the SEPA decision, proposed to the group that the decision of whether or not to proceed to be put in abeyance while the WCC proceeds with their process over the next few weeks and while he has the opportunity to discuss it with his clients. He also noted that the Fremont Neighborhood Council (FNC) will shortly have its monthly meeting. After input is

received from the WCC, the FNC, and plaintiffs, the group can make a better decision about whether or not to move forward with the stakeholder process.

Facilitator David Harrison asked the group if they approved of Toby's proposal. He asked the group if they would accept the setting up a third meeting in February or March if a clear indication is given that the group would like to proceed. If the feedback from the group is negative and the stakeholders decline to proceed, Meeting Three will not be scheduled. If the feedback is unclear, the group may reconvene. The first order of business then would be to discuss the input from the community meetings and confirm whether to proceed with the stakeholder group processor not. Each of the North stakeholders present at the meeting agreed with this proposal.

#### **ADDITIONAL ISSUES OF CONCERN**

During the meeting, members of the public as well as stakeholders took the opportunity to ask SPU staff questions about the project. David Harrison noted that we would track these questions and add any new issues to the list and review them with the stakeholder group when it next reconvened.

#### **Traffic**

Questions arose about traffic impacts with regard to the new station and concerns related to station customers using and speeding on side streets with small children such as Ashworth and Densmore. Tim Croll emphasized that that SPU hopes to prevent trucks from cutting through side streets in Wallingford and reduce wait time at the station. He added the new station will likely include more slots for dumping and more space for waiting on the property as opposed to the street. Specific ideas suggested included

- Traffic calming measures should be considered as part of street vacation. Speeding trucks in residential areas near the station are a problem.
- Consider adding a dead end to 35<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Design Build Process**

The group also briefly discussed why SPU is interested in a design-build process for the new transfer station. A member of the public stated that in his experience, the quality of design is often lower with design-build. Tim Croll stated that the City has found design-build to be an efficient, cost-effective way to do a project. Design-build is being done with the South transfer station, but the North station could be done differently. He emphasized that SPU is looking for creativity in design and the City will indicate in the RFP that they want award-winning quality.

A member of the public asked if it would be possible for community members to be a part of the design-build selection process after signing a confidentiality agreement. Tim Croll stated that he would take this idea into consideration.

#### **Soil Quality**

The concern was raised that the soil at the site may be dangerous to the health of nearby residents, particularly during construction when particulates are airborne. The City should test the soil at the transfer station before any construction is started.

**Building Height**

The suggestion was made to keep the height of the new building low enough so the community does not feel boxed in. A preference for keeping the height of the building the same as the existing building was stated.

**ADJOURN**

Facilitator David Harrison reviewed the outcomes of the meeting. The stakeholders asked for a brief delay to discuss the idea of reconvening the North Stakeholder Group. If feedback from the stakeholders is positive, a meeting will be scheduled in February or March to confirm if the group would like to proceed.

**Meeting Summary**  
**NORTH RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL STATION REBUILD PROJECT**  
Stakeholder Group Special Meeting  
Hamilton Elementary, 4400 Interlake Ave North, Seattle  
April 21, 2009 6:00 to 8:00 PM

**ATTENDEES**

**Stakeholders**

Pat Finn  
Eric Johnson  
Eric Pihl  
Bob Quinn  
Toby Thaler  
Cathy Tuttle  
Jessica Vetts

**Seattle Public Utilities**

Nancy Ahern  
Tim Croll  
Henry Friedman  
Jeff Neuner  
Beth Schmoyer

**Triangle Associates**

David Harrison  
Jennifer Howell  
Emily States

**Observers**

Emily Allen  
Ed Andrews  
Erika Bigelow  
John Bigelow  
Chris Butler  
Norm Davis  
Rob Gala  
Alison Hogue

**MEETING PURPOSE**

The purpose of this meeting was for the North Stakeholder Group to confirm the decision to reconvene and review and discuss the Issues of Interest document and the survey conducted by the Wallingford Community. SPU also provided a presentation on drainage and soil quality to answers questions that arose at the previous meeting.

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

- The stakeholders requested the preparation of a “design program” to provide a better idea of what SPU is considering in terms of planning and design assumptions for the station rebuild. SPU will provide the document and the next meeting on June 4<sup>th</sup> will deal directly with this topic.
- Additional issues identified will be added to the “issues matrix.” Follow up information will be provided.
- A request was made to add another representative from South Wallingford to the Stakeholder group. SPU agreed to consider this request. .

**AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION**

**WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW AND RECAP**

Facilitator David Harrison welcomed the stakeholders, led introductions and outlined the purpose of the meeting. He also introduced Nancy Ahern, Director, SPU Utility Systems; and Beth

Schmoyer, SPU Senior Engineer. Nancy has decided to join the group on a regular basis, and Beth was in attendance to give a report on soil and water concerns addressed in the matrix.

He reminded stakeholders that the process was delayed due to the legal action underway and that at the last meeting, the group agreed to confirm whether to reconvene the process at the start of this meeting, after the Wallingford Community Council had met.

He noted that the facilitation team had recommended that the membership of the stakeholder group be expanded to one more representative from both the Wallingford Community Council and the Fremont Neighborhood Council to provide additional input on the community benefits for street vacation. The stakeholder group all agreed this would be beneficial. He also noted that the schedule now includes a meeting devoted to this topic in June.

#### **DISCUSSION ON RECONVENING NORTH STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

David briefly revisited the purpose and outcomes of the January 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, which was held to discuss whether the group was ready to reconvene. He noted that SPU and the facilitators would like to move forward with this process, and that the comments from the Wallingford and Fremont Community Councils indicate comfort with proceeding. David then asked Bob Quinn, Wallingford Community Council representative and Toby Thayer, Fremont Neighborhood Council representative, to address whether or not the councils would like to proceed.

Bob Quinn indicated that Wallingford would like to participate in the process and Toby Thayer commented that the Fremont Council never believed it appropriate to go through with the process until the neighborhood knows all information about the station. He later noted that he would not walk away from the process and would welcome it if there was more clarity as to what stakeholders are responding to.

