

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 4th 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 20th 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 4th be used to discuss said document. This means that the meeting on public benefits will then be put off until June 30th. 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 4th 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 35th

SPU was asked why they planted trees on 35th 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 4th. Stakeholders will use that meeting to review and discuss the design document. The meeting about community benefits will be postponed until June 30th.