

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BRIGHWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM
DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PUBLIC HEARING

May 4, 2005
6:30 P.M.
University of Washington
Bothell Campus, Building UW2
18115 Campus Way Northeast
Bothell, Washington

Transcribed by Catherine A. Decker, Court Reporter
CCR 1975

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X O F P U B L I C C O M M E N T S

Speaker	Page
Greg Stephens 21926 State Route 9 Woodinville, 98072	16
Emma Dixon 24219 107th Drive Southeast Woodinville, 98077	20
Jim MacRae 5120 215th Street Southeast Woodinville, 98072	23, 34
Linda Gray 22629 78th Avenue Southeast Woodinville, 98072	27
John Schmiel 12826 Northeast 185th Court Bothell, 98011	30

1 MR. PETERSON: I'm Tom Pederson, the facilitator
2 for the public hearing tonight on the Draft Supplemental
3 Environmental Impact Statement on the Brightwater treatment
4 facility.

5 The purpose of our being in this room tonight is to
6 hear your statements, your comments on the Draft
7 Environmental Impact Statement on the Brightwater treatment
8 facility. If you have particular questions or would like
9 additional comment or discussion on particular aspects of
10 the proposal of the impact statement, please consult the
11 experts and staff in the foyer. That's why they're there,
12 to talk with you about particular aspects of this project.

13 The purpose of our being here in the hearing room is
14 to take your testimony and to give you an opportunity to
15 comment for the record. You have three ways to do that --
16 in writing, using the comment form in your blue handout,
17 and it has a couple of important pieces of information on
18 it. You need to include your name and address, and you
19 need to send your comments by the 11th of May. All
20 comments will receive a response that will be in the final
21 EIS, and that will be available in mid-July.

22 So two methods of commenting in writing, using the
23 comment form. There are boxes out in the foyer and also at
24 the sign-in table where you can leave those comment forms
25 or mail them in. And then we have the court reporter

1 tonight who will take your comments verbatim.

2 The listening panel, Christie True, who is the head of
3 major capital projects for the Department of Natural
4 Resources and Parks, and Don Tyler, who is the director of
5 wastewater treatment for the department, as well as Shirley
6 Marroquin, who is the director of environmental planning.

7 We will begin our listening, actually, by giving some
8 background on the project, on the Draft Supplemental EIS.
9 If you would like to speak, please sign up with Erica
10 Peterson right there at the sign-in desk at the top of the
11 stairs. I will call speakers from the list, so I will need
12 to have you sign in so that I know you would like to speak.

13 Given the number of people who are here tonight, you
14 will have five minutes to give your testimony, and we will
15 give you a warning sign when you're nearing the end of your
16 five minutes so that you can wrap up and be sure to make
17 all the points that you would like to make. Then I will
18 remind you that the time is up when we reach five minutes.

19 So it's important, I believe, to have background
20 information on this Draft Supplemental EIS, so I've asked
21 Shirley Marroquin to give us that, and then we'll welcome
22 your five-minute comments after her presentation. So
23 Shirley?

24
25

1 PRESENTATION BY SHIRLEY MARROQUIN

2

3 Okay. I'm not used to using microphones, so let me
4 know if you can't hear me or anything like that. Thank
5 you.

6 Good evening. This evening I'm going to talk about
7 what a supplemental environmental impact statement is, what
8 we studied and what we learned, how we changed the project
9 as a result of our studies. And following that, members of
10 the audience can make their testimony.

11 The purpose of an EIS is to discuss the probable
12 impacts of a project. In this case the Supplemental EIS
13 analyzes the hypothetical impacts of an earthquake at the
14 proposed Brightwater site. Brightwater facilities will be
15 constructed at the Route 9 site to treat wastewater from
16 the growing population in south Snohomish and north King
17 counties. General information about the project is
18 available in the foyer.

19 Prepared and issued under the State Environmental
20 Policy Act, or SEPA, the SEIS supplements the final EIS
21 that King County issued in November 2003. In other words,
22 since the final EIS was issued, we found new information
23 that needed to be added. This information is included in
24 the SEIS.

25 In cases of scientific uncertainty, SEPA says we

1 should evaluate the worst-case scenario and describe the
2 possibility or the chance that the scenario would happen.
3 This SEIS involves uncertainty because we cannot say when
4 and where earthquakes will occur nor do we know how big
5 earthquakes will be. We have evaluated three different
6 scenarios. For this SEIS, the most probable scenario has
7 about one percent probability of occurring over a 50-year
8 period, so it's not likely to happen during the 50-year
9 design life of the project.