One stakeholder raised the issue that it is difficult to make comments about the project without seeing a design program or a defined scope. Several stakeholders and a few citizens agreed that it is difficult to know how they want to proceed without knowing more about the plans for the site. SPU representatives said that such a document could be produced and made available to stakeholders, but that it would have a limited amount of detail.

A Wallingford citizen noted that the neighbors put together a petition asking SPU to do an EIS and they received 384 signatures so far, 308 of which live right around the area. Citizens also voiced a desire to be able to comment on the proposed design document that SPU will provide.

A stakeholder also brought up the permitting process and zoning and expressed concern that land use issues have not been addressed properly. Several citizens also voiced this issue. A map of the existing zoning at the north transfer station was provided by one of the stakeholders.

The facilitator asked Tim Croll, Seattle Public Utilities, to respond to comments regarding permits and design. Tim replied that SPU would like to get input so they can get to the design and feedback stage and it will reflect their best shot at addressing concerns. He would like to keep the process going despite litigation. Nancy Ahern noted that the design document is just the first step and that SPU would like to have input from the stakeholders in a collaborative

manner. To create an actual design and drawings is a significant investment on the part of the city. Tim noted a concern that the design document may still not have the level of detail that some stakeholders would like to see.

### **Stakeholder Meeting Schedule**

Jennifer Howell briefly reviewed the proposed new schedule for the stakeholder group and community outreach. She noted that two additional meetings had been added in the process, in order to spend some time discussing the design elements in order to generate a list of parameters to give to the firm hired to design the facility and another meeting to discuss community benefits. An open house would be held in the fall to present feedback from the group and SPU's proposed plans.

David Harrison noted that the group is provisionally proceeding and proposed that SPU provide a design document and that the next meeting on June 4<sup>th</sup> be used to discuss said document. This means that the meeting on public benefits will then be put off until June 30<sup>th</sup>. The request was made to provide material with more time prior to the meeting. SPU agreed to have the document to stakeholders at a minimum of two weeks prior to the June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **PRESENTATION BY SPU ON SELECTED ISSUES (DRAINAGE, SOIL AND GROUNDWATER)**

#### **Drainage**

Beth Schmoyer reviewed the City of Seattle's utility drainage system and described the differences between a separated waste water system and a combined sewer system. Using an aerial photo and map, she explained the systems that are located at the transfer station site and how it handles stormwater and potential overflows. She pointed out the several different drainage systems that handle stormwater runoff from the site and from the surrounding neighborhoods. Currently the stormwater from the site goes to the West Point Treatment Plant where it is treated. She also noted that there has been no direct discharge into Lake Union since 1991 and no overflow into the lake since a detention basin was added and the overflow was plugged off in 2006.

Questions arose regarding where the combined sewer overflows go, the number of overflow events that have occurred in specific areas. David Harrison suggested that SPU provide a table of systems and overflows. SPU agreed to this noting that they only have records starting in 1998.

The question arose regarding plans for a detention tank when the station is rebuilt and how water may be reused. Beth noted that when the station is rebuilt, the stormwater code will require detention for the site. Also, new facilities frequently collect roof water for reuse in washing trucks, typically a 5,000 gallon tank. SPU noted the goal is to reduce peak discharges associated with rainfall and to decrease sanitary flow quantities and water use.

A member of the public voiced a concern about trucks and the potential for waste matter to get onto the streets and then run off into Lake Union and wanted to know how SPU would deal with this issue. This concern will be added to the Issues Matrix.

## **Soil**

Beth discussed a soil study conducted in 2008 and reviewed the past uses of the property. The transfer site was built in 1967 and two underground storage tanks were removed in 1994. The 1550 Building also had a truck maintenance facility and three underground fuel tanks were removed from that site. The previous owner conducted a voluntary clean up of the site under the Model Toxics Control Act and removed soils contaminated with petroleum and solvents. This included groundwater treatment and quarterly sampling of groundwater. No contamination over state water quality limits has been found in recent years and Ecology has signed off that no further action is required. However, Ecology must be notified when any additional soil excavation occurs on the site.

In 2008, SPU conducted a limited site investigation and collected sub-surface soil samples as well as groundwater samples. They conducted a full scan to test for chemicals, pesticides, petroleum, and any other potential contaminants. She expressed that the results were pretty low for an urban area and given the past history of the site, one would expect to find some contaminants. They found four chemicals above the state cleanup level for groundwater. The city will conduct further investigations during any work on the site and will comply with soil management requirements.

A few comments were made regarding where the contamination came from, and whether any of it came from the transfer station. SPU replied that none of this appears to be associated with waste handling activities from the existing transfer station because the waste handling area has been repaved annually since 1967 and any drainage is collected and treated. Also, the parameters detected are not characteristic of solid waste discharges. What they found was mostly solvents that could be attributed to the facility at the 1550 Building site or other vehicle maintenance activities in the area. Neighbors asked to compare results to soil studies conducted in 1997. One of the neighbors raised the issue of groundwater flow and whether or not construction associated with the rebuild will impede groundwater. SPU responded that it will depend on the quantity and depth of water, but that there are straightforward engineering solutions.

A few neighbors wanted to know how much more in-depth an EIS would be, and whether or not SPU would be responsible for cleaning up the soil contaminants in the area. SPU responded that they would manage the soil properly and that the management of contaminated soils was addressed in the SEPA documents. Beth Schmoyer added that an EIS would not normally include an in-depth evaluation of soil conditions or management methods.

## **ADDITIONAL ISSUES OF CONCERN**

### **Request for Additional Wallingford Representative**

Some of the South Wallingford neighbors asked to have another representative from their neighborhood added to the stakeholder group.

Jennifer Howell briefly described the process for selecting a stakeholder. The facilitators will discuss the possibility with SPU and get back to everyone regarding the decision.

### **Tree Planting on 35<sup>th</sup>**

SPU was asked why they planted trees on 35<sup>th</sup> and whether or not the trees will stay if they move forward with plans for the transfer station. Tim Croll responded that the trees were planted as a screen for the existing station, and that he is not sure whether or not the trees will stay. It was decided to add trees to the matrix.

