
Foreword

The Brightwater Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is a supplement to the EIS issued for the Brightwater Regional Wastewater Treatment System in November 2003. It has been prepared and issued pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (RCW 43.21 and WAC 197-11).

Background

An appeal was filed with the King County Hearing Examiner in January 2004 challenging the adequacy of the Brightwater EIS. The Hearing Examiner ruled in August 2004 that the EIS was adequate to support the King County Executive's December 2003 siting decision to build the Brightwater Treatment Plant on the Route 9 site north of Woodinville, with a conveyance tunnel across north King County and an outfall off Point Wells.¹ This ruling was upheld in June 2005 by the King County Superior Court.²

The King County Hearing Examiner also directed King County to excavate at least one investigative trench to evaluate whether a geologic feature on the northern portion of the Route 9 site was a fault and to determine the extent of recent earthquake activity on the suspected fault, if any. King County was directed to prepare a Supplemental EIS if the suspected fault was found to be active.

Consistent with the direction of the King County Hearing Examiner, in October 2004, King County, in a cooperative agreement with the U. S. Geological Survey (USGS), studied a strand of the Southern Whidbey Island Fault (SWIF) that crosses the northernmost portion of the Route 9 site several hundred feet north of planned new treatment plant facilities. This potential fault was identified by USGS in March 2004 and is referred to as Lineament 4 (Blakely et al., 2004).³ Information gathered from a trench dug on the Route 9 site confirmed that Lineament 4 is an active strand of the SWIF. In addition, USGS identified another lineament at the south end of the Route 9 site (Lineament X); however, there is no direct evidence indicating that this lineament is a fault. No evidence has been identified by USGS or other experts to suggest the presence

¹ King County. 2004. *Decision denying appeal, subject to conditions, Brightwater Final Environmental Impact Statement appeals of adequacy*. Seattle, WA: Office of the Hearing Examiner.

² King County Superior Court. 2005. *Court findings and facts of law in re: appeals of adequacy of Brightwater Final Environmental Impact Statement brought by StockPot, Inc., City of Bothell, City of Shoreline, Sno-King Environmental Alliance, and City of Woodinville*. Case No. 04-2-21301-1 SEA. Seattle, WA.

³ Blakely, R.J., Sherrod, B.L., Wells, R.E., Weaver, C.S., McCormack, D.H., Troost, K.G., and Haugerud, R.A. 2004. *The Cottage Lake Aeromagnetic Lineament: A possible onshore extension of the Southern Whidbey Island Fault, Washington*. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2004-1204.

of any additional lineaments between Lineaments 4 and X on the Route 9 site in the area where proposed new facilities will be built.

Because Lineament 4 was found to be an active fault, King County prepared a Draft Supplemental EIS in accordance with the Hearing Examiner's direction. The Draft Supplemental EIS, issued in April 2005, presented a worst-case analysis as allowed under SEPA (WAC 197-11-080). The analysis covered a range of hypothetical worst-case scenarios involving rupture of the ground surface on the Route 9 site during an earthquake and the varying types and degrees of damage and impacts that could result. The analysis presented is conservative in that the scenarios considered are highly unlikely to occur during the design life of the treatment plant.

Onsite seismic studies and the ensuing worst-case environmental analysis prompted changes in the design and layout of treatment plant facilities to mitigate the effects of a major earthquake on the Route 9 site. Facilities are now being designed to exceed current seismic design standards. The locations of chemical storage facilities have changed to prevent the onsite mixing of alkaline and acidic chemicals. Additions, such as valves and flexible piping, will prevent these chemicals from mixing offsite, will isolate the contents of individual piping systems and tanks, and will minimize the potential for leaks where the pipes enter the tanks.

A 30-day comment period—April 11 through May 11, 2005—was provided for the Draft Supplemental EIS. One public hearing was held on May 4, 2005. In all, 26 agencies, organizations, and individuals submitted more than 600 comments either at the public hearing or in written form. Brightwater project team members responded to each comment. Because the changes in the document that resulted from responses to comments are minor and few in number, the scope and analysis of impacts contained in the Draft Supplemental EIS remain essentially intact.

The Final Supplemental EIS, therefore, consists of the two-volume Draft Supplemental EIS as issued in April 2005 and this new volume, which responds to comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS and also includes pages that have been revised to correct or enhance the information presented in the Draft Supplemental EIS. SEPA allows this approach when changes are minor (WAC 197-11-560). All volumes are contained on the CD attached to the back cover of this volume.

The King County Executive will consider the new environmental information contained in the Final Supplemental EIS, along with other factors such as cost and likelihood of earthquakes, and will reevaluate the decision made in December 2003 to select the Route 9–195th Street System Alternative, which locates the Brightwater Treatment Plant at the Route 9 site.

How this Volume Is Organized

This volume contains comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS, responses to comments, changes made to pages in the Draft Supplemental EIS, and an updated fact sheet. All comments received during the comment period are included—whether

submitted in the form of public testimony, letters, online submissions, or handwritten comment forms.

Each submission is broken down into discrete, numbered comments. Following each submission are the individual responses to each comment. Some of the responses refer readers to “summary responses,” which focus on themes that occurred frequently in the comments and that called for detailed discussion. The summary responses appear in the section immediately before the comments and individual responses. A list of acronyms and abbreviations and a glossary serve as aids in reading the responses to comments.

Changes to pages in the Draft Supplemental EIS follow the responses to comments. The changes are organized by chapter and appendix of the Draft Supplemental EIS.