10 The other two scenarios are even less probable. In
11 other words, the chances of any of these three scenarios
12 happening is extremely remote, but I will cover
13 probabilities again when I describe the three scenarios.

14 I want to call your attention to this figure right
15 here. Each dot on this graphic represents an earthquake
16 that has been recorded since 1900. Working with the USGS,
17 we have learned a lot about the seismic forces in our
18 region and on the Brightwater site in particular. Our area
19 is prone to earthquakes. The central Puget Sound region is
20 criss-crossed by faults. The Southern Whidbey Island fault
21 is one of more than six major fault zones that USGS has
22 identified in our area. The Seattle fault is perhaps the
23 best known of these. And for your reference, the Nisqually
24 earthquake in 2001 measured a magnitude 6.8 but caused no
25 rupture at the ground surface.

1 As part of the larger Southern Whidbey Island fault
2 study, USGS studied a lineament that crosses the northern
3 portion of the Route 9 site, called "Lineament 4." A
4 lineament is a linear arrangement of land forms such as
5 streams, low ridges, and ravines that may have been formed
6 by seismic faulting, erosion, or glaciers.

7 We learned that Lineament 4 is an active fault that
8 has moved two to three times in the past 12,000 to 16,000
9 years and last moved within the past 2,700 years.
10 Averaged, this is once every 4,000 to 8,000 years. As a
11 result, plant design has been beefed up to withstand
12 stronger seismic shaking. And some facilities have been
13 placed differently on the site to avoid hazards.

14 The USGS also identified a potential lineament we call
15 "X" crossing the southern tip of the plant site. And you
16 can see that on the figure. A fault can occur anywhere
17 during an earthquake, not just at known fault locations.
18 So even though there is no evidence of a fault under the
19 treatment structures, we decided to analyze that
20 hypothetical scenario also.

21 We developed three scenarios to arrive at a worst-
22 case assessment of potential impacts. And there is a table
23 on the wall just to the other side of the slide that lists
24 those scenarios. Scenario A is a major ground-rupturing
25 quake on Lineament 4, which is to the north. Here it is.

1 Scenario B is a ground-rupturing quake on Lineament X,
2 which is to the south. And then scenario C is a
3 ground-rupturing earthquake on a hypothetical new fault
4 somewhere under the treatment facilities. So it would be
5 located somewhere between the two.

6 Since we're trying to get at the worst case, all of
7 the scenarios assume full use of the Brightwater system
8 plant and pipes at its largest capacity in 2050. We also
9 assume that it occurs during wet weather, and wet weather
10 overflows to Lake Washington and Sammamish River would be a
11 risk any time after 2010 if
12 Brightwater were not up and running for whatever reason.

13 We also assumed ground-rupturing quakes for each
14 scenario, even though these occur rarely in this region.
15 None of the scenarios result in a threat to public safety
16 or known drinking water sources.

17 Moving to Scenario A. Scenario A is very unlikely to
18 occur during the design life of the plant. It assumes very
19 hard shaking from a major ground-rupturing earthquake on
20 Lineament 4, which we know to be an active fault. You see
21 that on the north side. There are no treatment process
22 facilities such as water holding basins on or near this
23 lineament. In this case, the Brightwater facility would
24 undergo hard shaking but would survive the earthquake with
25 minor damage that could be repaired within a few days.

1 The design of the plant has been strengthened to
2 protect it in an earthquake that exceeds a magnitude 7.
3 The Brightwater plant as currently designed will withstand
4 ground shaking comparable to recent damaging quakes in
5 Northridge, California, and Kobe, Japan, which measured 6.7
6 and 6.9 magnitude, respectively.

7 The plant could be emptied to Puget Sound via the
8 effluent tunnel while inspections and repairs were made.
9 New Brightwater flows would be diverted to the other two
10 plants. If the plant down-time happened to coincide with
11 extremely wet weather, there would be overflows to the
12 Sammamish River and Lake Washington as well as local
13 streams. Near the plant site there would be not releases
14 of polluted water to the environment. As I said, this
15 scenario is not at all likely to occur.