### **Stakeholder Decisions**

A community member wanted to know whether or not stakeholder decisions are enforceable. David Harrison explained that a lot of stakeholder decisions are written into the design and initiative but they don't have legal status.

### **Open House**

The facilitators asked the community if they had any comments or feedback about how to best get information to the community. Updates are being sent via email to the Community Councils, other organizations and interested citizens. An open house is proposed for the fall and full publicity including a mailing is anticipated. They asked meeting attendees to suggest additional ideas for engaging the community.

### **ADJOURN**

Facilitator David Harrison reviewed the outcomes of the meeting. SPU will provide a design document with minimal detail at a minimum of two weeks prior to next meeting on June 4<sup>th</sup>. Stakeholders will use that meeting to review and discuss the design document. The meeting about community benefits will be postponed until June 30<sup>th</sup>.

**Meeting Summary**  
**NORTH RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL STATION REBUILD PROJECT**  
Stakeholder Group Special Meeting  
Hamilton Elementary, 4400 Interlake Ave North, Seattle  
June 4, 2009 6:00 to 8:00 PM

**ATTENDEES**

**Stakeholders**

Bill Bergstrom  
Pat Finn  
Eric Johnson  
Trish McNeil  
Eric Pihl  
Bob Quinn  
David Ruggiero  
Rob Stephenson  
Toby Thaler

**Triangle Associates**

David Harrison  
Jennifer Howell  
Renee Stern

**Observers**

Allison Hogue  
Jerry McNeil  
Jake Beatty  
Mary Sussex

**Seattle Public Utilities**

Nancy Ahern  
Tim Croll  
Jeff Neuner

**MEETING PURPOSE**

The purpose of this meeting was for the North Stakeholder Group to discuss and review the transfer station design document previously distributed to the group by SPU and to prepare for the community benefits meeting on June 30<sup>th</sup>. SPU also introduced new stakeholders and provided an update on the contracting process.

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

- SPU will retain a support services contractor this year. SPU and the contractor will work with the stakeholder group to clarify design issues and solicit ideas to address concerns that can be incorporated into the design-build Request for Proposal (RFP) process.
- The issues identified as part of the discussion on the design program will be incorporated into the master “issues of interest” document if they are not already included.
- The next stakeholder meeting will be June 30 and will focus on community benefits for street vacation.
- SPU and Triangle Associates will investigate possible dates and times for a special stakeholder meeting to review and discuss recycling/reuse, traffic and view corridors.

**AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION**

**WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW AND RECAP**

Facilitator David Harrison welcomed the stakeholders, led introductions and outlined the purpose of the meeting.

Nancy Ahern, SPU Deputy Director, introduced three new members including David Ruggiero from SWAC to replace Brandi Gaines, Trish McNeil from South Wallingford, and Greg Hale (not in attendance) who is a district manager for Waste Management. The new members in attendance briefly stated their background and where they live. Ms. Ahern also announced that Veronica Baca is the new project manager for the North Station project since Henry Friedman is totally focused on the South Station project.

The facilitator reviewed the stakeholder group charter and noted that he plans to be more attentive to stakeholders and will call on them first before calling on members of the public.

#### **UPDATE ON CONTRACTING PROCESS**

Solid Waste Director Tim Croll stated that SPU has intended to work with stakeholders and the community to get input for the transfer station design process. Stakeholders asked for more detail from SPU in order to begin that discussion, and that information was presented in the Design Program document.

SPU presented a flow chart illustrating SPU's proposed contracting process. Tim Croll stated that the next step is for SPU to retain a support services firm that will assist in the design requirements and Request for Qualifications and for Proposal (RFQ/RFP) processes, but will not be the ultimate designer-builder of the new station. Project Manager Veronica Baca will work on retaining the support services firm and this is likely to happen by October at the earliest. SPU will then turn over the design program and issues of interest matrix to the support services contractor and sit down with the stakeholder group to discuss ideas, key issues, and key design requirements. This is likely to happen in October/November. After this, the larger community will be involved in a community-wide open house and SPU will share preliminary design requirements, how the design might respond to their concerns, and the ideas for community benefits suggested through the stakeholder process. The intent of the process is to have worked out the stakeholder issues and identified any requirements or constraints and necessary approvals prior to hiring a design-build firm. Stakeholders will then have the opportunity to provide input on the proposals submitted by the top three design-build teams. The teams that bid would still have the opportunity to use their creativity to design the facility.

Stakeholders asked several questions about the new contracting process. One stakeholder asked when alternative scenarios for the new station's footprint and height will be presented. SPU stated that the stakeholders will be able to review proposals and provide input on firms with varying ideas on the height, bulk and scale of the facility. SPU also noted that some of those questions may be answered during the session with the support services contractor. A citizen asked why SPU wouldn't want to issue the RFP now and bring the primary contractor on board to begin work. SPU replied that there is a great financial advantage to design-build approach. Also, SPU is required by law to change firms if they select a firm to complete the design. The City is then required to go out to bid and hire the firm that submits the lowest bid to build the facility. By using design-build, the firm that designs the building has more flexibility and expertise in the actual intent of the design.

Questions arose regarding the timing of meetings and events. It was suggested that January or February would be a good estimate for when there would be a meeting with the community at

large to receive public input after the stakeholder group had worked out specific issues and design considerations or criteria with the support services firm. SPU clarified that there will be a stakeholder meeting following the community open house and also stated that construction of the new facility would likely start in 2012 at the earliest.

SPU advised the stakeholders to carefully consider desired design details far in advance of the RFP and proposal process. Once the proposals are received, the stakeholders will be able to indicate their preferred proposal and perhaps suggest a few modifications to the design, but the major design issues will not be negotiable by that time. Stakeholders will not be able to choose specific elements from each proposal and blend them together. Jennifer Howell from Triangle Associates noted that the matrix of issues from the South stakeholder process is available online. In this document, the consultant highlighted where design concerns were addressed in the RFP process.

The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standard for Green Building design was briefly discussed. SPU stated that all large buildings of importance must be at least LEED silver. The South Station will be built to Gold standards and the North Station is likely to be the same.

## **SEPA**

A stakeholder asked where the Statewide Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review will fit into the process. He noted that the application of SEPA beyond the Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) is under appeal and asked if the City is taking the position that SEPA was addressed for all phases of the project. Tim Croll responded yes, SPU takes the position that SEPA has been addressed for the project through construction.

## **DESIGN PROGRAM PRESENTATION AND STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSION**

### **Overview**

The facilitator requested comments on the design document provided by SPU. SPU planning manager Jeff Neuner introduced the design document and noted that it was created by combining earlier work on design requirements for a new facility.

Stakeholders asked about the future of the 1550 building. SPU stated that it will be demolished unless there is not enough money to do so. SPU also indicated that Carr Place will be vacated due to traffic flow and a retaining wall may be built.

### **1.2 Facility Purpose**

Stakeholders requested that a bullet be added to the design program document stating that the design of the facility should more adequately complement the neighborhood and provide aesthetically pleasing landscaping. Another stakeholder noted that in his opinion the references in the document don't conform to SEPA and that neither the facility plans nor the City's Zero Waste policy underwent SEPA review. SPU noted this was a point of disagreement.

### **2 Facility Functions and Key Elements**

Several questions about planned services arose during the discussion on Facility Functions and Key Elements including whether SPU is considering including a retail store or trading station

onsite or planning to collect household hazardous waste, e-waste, construction and demolition waste (C&D) or food waste with the yard waste at the north station. SPU stated that there is not enough space for a reuse store and that the South Station will have a re-store on site. SPU also stated that Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and E-waste are not planned for the North station. HHW is currently collected at another location in North Seattle and e-waste is handled through a fee-based curbside collection process or through the Take-It Back Network. However, SPU does plan to collect construction and demolition waste and wood waste as well as yard waste with food. There was discussion about whether food waste tonnage may shift from the garbage stream to the organics stream and whether that would result in any extra odor problems at the station. Tim Croll noted that the waste would be removed on a daily basis. A stakeholder asked that SPU consider the need to add some HHW services in the future.

### **3.1. Zoning and Land Use**

One stakeholder asked that SPU change the text from “may” require zoning change to “zoning changes are required” and include this change on the project website if indeed it will be required. A stakeholder also asked why the recycling center must be on the east side and would like SPU to consider adding a green belt on the east side of the site. Stakeholders would like clarification on zoning requirements and understand that no solid waste handling for disposal is allowed on the 1550 property (zoned C2-40).

### **3.3 Tonnage and Traffic**

A stakeholder asked about whether traffic will increase by 2050 and would like clarification on expected traffic impacts. Stakeholders would also like more traffic enforcement of the large trailer trucks that often speed on 38<sup>th</sup> Ave.

### **3.4 Operational Considerations**

A stakeholder asked if the hours of operation would change. Current public hours are now from 8:00am-5:30pm, but SPU stated that they are considering extending the hours. It was noted that changing hours can be a trade-off — traffic is spread out more the longer the station is open.

### **3.5 Design Goals**

#### **Site Entrances/Exits**

A stakeholder would like SPU to take steps to stop cut-through traffic on Woodlawn and 36<sup>th</sup> Ave. It was also requested that self-tipping trucks be allowed to have priority. Stakeholders also expressed concern about the possible noise and pollution impacts of queuing/idling onsite near the residential neighborhood.

#### **Waste Transfer Building**

##### **Building Height/Views**

It was requested that SPU clarify which existing building will be used to define the height goal. One stakeholder suggested that the SPU ensure that new facility not block views on Ashworth, Interlake and Carr streets. Another stakeholder requested that SPU commit to maintaining the quality of views and not place mechanical equipment on top of the facility such as exists on a neighboring building. In general, the stakeholders would like a better understanding of how view corridors may be impacted in the neighborhood.

## **Noise**

A stakeholder recommended that the building be designed to reduce acoustical noise both inside and outside the building. It was also suggested that SPU locate the entrance/exit closer to commercial area – away from residential area.

## **Yard Waste**

A stakeholder asked if yard waste will be dumped into a pit and stated that it is faster and creates less exhaust to have pit versus a flat floor.

## **Recycling and Reuse Facilities**

It was requested that SPU provide more clarity on what is planned for the recycling facilities. Some stakeholders are concerned about providing a flat floor and would like to know whether and how compaction will occur. Many stakeholders are concerned about noise impacts, particularly in the northeast corner of the site. One stakeholder asked if it is possible to relocate the recycling onsite given its close proximity to residential neighborhoods.

## **Administration Building**

One stakeholder commented that SPU consider adaptive reuse of the 1550 building. Another stakeholder asked if the proposed employee parking lot was larger than needed and would like to know if all or part of the employee parking lot could be buried underground as a community benefit.

## **Utilities**

It was suggested that the new facility meet the new drainage codes and ensure that no toxics are added to Lake Union.

## **POTENTIAL EDUCATION SESSIONS**

The facilitator suggested that a special stakeholder session be held after June 30 to investigate subtopics raised including recycling/reuse, traffic and view corridors. Each of these topics could be covered in 40 minute sessions and would allow stakeholders a chance to gain a deeper understanding of important issues surrounding these topics.

## **PREPARATION FOR DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY BENEFITS ON JUNE 30**

SPU handed out information on street vacation and community benefits in preparation for this meeting. The facilitator suggested that at the June 30 meeting that each stakeholder would have three minutes to suggest ideas for community benefits and that the group would then discuss each item on the generated list.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jake Beatty from the Center for Wooden Boats stated that the community-based non-profit is hoping to expand its campus on Woodlawn to utilize a piece of underused Metro property on Lake Union. This would increase public access to the lake and allow the Center more space for their hands-on educational programs. He is looking forward to taking more with the stakeholder group and would like to present again in the future.

## **ADJOURN**

Facilitator David Harrison reviewed the outcomes of the meeting. It was decided that SPU will proceed with the revised contracting process and will retain a support services consultant. It was noted that the next stakeholder meeting will take place on June 30<sup>th</sup> and will focus primarily on community benefits for street vacation. The goal of the meeting will be to generate a master list of potential community benefits that can move forward for further review and discussion by stakeholders and the community. Another meeting of the stakeholder group will be scheduled in July or September to review background information on traffic, views, and recycling and reuse.