16 Under Scenario B we made the assumption that Lineament
17 X at the south end of the site is an active fault and a
18 ground-rupturing fault occurs there. This scenario is very
19 unlikely, less probable than Scenario A. There are no
20 treatment facilities on or near Lineament X, but the tunnel
21 that carries flows to and from the plant does cross it.
22 There's the tunnel and the pipe line that brings flows to
23 and from the plant. The pump station at Bothell would stop
24 sending flows to the plant immediately, but the amount of
25 flow right at the location of the break would leak into the

1 ground about 25 feet below the surface.

2 The tunnel and pipelines are being designed with
3 features to withstand earthquakes, such as thicker pipes
4 and high performance joints. However, in an earthquake so
5 strong that it exceeded these design features, the plant
6 would be shut down for up to six months while the tunnel
7 was being repaired. For several weeks all Brightwater
8 flows would be routed to the other plants for treatment.
9 In extremely wet weather there would be overflows to Lake
10 Washington, the Sammamish River, and area streams.

11 Depending on the location and extent of the break, the
12 county would immediately begin to build the temporary
13 facilities to divert untreated wastewater directly into the
14 effluent line heading to Puget Sound, where impacts would
15 be the least. It would take up to six weeks to put this
16 diversion into place. The contents of the plant at the
17 time of the quake could be pumped into tankers and trucked
18 to other plants for treatment. The damage to the plant
19 itself from such a strong earthquake on Lineament X would
20 be similar to the damage from a strong quake on Lineament
21 4. It would be minor and capable of repair within a few
22 days.

23 Any contaminated water in the ground could be cleaned
24 up before it reached Little Bear Creek. There are no
25 recorded downstream water users who could be affected;

1 still, this scenario is very unlikely to occur.

2 The third scenario, Scenario C, is remotely possible
3 but extremely unlikely compared to either of the other two
4 scenarios. This scenario is actually a bundle of different
5 scenarios based on a hypothetical fault that could develop
6 and rupture the ground during an earthquake sometime in the
7 future.

8 Our experts drew hypothetical lines moving the fault
9 north and south between Lineaments 4 and X. So to figure
10 out where a ground-rupturing earthquake would have the most
11 serious impact, the fault location that would produce the
12 worst-case impact for surface water quality is different
13 from the one that would produce the worst case for ground
14 water quality. The worst-case location for air emissions
15 is different from the other two. So you can't put the
16 impacts together to understand the consequences from
17 Scenario C. It would depend where the hypothetical fault
18 was located what the environmental impacts of a major
19 earthquake would be.

20 A rupture under the buried water-holding basins, right
21 here, would affect groundwater. But because groundwater
22 flows away from the Cross Valley wells under the site,
23 there would be no effect on the public water supply. The
24 soils in this area are very tightly packed, so the spill
25 would move very slowly, giving King County time to clean it

1 up. There will be underdrains that carry groundwater under
2 the tanks to the stormwater control system and eventually
3 Little Bear Creek. Plugging these after a quake would
4 confine any leakage to the ground, and it could be
5 intercepted and pumped out of the ground before it reached
6 the creek.

7 The worst impact would occur under Scenario C if such
8 a fault were to develop and rupture under the solids
9 digesters located right there. King County could contain
10 any leakage on site from a smaller event that lacked the
11 force to pull the steel-reinforced digester walls apart.
12 Even though they are constructed with reinforcing steel to
13 protect their structure, if they were to crack wide open,
14 wastewater solids would empty onto the ground and make its
15 way through the plant site and enter Little Bear Creek.

16 This material would take oxygen out of the stream and
17 raise the water temperature so that fish and other
18 organisms downstream would die. There would be very strong
19 odors. In a few hours' time, the solids would make it to
20 the Sammamish River and Lake Washington, although impacts
21 wouldn't be nearly as great because those water bodies are
22 larger and can absorb more. Even though King County would
23 begin cleanup as soon as possible and remove contaminated
24 material, it would take a long time for Little Bear Creek
25 to fully recover. Clean upstream water would begin that

1 recovery process immediately, but it would likely take at
2 least a year or two for the spring to be restored to
3 health.

4 I want to emphasize that the very serious scenario I
5 just described would occur only if a new fault developed
6 under the digesters and ruptured the ground. This is an
7 extremely unlikely event since there is no evidence of a
8 fault there.