**Meeting Summary**  
**NORTH RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL STATION REBUILD PROJECT**  
Stakeholder Group Meeting 6  
Hamilton Elementary, 4400 Interlake Ave North, Seattle  
June 30, 2009 6:00 to 8:00 PM

**ATTENDEES**

**Stakeholders**

Bill Bergstrom  
Eric Pihl  
Bob Quinn  
David Ruggiero  
Rob Stephenson  
Toby Thaler  
Cathy Tuttle  
Paul Willumson

**Seattle Public Utilities**

Nancy Ahern  
Veroncia Baca  
Tim Croll  
Jeff Neuner

**Triangle Associates**

David Harrison  
Jennifer Howell  
Renee Stern

**Observers**

Ed Andrews  
Erika Bigelow  
David Hansen  
Mary Heim  
Allison Hogue  
Jake Beattie  
Eric Mead  
Jeff Parker  
Mary Sussex

**MEETING PURPOSE**

The purpose of this meeting was for the North Stakeholder Group to discuss and develop an initial list of potential community benefits for the vacation of Carr Place. Eliminating a public right-of-way requires that the City provide some other community benefit as compensation. Further discussion of community benefits will take place at future meetings. After receiving input from the stakeholder group and the community, SPU will make a recommendation to the Seattle Department of Transportation. The Seattle City Council will make the final decision. (See <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/streetvacations.htm> for details on the street vacation process.)

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

- The next stakeholder meeting will held in September/October close to the transfer station and will focus on the issues of recycling/reuse, traffic and view corridors. A meeting will also be held in November after the support services contractor has been chosen. The November meeting will focus on the issues of interest matrix, community benefits and design issues.
- SPU and Triangle Associates will work with stakeholders to identify the best dates and times for the September and November meetings.

## **AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION**

### **WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW AND RECAP**

Facilitator David Harrison welcomed the stakeholders, led introductions and outlined the purpose of the meeting. He emphasized that the discussion of community benefits would not end with this meeting and it is expected that stakeholders will circulate some of the ideas developed to their constituent groups for further consideration. David Harrison also noted that this will be his last meeting as facilitator and Bob Wheeler, president of Triangle Associates will be taking over in his place. Nancy Ahern, SPU Deputy Director introduced the new project manager for the North Transfer Station project, Veronica Baca.

### **UPDATE ON PROJECT STATUS**

Project Manager Veronica Baca stated that SPU is preparing to put out a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to retain a support services contractor. She handed out portions of the proposed scope of work and would like to receive any comments from stakeholders in the next week. She noted that the consultant will flesh out the design requirements of the new facility and will be responsible for helping to select and negotiate with the design build contractor. One observer stated that it would be nice to see qualifications relating to urban design in the request for qualifications.

Solid Waste Director Tim Croll spoke to the stakeholders about zoning issues at the station. He stated that the industrial buffer on the northeast corner of the property cannot be built on unless it is re-zoned. The current facility is only allowed on the industrial buffer due to it being a pre-existing condition. Regarding the 1550 N. 34<sup>th</sup> Street building (1550 building), recycling is generally allowed in commercial zones, but there is some lack of clarity about whether recycling in the 1550 building would be viewed as being “accessory” to the new transfer station across Carr Place N. If it were accessory, then recycling would likely be precluded from the 1550 parcel under existing code. SPU is consulting with the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) on this issue and will know more definitely in the next few weeks about zoning for recycling on that site.

### **REVIEW OF PROCESS FOR RECEIVING COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND DISCUSSION**

The facilitator asked each stakeholder to provide input on potential community benefits for street vacation. He noted that this is an opportunity to start the discussion on benefits and that SPU will respond to the ideas generated.

Tim Croll added that SPU is required to show community benefits for street vacation as part of the project. SPU will be asking the City Council for a street vacation of Carr Place which will include approval for an expenditure on public benefit in exchange for the vacation. He noted that there is no formula to determine the value of community benefits, but it is generally preferred that the benefits be close to the impacted site. A stakeholder asked SPU to provide information on traffic near Carr Place to help the community better understand the traffic impacts.

Stakeholders and observers then presented their initial ideas regarding community benefits. The following ideas were suggested.

### *Facility Improvements*

- Bury or lower the building to minimize impacts on views.
- Promote zero waste practices and think into the future to design a facility that makes it easy to sort materials and minimize waste.
- Provide for a green roof. This enhances the aesthetics of the neighborhood.
- Create a strong buffer zone between the facility and the neighborhood – develop a greenbelt.
- Ensure that the new station is exceptionally safe and that environmental testing is thorough and transparent.
- Downzone the new property.
- Ensure that idling time for trucks is minimal. This helps businesses, reduces impacts on the neighborhood and the environment.
- Provide educational opportunities at the transfer station and promote the City’s zero waste goals.
- Have the entrance to the facility be in the southeast corner.
- Move the recycling facilities further west or away from the area.
- Use the top floor of the 1550 building as a community meeting space.
- Do not increase the height of the buildings.
- Seriously control speeding vehicles near the transfer station.

### *Community Open Space*

- Create a community center near the transfer station. The surrounding area does not have an active community center.
- Consider converting the employee parking lot in the northeast corner into an open space for the community.
- Convert the Essential Bakery parking lot into public space.
- Devote land to a community pea patch.
- Set aside space for a farmer’s market.
- Dedicate/repurpose the former University Child Development Center building at 3500 Interlake Ave N. to public use as a community center and pea patch.

### *Other Off-Site Improvements*

- Put funding toward the Center for Wooden Boats to create a new maritime-based community center campus at the old Metro site on Lake Union. Classes could be offered to a variety of ages, the public could rent boats, a farmers market could be set up, and a water taxi could be established on the site.
- Enhance existing park facilities such as Gas Works Park.
- Provide additional parking at Gas Works Park.
- Build a swimming pool for the community.
- Create an off-leash dog park.
- Dead end streets near the facility such as Carr and Woodlawn.
- Build a pedestrian boulevard toward Gas Works Park starting on Woodlawn Ave. This would help create a stronger link between Wallingford and Gas Works Park.

- Create a non-profit entity and earmark funds to be spent in the community as decided by trustees.

Stakeholders discussed possible criteria to consider when choosing community benefits. One stakeholder emphasized that community benefits should be close to the station and should be aligned with the goals and objectives of the Wallingford Neighborhood Plan. He noted that there is currently a community planning process underway which may help flesh out community gaps and needs. The Wallingford Community Council president added that there will be a public meeting in September to prioritize some of the desired community services and programs. Stakeholders also mentioned that additional criteria should include the number of people impacted and benefits to residents living within a few blocks of the station. There was some disagreement about whether the community benefits should focus more broadly on the needs of the City instead of the area surrounding the transfer station. One stakeholder noted that the offsite benefits are more tangible and that if the community chooses to focus on onsite benefits, they should be substantial. Another stakeholder stated that because the City was not required to do an environmental impact statement, the first priority should be to mitigate for the environmental impacts that would have been required under SEPA such as traffic flow and toxic waste. One member of the public asked the stakeholders to look carefully at community impacts and potential effects on crime in the area. Several stakeholders also expressed a desire to ensure that the community benefits fit in with Wallingford's designation as an urban village.

The facilitator noted that SPU will respond to the suggestions raised for community benefits. Tim Croll stated that SPU will be consulting with SDOT on which of the ideas discussed may be feasible. Nancy Ahern added that there is interplay between community benefits and design issues and she looks forward to revisiting the ideas presented as the design process moves forward. The November meeting may provide an opportunity to discuss both facility design and community benefits in more detail. By November, a support services firm should have been chosen and the height/bulk and scale of the facility can be discussed. The master use permit (MUP) will come later in the process.

One stakeholder asked SPU some clarifying questions about the facility plans, the purchase of the 1550 building, and whether the City had considered including purchasing additional property to the west. Regarding the property acquisition of 1550 building, SPU acquired the property through a negotiated sale with the owner. The owner agreed to sell the property to SPU under the threat of condemnation. SPU paid the owner the fair market price for the property. SPU stated that the former University Child Development Center at 3500 Interlake Avenue N. was never considered a part of the plan given that access to the building is difficult. SPU noted that recycling at the 1550 building will be largely for commercial customers and will have items such as cardboard and batteries that can't be recycled through curbside programs. A non-fee recycling station is also at the South transfer station. Issues surrounding recycling at the new North station will be discussed in more detail at the September/October meeting.

#### **FINAL THOUGHTS AND ADJOURN**

A stakeholder noted that there will be a judicial hearing on July 31<sup>st</sup> at 8:30am on the issue of whether or not SPU's Determination of Non-Significance was appropriate. He invited anyone to attend. Facilitator David Harrison then reviewed the outcomes of the meeting. He restated that

the next meeting will be held in September or October and will focus on recycling/reuse, traffic and view corridors. A meeting will then be held in November to review community benefits and discuss design issues. He then thanked the parties for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

**Meeting Summary**  
**NORTH RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL STATION REBUILD PROJECT**  
Stakeholder Group Meeting 7  
Nalanda West, 3902 Woodland Park Avenue N, Seattle  
October 20, 2009 6:00 to 8:00 PM  
Walking Tour of Neighborhood 5:00 PM

**ATTENDEES**

**Stakeholders**

Bill Bergstrom  
Eric Johnson  
Trish McNeil  
Eric Pihl  
Bob Quinn  
David Ruggiero  
Rob Stephenson  
Cathy Tuttle  
Jessica Vets  
Paul Willumson (tour only)

**Seattle Public Utilities**

Nancy Ahern  
Bill Benzer  
Tim Croll  
Jeff Neuner

**Triangle Associates**

Bob Wheeler  
Jennifer Howell

**Presenters**

Art Campbell, Herrera Associates  
Laura Van Dyke, Heffron Transportation

**Observers**

Richard Floisand  
Marcia Wagoner  
Erika Bigelow  
Penny Mabie  
Rob Gala

**MEETING PURPOSE**

The purpose of this meeting was for the North Stakeholder Group to discuss view corridors, recycling/reuse, and traffic. The meeting was preceded by a walking tour north of the transfer station to see views first hand. SPU also introduced new project staff and provided an update on the contracting process.

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

- SPU will include ideas related to the view of the proposed recycling center from Woodlawn Avenue N to the scope of work for the support services contractor who will work with the stakeholder group. Additional suggestions from members of the group included looking at the cumulative impact of traffic from the Fremont urban village with the transfer station or expanding the range of assumptions regarding traffic, garbage and recycling generation.
- SPU will identify the number of parking spaces for the facility that are required by the Department of Planning and Development.
- SPU will invite a representative from the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to talk about traffic calming techniques if the stakeholder group would find this helpful.
- SPU will evaluate existing information and determine if an additional study or survey on who currently is using the North Station for recycling is needed. If adequate information does not already exist, SPU will gather it.
- The issues identified as part of the discussion on views, traffic, and recycling will be

incorporated into the master “issues of interest” document if they are not already included.

- Undergrounding utilities and adding a buffer area along east side of property will be added to the list of ideas for community benefit.
- The next stakeholder meeting will be in late winter or early spring after the support services contractor is hired and has had time to finish the first task in the scope of work and is familiar with the design program for the project.

## **AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION**

### **TOUR SUMMARY**

Prior to the meeting, Art Campbell, Herrera Associates, led a walking tour to the key viewpoints in the Visual Technical Report he prepared for the project. The group met at the corner of 35<sup>th</sup> and Stone Way, walked east on 35<sup>th</sup> Street to Woodlawn Ave N, stopping at locations along the way. The group was able to look at the view from the porch of 3428 Woodlawn where you could see over the 1550 Building (1550 N. 34<sup>th</sup> Street Building, formerly the Oroweat Bakery). The corner of Woodlawn Avenue N. and 35<sup>th</sup> was also a key viewpoint. The group walked up Woodlawn to 36<sup>th</sup> and then west to Ashworth, another key viewpoint. Back at Ashworth and 35<sup>th</sup>, the group noted the view of the fence and the transfer station building along 35<sup>th</sup>. The group then walked west to Interlake Ave N, another viewpoint and then north on Interlake. The group then proceeded to the meeting site at Nalanda West. Comments made along the tour were reiterated at the meeting and will be described below.