9 Treatment plants in other places that have been
10 damaged by strong earthquakes have not caused catastrophic
11 environmental damage such as the worst case the draft
12 supplemental EIS describes. King County wastewater
13 treatment facilities have performed very well in the
14 earthquakes of the past 40 years when we had experienced
15 two major events and several smaller ones. There has been
16 only minor damage and in no case have there been releases
17 of wastewater to the environment.

18 King County is taking a proactive approach in planning
19 for earthquakes. In the 1990's we began to retrofit older
20 facilities to reduce hazards and decrease potential for
21 damage to our facilities. The proposed plant design has
22 been changed and made safer in light of the analysis in
23 this SEIS. The latest building codes take into account the
24 potential shaking that can occur in this region, and they
25 are updated all the time to reflect the latest information,

1 including recently gained information about Lineament 4.
2 And of course these building codes are applied to these
3 facilities, including Brightwater.

4 Early on the bulk storage for chemicals was designed
5 to code, requiring 20 feet of separation. Now the design
6 has been revised so that these chemicals will be separated
7 by 1200 feet, much further apart than the code requires.
8 Alkaline chemicals in the north and acidic chemicals in the
9 south. Brightwater will also have the flexibility to send
10 flows to other treatment plants in case of a major
11 emergency.

12 It's time for the hearing to begin, but I want to
13 leave you with five thoughts. First, the SEIS process
14 worked. The proposed plant design has been changed and
15 made safer in light of the analysis in the SEIS.
16 Brightwater would be designed to withstand a strong
17 earthquake centered on the fault called Lineament 4. The
18 Sno-King Environmental Alliance, called SKEA, deserves
19 credit for insisting that Lineament 4 needed to be
20 investigated further. SKEA and their expert, Dr. Yates,
21 pressed for trenching on Lineament 4, and because of their
22 efforts, King County worked in cooperation with USGS to do
23 that.

24 Second point. Damage to the plant would not in itself
25 pose a serious risk to public health or safety. It would

1 not affect the Cross Valley drinking water wells.

2 Third, King County is responsible for cleaning up any
3 spills to the environment. In most situations described in
4 this SEIS, there would be no long-term environmental
5 damage. Even in the worst scenario, the ecosystem would
6 recover after a few years.

7 Fourth, early in planning, King County sought to avoid
8 added design costs for structures near faults, so we
9 included an engineering constraint that the plant should be
10 a half kilometer from a "known documented fault." Experts
11 now tell us that there are likely many faults in this area
12 in general and the entire area is seismically active. In
13 areas that regulate distance from known faults, a typical
14 setback is far less, about 50 feet. It is impossible to
15 know where all faults are now or where they might develop
16 in the future, so we must design with extra reinforcement
17 for the possibility that there is or will be a nearby
18 fault.

19 And finally, let me remind you that I have been
20 describing worst-case impacts that are extremely unlikely
21 to ever occur. Still we cannot avoid earthquakes, so we
22 need to prepare for them in our public infrastructure and
23 also at home.

24 Thank you for your attention, and now it's time to
25 continue with the public hearing.

1 MR. PETERSON: If you would like to give
2 testimony, please sign up with Erica who has the list here.
3 A reminder that you have five minutes. The time keeper is
4 Marla here in the center of the room. She will give you a
5 warning card when you have one minute to go.

6 Our first speaker is Larry Whalen. If you would
7 please give your name and address when you begin your
8 testimony, the court reporter can get that attributed to
9 you so that we have an accurate record of who spoke. Larry
10 Whalen, please.

11 MR. WHALEN: I have no comment to make at this
12 time.

13 MR. PETERSON: Larry, if I'm hearing you
14 correctly, you don't have a comment at this time?

15 MR. WHALEN: I don't have a comment at this time.
16 I signed up in case I was provoked into a response.

17 MR. PETERSON: Okay. Greg Stephens?

18 MR. STEPHENS: Yes, I do have a comment.

19 MR. PETERSON: Okay. Would you come up, please.

20

21 COMMENTS OF GREG STEPHENS

22

23 Good evening. My name is Greg Stevens. I live at
24 21926 State Route 9, Southeast, Woodinville postal zone.
25 That is directly across the street from the northwest end

1 of this site. My thanks to the panel tonight and to the
2 staff that have come to help further the educational
3 process that our community has been going through for the
4 last several years.

5 As we grow in Puget Sound, it's clear that we need
6 more public infrastructure. It's clear that it has to be
7 built somewhere to accommodate the hundreds of thousands of
8 new people that will be coming to Snohomish County, and I
9 expect many more than that to the greater Puget Sound.

10 As technology has increased in it's reach and scope
11 over the last decades, I have noticed a change in the
12 educational level, both in the public and in the private
13 sectors as to the kinds of things that are in our living
14 environment. Puget Sound is a seismically active region,
15 and the place that I grew up in was also very seismically
16 active.

17 I was president during the 1971 San Fernando
18 earthquake in the northern part of Los Angeles and I was
19 privileged to survive, many other people did not, as it did
20 incorporate many surface ruptures and scarp and slip fault
21 as well as vertical displacement-type rearrangements of the
22 landscape. There was considerable infrastructure
23 disruption to pipelines, buildings, roads, bridges, and
24 everything else you can imagine, including my parents'
25 home. I feel that I am fairly qualified to make comment on

1 the kinds of things that we could suspect might occur in a
2 major seismic event.

3 The way the Puget Sound area is rebounding in a
4 post-glacial epic indicates that we are likely to find
5 considerably more lineaments, cracks if you will, in the
6 earth's crust because of the movement that is presently
7 undergoing rearrangement in Puget Sound geology. That
8 increase in technology only means that our eyes are getting
9 better. We're able to see things that 35 years ago in the
10 San Fernando quake we weren't to see, we could only suspect
11 might happen, because of the great San Andreas fault
12 system.

13 At the time it was thought things like that might
14 happen only once every 500 or a thousand years.
15 Subsequently there have been two major events in that area,
16 the San Fernando quake and the Northridge quake that was
17 referred to earlier.

18 This gives us pause, I would hope, but it also gives
19 us education to arm ourselves and to provide much better
20 insight and planning for the kinds of things that will
21 happen someday. Whether it's in our lifetime or this
22 facility's lifetime, they will indeed happen. It's
23 incumbent upon us to plan for severe events, perhaps even
24 more severe than anyone in this room might anticipate,
25 because public health is something we cannot play dice

1 with. And the environment that our children and
2 descendents live in can in large part be determined by the
3 things we do now.

4 Public infrastructure is something that contributes to
5 public health and our quality of life now. If we plan it
6 right, and we build it strong enough to withstand things
7 that could happen anywhere, not just at this site, but one
8 mile, five miles, ten miles away, there could be and most
9 likely are similar geologic formations. We should plan and
10 build to the very highest standards.

11 SKEA should be commended for having helped this
12 process to become a public education event. I think that
13 the planned site should be built to the strongest possible
14 specifications, and that includes not just the facilities
15 for production and wastewater treatment but also the
16 environmental education center that is scheduled and has
17 been promised to be built at that site as well. And since
18 it would be something that people would be in as opposed to
19 just chemicals or wastewater, it should be built also to
20 the very highest standards.

21 I will have very detailed suggestions in my written
22 comments submitted later to the staff with regard to how to
23 protect Little Bear Creek, specifically, from the kinds of
24 overflows that have been indicated could occur. Thank you
25 very much for your time, and I invite as much public

1 participation in this process as possible.

2 MR. PETERSON: The floor is open for your
3 comments. We have no person at this time signed in. If
4 you would like to speak, please sign in with Erica
5 Peterson.

6

7 COMMENTS OF EMMA DIXON

8

9 My name is Emma Dixon, and my address is 24219 107th
10 Drive Southeast, that's Woodinville. My comments are the
11 following: Why does the Draft Environmental Impact
12 Statement only consider 50 years design life for the
13 Brightwater project, when it will likely be in operation
14 for much longer than that? Renton, West Point were built
15 in the 1960s, yet there are no plans to decommission them
16 in the foreseeable future. In fact, Brightwater planning
17 presumes that both the facilities will be fully
18 operational, pushing them closer to a 100-year operation.
19 So shouldn't the Supplemental EIS reflect that reality?

20 Would the trenching of the footprint of the facility
21 really be financially cost prohibitive given the 4.5
22 billion and rising cost of this project. Repeatedly in the
23 document there's reference to the lack of data regarding
24 Lineament X and potentially Lineament C in the middle, and
25 that ambiguity could be conclusively established one way or

1 the other by trenching. So why not pursue all possible
2 avenues to understand and be certain what conditions are
3 all across the site.