### **WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW AND RECAP**

Facilitator Bob Wheeler welcomed the stakeholders, led introductions and outlined the purpose of the meeting. He reminded the group that he has taken over the role of facilitator from David Harrison. Nancy Ahern, SPU Deputy Director, also introduced the new project manager for the North Transfer Station project, Bill Benzer. Veronica Baca took an extended leave shortly after the last stakeholder meeting.

The facilitator recapped the last meeting noting that the suggestions for community benefits were captured in the meeting summary and would be revisited later in the process after the support services contractor is hired. He also pointed out the Issues of Interest document and that any new issues identified at tonight’s meeting would be added to the matrix.

### **VIEW CORRIDORS**

Facilitator Bob Wheeler reviewed the route of the tour and then asked Art Campbell, Herrera Associates, to comment on what he heard and then invited stakeholders to add their impressions. Several stakeholders noted how helpful it was to walk in the neighborhood and see firsthand how views are affected. Tim Croll, SPU Solid Waste Director, reiterated SPU’s commitment not to raise the height of the transfer station building from its existing height except any height that would be needed if a green roof was added. Jeff Neuner, SPU, also commented that a 25-foot height was needed for operations and that no advantage existed to raise the transfer building higher than what it is.

### **1550 N. 34<sup>th</sup> Street Building—Recycling Area**

Art Campbell noted that he heard several comments regarding what will happen with the 1550 Building and how this may impact views along the east and northeast side of the facility. The

walking tour underscored that the residences particularly on Woodlawn have views of Queen Anne and the Aurora Bridge. Some areas see Lake Union, the Space Needle, and/or parts of the city skyline. The issue regarding the potential rezone of the 1550 Building property and how that impacts both height and buffer requirements was raised. The fact that the property slopes to the south and the grade between the existing 1550 building and the existing transfer station is different also may create some opportunity to improve or reduce the impact on existing views. Stakeholders suggested the following ideas on how to minimize view impacts created by replacing the 1550 Building.

- Lower the building.
- Move it further south on the site.
- Move it further west to allow a larger buffer along the east side of the building.
- Add a promenade on the east side of the building—a slithering park down to the water.
- Add a green roof to the building. If the building was lowered/buried and it had a green roof, this could possibly enhance views for the residents in the neighborhood.
- Place any needed height for the building further down south on the property so the existing view would not be affected.
- Bury utilities to improve view.

An observer commented that he would like to see the building fit better into the residential setback of 25 feet and have a softer treatment, not just a big wall. Tim Croll, SPU Solid Waste Director, commented that SPU was concerned about the weight of a green roof on the transfer station building where the roof has to cover a large span without internal columns. However, the recycling building would not need to be as wide and therefore possibly could hold the weight of a green roof. A green roof could be an interesting concept. A stakeholder commented that SPU may have an opportunity to enhance what residences right next to the property look at and that this would mitigate the immediate impact of the facility.

Stakeholders also asked about the view from the Aurora Bridge and how the view of the site appears from other locations. A green roof would be more attractive to look at. A request for a topographic map that shows the grade across the site would be helpful.

### **Employee Parking Lot**

An observer noted that the parking lot to the north of 35<sup>th</sup> is zoned a conditional use. He suggested moving the parking to the industrial zone and making the parking lot a park. Nancy Ahern noted that this idea was raised at the last meeting as a potential community benefit. The group discussed whether the lot was bigger than needed and whether all or part of the site could be used for other purposes. Tim Croll noted that the lot currently has more spaces than needed. Laura Van Dyke, Heffron Transportation, noted that the lot currently has 46 spaces and that the traffic study indicated that the number of employees could range from 29-39 employees. The higher number reflects 10 additional SPU employees who were added in the high traffic scenario. SPU can determine what is required by DPD.

### **Trees on 35<sup>th</sup> Street**

The question was raised regarding how tall the trees on the north side of the facility might get. Jeff Neuner, SPU, noted that SPU can control the height of the trees and that the goal for planting these was to screen the building, not to obscure the views above the station. One stakeholder commented that the trees were a great addition.

## **RECYCLING AND REUSE**

Jeff Neuner, Solid Waste Planning Manager, presented SPU's future plans for recycling and reuse at the north station. He reviewed the benefits and current operating assumptions for developing a separate recycling center. Separating the recycling from the transfer station allows more space, convenience for customers who are only recycling, and provides one central location for recycling. It also will save approximately 2000 square feet in the transfer building that could be used for other purposes such as adding stalls to get waiting cars off the street. Jeff explained that the preferred location for the recycling center is the east side of the site where the 1550 Building is now. Access would be on the west side and customers would enter and exit off 34<sup>th</sup> Street. Ideally a cutover would allow access to the transfer side so customers could drop off recycling prior to paying for disposal, encouraging people to recycle and save money.

Questions arose about who currently uses the recycling available at the existing site and who is expected to use it in the future. Jeff Neuner responded that currently mostly cars and small trucks bring recycling; businesses bring cardboard, taverns bring bottles, self-haulers bring packing boxes. Big recycling trucks go directly to recycling facilities. SPU hopes that more recycling will happen at the curbside. A stakeholder commented that currently people who have parties or big events bring the recycling to the facility to avoid overloading their curbside container. Tim Croll noted that SPU knows what kind of trips come to the station to recycle but not who they are or why they are bringing the material. SPU could do a study to collect data on who is using the facility.

The group discussed recycling metal at the facility. Jeff Neuner stated that providing a place to recycle metal is a real need at the facility that is not available at curbside. SPU expects to keep the metal recycling in the transfer building because it is heavy and hard to move. This would also include appliances. Metal that can be recycled curbside would be collected in the new recycling building. One stakeholder suggested that SPU allow recycling mid-size metal in the recycling building to encourage recycling of this material as long as it could fit in a dumpster or be lifted by one person. Tim Croll added that it would be important to keep anything that would make a lot of noise in the transfer building. Facilitator Bob Wheeler noted that these issues would be added to the list for follow up.