4 The SEIS states that the likely existence of faults
5 throughout the area makes it very difficult to select a
6 site that does not have risk of ground shaking or even
7 fault rupture within the Puget Sound area. However, during
8 the original siting selection process, only 5 of the 95
9 potential sites were eliminated due to approximately less
10 than half a kilometer from an active fault. So hasn't King
11 County chosen to proceed with a site that's not only less
12 than half a kilometer away, but has several on site, when
13 in fact there are 89 other potential sites that are over
14 half a kilometer away from an active fault?

15 Why is siting Brightwater on Route 9 on a fault zone
16 an acceptable risk to impose on a surrounding community
17 when the 2003 international building codes does not protect
18 structures from fault rupture, especially when the seismic
19 studies indicate previous displacements of up to six feet?

20 The SEIS states that the King County Executive will
21 consider the new environmental information contained in the
22 final SEIS along with other factors, such as cost and
23 likelihood of earthquakes, and reevaluate the decision made
24 in December of 2003 to locate the Brightwater treatment
25 plant at Route 9. How can that be done when the document

1 is purely in support of the previously made decision? Why
2 doesn't it discuss any alternative options and compare the
3 costs and potential risks to the surrounding community in
4 all the options? Will the public be provided with the
5 other pieces of data and information that will be factored
6 into the reevaluation of the site decision?

7 Why is there a disparity between King County's claims
8 of a 1 percent probability of an earthquake affecting the
9 Route 9 site over the next 50 years and the probability of
10 15 percent indicated by the USGS in the Seattle Times
11 article on the 11th of April? In the comparisons to waste
12 treatment facilities that endured earthquakes in
13 California, Japan, and Taiwan, are they truly comparable?
14 The documents actually state that fault ruptures beneath
15 the facilities did not occur in any of those four
16 earthquakes, so how can these be valid comparisons?

17 At Route 9 we have facilities and pipelines running
18 directly over lineaments which would be active faults, so
19 shouldn't King County reevaluate these comparisons to
20 determine if they accurately reflect similar locations in
21 proximity to active faults?

22 In the SEIS, figure 2.2 shows quite a cluster of
23 earthquakes around the conveyance route which
24 coincidentally appears to be similar to areas of some of
25 the six potential lineaments identified in the USGS in the

1 April 2004 report. Shouldn't King County investigate those
2 lineaments further and understand the actual
3 characteristics there too?

4 And I'll submit additional comments in writing. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Jim MacRae?

7 COMMENTS OF JIM MACRAE

8
9 Hello. My name is Jim MacRae. I reside in Snohomish
10 County at 5120 215th Street Southeast 98072. Thank you for
11 the opportunity to speak. I will be giving comments in
12 writing and as I understand by e-mail as acceptable to the
13 Brightwater Site. On the conclusion slide that was just
14 done, the first bullet point said that the SEIS process
15 worked, that Brightwater will be built stronger and safer
16 because of the work that's being done.

17 I want to read from a prepared statement I gave to
18 some of you, just an opinion, which I can give copies of
19 later to anybody that wants, which speaks to one of the
20 aspects of mitigation and risk avoidance.

21 Would you build a house on top of a known active
22 earthquake fault? Just think about that for a minute.
23 Would you build a house there? Would you place a school on
24 top of a known active earthquake fault? Would you engineer
25 a biochemical time bomb and place it on top of a known

1 active earthquake fault? The Brightwater staff and their
2 team of consultants seem to think yeah, risks/benefits,
3 yeah, it's okay.

4 To Brightwater staff and to Ron Sims, in reconsidering
5 his site placement decision, please remember that the best
6 form of mitigation is avoidance. There is nothing that
7 says this site has to be built, used for the sewage
8 treatment facility, it doesn't have to be put there. They
9 bought all the land, they paid tens of millions of bucks
10 for it, they kicked out industries, they destroyed our
11 grange. You know, they've taken the Howell Cabin,
12 historical property. They're going to screw up a
13 sole-source aquifer in spite of what their previous
14 materials suggested.

15 I want to talk to the SEIS briefly, just a couple
16 points there that I think need to be made. One is, I've
17 got to commend the team. They finally, for the very first
18 time, after years of reading thousands of pages of their
19 material, on page 4-23, said there could be some discharge
20 of chemicals into the ground or things into the atmosphere,
21 specifically methane they said. Good for you. It's nice
22 to see. We can engineer, we can design. An earthquake
23 maybe would cause some problems if it occurs there.

24 When you do a worst-case scenario -- and now you're
25 playing on my turf because I do risk management. When

1 you're doing a worst-case scenario, you don't minimize the
2 odds, not even a question. What you do is you balance the
3 odds of this occurring with the impact on the environmental
4 public health that would result. And when I read -- and I
5 have not completed reading your materials. When I read
6 chapter 5, particularly, of your materials and look at the
7 environmental impacts, and you're saying toxics won't leave
8 the site, 50 feet away -- if you're not within 50 feet it's
9 okay. Now the viruses, the bacteria, the other stuff start
10 to flow across Route 9, but they're not going to hurt
11 anybody. They'll kill some fish, maybe.

12 Well, I want to ask you this, why are there no
13 mortality tables? Why are you not estimating the actual
14 impact in death and sickness of the population, not only
15 the employees on the site and those that your own documents
16 says the impacted, those that live or work near the site,
17 but also the sensitive populations, the children and the
18 schools just downstream -- by the way, the same stream that
19 all the crap is going to flow if it goes. The children
20 down the stream, the old folks in Woodinville now living
21 sort of towards the north side. You don't compromise
22 populations? Bad stuff to get exposed to this. I don't
23 see a single piece in your materials estimating how many
24 deaths will occur under your worst-case scenario.

25 And another point. A worst-case scenario is not

1 conveniently chosen to show a minimal risk to the
2 environment. You have to take into account things -- okay.
3 You can't mix the chemicals, great, you put them far apart.
4 I love it. They're going to flow into different wastewater
5 things if there's a problem. Ultimately they flow into the
6 stream. They mix there. I don't see anything in here
7 showing what the impact of a massive bloom of chlorine
8 going down the valley towards Woodinville would be. That
9 is now possible, very unlikely, but possible.

10 When you say what the impacts of that would be,
11 respiratory irritation, other toxic effects, talk about
12 people's eyeballs popping out of their heads, turning into
13 sulfuric acid, going blind, choking to death, dying a
14 horrible death that we fortunately haven't seen on this
15 planet in great numbers since when what, 1918? when the
16 Germans last used those things. That's not nice. Don't
17 minimize just the possibility of occurrence. Please
18 accurately and completely state what the risks are to the
19 community. Thank you.

20 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. The floor is open for
21 your comments. If you would sign up with Erica Peterson.
22 Anyone else wish to speak?

23

24

25

1 against even a rare event."

2 It was mentioned earlier that there are 89 sites that
3 were not eliminated, they were not within 0.5 kilometers of
4 a fault. There are faults all over the Route 9 site, and
5 King County refuses to understand and trench. And if you
6 were to look at their track record, it's not very good.
7 Every time we've said there's a fault, there's a fault.
8 Every time they said there's not a fault, there is a fault.

9 Additionally, Renton and West Point do not sit on
10 active earthquake faults. They are not in extensions of
11 the South Whidbey Island fault nor are they in extensions
12 of the Seattle fault. Route 9 is right in the middle of
13 that, and in 1996, in the maps that they displayed in this
14 document, in this draft, it shows very clearly the Route 9
15 site in the extension of the South Whidbey Island fault.
16 Why wasn't that site eliminated?

17 According to the Johnson Study in 1996, it would have
18 saved a lot of grief for everyone had they used their
19 criteria properly, and rather than dismissing Johnson in
20 2000, used his information and eliminated the site because
21 we found out what he said is in fact true, that the South
22 Whidbey Island fault goes across the Route 9 site. And
23 it's not like the San Andreas fault, it's not a single
24 structure. It's multiple structures.

25 And as Dr. Yates said, this area has ruptured over

1 nine times within the last 2,700 years. He says that's a
2 very, very high probability that it will happen again.

3 And finally, what kind of mitigation is hoping that
4 it's not going to happen? I find that hard to believe, and
5 since I live here, hard to accept. Thank you.

6 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. We welcome your
7 comments. Someone who hasn't spoken yet. Is there anyone
8 who would like to speak now? Anybody who hasn't spoken
9 yet? Mr. MacRae?