Jeff Neuner then described plans for dropping off reusable materials including construction and other materials. The space allows only for drop off not a retail outlet. He described the pilot project for reuse that flags people who have reusable materials before they get on the property so they can drop them off at the 1550 Building area. Several stakeholders emphasized the importance of taking the opportunity of educating people on reuse or recycling opportunities as they use the transfer station. Discussion ensued about the pros and cons of separating reuse and recycling versus keeping it in the transfer station which might allow for more education or future flexibility. Concern regarding noise generated at the recycling center was also highlighted as was managing the queues of customers and keeping commercial customers separate from self-haulers. Also noted were concerns regarding open bins and the potential for rats and blowing trash.

Jeff Neuner concluded his presentation that the new recycling center could include new materials not currently accepted such as textiles, electronics, or other things not yet known. He added that the administration office for the facility would also be moved to the same area.

## **TRAFFIC**

Laura Van Dyke, Heffron Transportation, then presented the results of the Transportation Technical Report. This was a reprise of the presentation provided to the stakeholder group on March 18, 2008. Heffron was hired by SPU to perform a transportation study and examine transportation scenarios for low, medium and high traffic volume.

Ms. Van Dyke presented highlights of their analysis. The study was based on construction of a new transfer station building on the existing site; expansion of the site's recycling facilities within the vacated portion of Carr Place N, construction of new employee facilities and offices on the property east of Carr Place; and parking in the SPU-owned parking lot northeast of N 35th Street/Carr Place N. As part of the study Heffron documented background (Existing and No-Action) transportation conditions, added projected NRDS trips for three traffic scenarios (high, medium, and low) and evaluated transportation changes with the Action condition.

Heffron concluded that the net change in site-generated trips is projected to be slightly higher with the Action condition compared to the No-Action condition, ranging from 14 to 40 daily trips depending upon the analysis day and the traffic scenario. These trips are associated with new employees needed for recycling and possibly for other SPU employees that could relocate to the site. Also, while the number of transfer trucks may decrease, the number of transfer trucks moving reuse and recycling would increase. This is because these materials are typically moved in smaller vehicles.

Heffron further concluded that there would be no adverse impacts to any off-site intersection or roadway due to the project and driveway intersections would operate acceptably at LOS C or better during the PM peak hour in 2030. On-street queuing would be less with the proposed project since the number of scales and transfer building stalls would increase with project. No significant impacts to the roadway network are anticipated due to vacating Carr Place.

Ms. Van Dyke stated there would be no transportation impacts during the closure and rebuild of NRDS since existing station traffic will be diverted to other facilities during construction. Parking for construction workers will be onsite or in the SPU-owned parking lot northeast of N 35th Street/Carr Place N. As no adverse transportation impacts were identified, no transportation mitigation would be required.

An observer asked when Heffron conducted the traffic count on Carr Place and whether this was on a peak day. Ms. Van Dyke explained that while Heffron commissioned the count on Carr Place on a Tuesday in November, all transfer station transportation data were obtained from SPU for an average day and an average day in the peak season.

A stakeholder wondered if the study was based on how the station is currently used and whether it had considered new activities such as product stewardship, take back, and reuse. Tim Croll responded that if a significant amount of our trash goes into product stewardship mode, that SPU would provide this service at curbside rather than having people come to the station. Collection

must be efficient. Another idea would be to have small take-back centers rather than use the transfer station.

One stakeholder requested that SPU look at the cumulative impact of traffic from the urban village proposed for Fremont and the transfer station. The study only looks at the transfer station, not how it will interact with the urban village. A request was made for SPU to provide more information on the assumptions and comparison from today to 2030. Another stakeholder noted that the assumptions from the 1960s when the station was first built were really low for expectations for the future.

Another issue of interest was the impact on traffic for the closure of Carr Place North. While stakeholders understood the concept, concern for where the 90 cars per day will go was raised, particularly if this impacted Woodlawn or Densmore, the two streets that go through to 34<sup>th</sup> where the entrance to the station is. Concern for safety of pedestrians was also identified.

Tim Croll suggested that SDOT could come and discuss traffic calming ideas with the community. When discussing whether to do further or new traffic studies, some stakeholders noted that these are expensive and won't tell us anything new. They'd rather focus on solutions on how to get the traffic to go where you want it to go, reduce queuing, and get the self-haulers off the street. One suggestion was to either add a light or allow left turns onto the site from 34<sup>th</sup>.

The suggestion was made to look at the baseline in a different way. If a range of assumptions or scenarios were provided, this might make the rezone easier. We don't know what will be happening with recycling in 10 years or traffic. Tim Croll noted that we need to look at this in context of views. If views are paramount, this may affect the size of the building which in turn could affect the ability to keep queuing off the streets.. He noted that it is good to do this together so SPU and the stakeholder group can agree where to make compromises.

A stakeholder noted that predicting the future garbage estimates can be based on historical trends --if you look at people's habits, tie it to residential density, you can get a good idea of the volume of trash but you may not know the mix. The city is already recycling over 50%. You need to remember this facility is for waste that isn't recycled at curbside and the city is continuing to incentivize people to do more at the curb. The suggestion was made to consider material compaction and consolidation in the transfer station and co-mingling recyclables.

## **PROJECT UPDATE AND NEXT STEPS**

The facilitator then noted that it was 8 PM and time to wrap up the meeting. Tim Croll promised to email the group with a response to a stakeholder's questions on funding and the delay mentioned by Council President Richard Conlin at the candidates forum. Bill Benzer informed the group that SPU's next steps were to select a support services consultant, negotiate a contract, do the research, and get ready to look at the concepts presented in the scope. Tim Croll noted that SPU expects that the stakeholder group may also suggest some ideas for concepts.

## **ADJOURN**

Facilitator Bob Wheeler reviewed the outcomes of the meeting. He noted that the issues of interest document would be updated and the group would reconvene sometime in 2010 when the support services contract was underway.