10 MR. MACRAE: I do have one other comment. I've
11 already introduced myself, Jim MacRae.

12 Given the possibility of release of bioagents into the
13 environment, I would imagine under OSHA regulations that
14 you do have the employees at the site appropriately
15 vaccinated against hepatitis strains and things of that
16 sort. I would suggest that as part of your mitigation
17 strategy, if you choose, and Mr. Sims chooses to go forward
18 with this most inappropriate site, that you offer free
19 vaccinations to the surrounding population, including the
20 specifically sensitive populations that I mentioned earlier
21 for the agents that would be expected to be part of any
22 exposure, should the worst-case scenario or a real
23 worst-case scenario occur. Thank you.

24 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Ms. Gray?

25 MS. GRAY: I forget to mention one thing, and

1 that was that in addition to needing to have another draft
2 supplemental statement because of the fact that they didn't
3 evaluate all the scenarios, they also didn't look at other
4 alternatives based on the information that they now have.
5 And the fact that there really is no mitigation, other than
6 hoping it's not going to happen, what other sites were
7 included in this draft to look at as alternatives? There
8 are none. Thank you.

9 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Clearly we're
10 interested in your comments. Would anyone else like to
11 speak at this time?

12

13 COMMENTS OF JOHN SCHMIED

14

15 Good evening. My name is John Schmied. I live at
16 12826 Northeast 185th Court, Bothell 98011, across the
17 street and up the hill. I'm an educator. I've been
18 working on this project, attending meetings on this project
19 for the last four years. I was a citizen of the community
20 siting team. I'm a teacher in the nearest junior high
21 school, at Skyview Junior High in Northshore. I'm a local
22 resident. And one of the things -- I've got some
23 observations about this whole thing, the last four years.

24 We haven't always agreed. Matter of fact, very often
25 we have disagreed. All the time we've been disagreeing.

1 But the thing that has helped me is there's a very active
2 information flow between the citizens and the county.
3 Sometimes it comes hard but it's coming, and the SKEA
4 people have done a very good job in doing that. And what
5 that's resulted in is an enormous amount of education for
6 our community. And I think that's really important because
7 we need to know more about what's going on in our
8 community.

9 Some of the things that's actually resulted in this,
10 and some of the things that I fought for with everyone
11 else, were, you know, if it's going to happen, I want some
12 air cleaning equipment and I want some guarantee that the
13 air is going to be clean. I don't want to smell Stock Pots
14 Soup anymore. I wanted backup systems, and backup systems
15 were put into the plan. I wanted tertiary treatment of the
16 wastewater because I'm tired of a billion gallons of
17 partially treated wastewater in my opinion going into Puget
18 Sound every single day, and that's the truth, that's what's
19 happening right now.

20 Strengthened structures were included, things that I
21 really look forward to because I had been a Coast Guard
22 ship driver for many, many years. I had to winter over in
23 the Arctic Ocean because our backup systems were not in
24 place properly. And I wanted to make sure that that
25 happened in my community, that we did have backup

1 systems -- wouldn't be stuck in the Arctic Ocean again --
2 and many more things.

3 And the comments that came in -- and that's really the
4 thing that makes this process alive is all of the comments
5 that keep this process moving in the right direction. And
6 if it requires that we have to spend more money to do it,
7 then in the end if it requires that we have to do something
8 different, I think that we have to keep the comments going,
9 the education going in our community. Because if we don't
10 think about our community education, then we're going to
11 have problems in our community.

12 For example, we might actually have our streams
13 polluted 90 percent of the time. Well, we actually do, but
14 nobody really talks about that. They talk about polluting
15 the streams. They're already polluted. They don't talk
16 about cleaning them up. I have a problem with that. I
17 think that as part of the whole picture that we ought to
18 take a look at the whole picture, that we do have a problem
19 already. There's fecal coliform over 95 percent of the
20 time in Little Bear Creek, sometimes as much as ten times
21 over the state standard. That's a problem. North Creek's
22 the same way, Lyon Creek's the same way, all the way across
23 the northern interior.

24 So I think we do have some issues that need to come
25 out in education, more than just processing the wastewater.

1 You know, I got a school that was designed for 800 people,
2 it's got 900 kids in it right now. And because of all the
3 processes, the siting processes gone on, we're going to
4 have 1,250 in three years. I don't know where we're going
5 to put them. I don't know where their wastewater's going
6 to go. But these are issues that we have to get out in the
7 open and keep talking about and be willing to keep working
8 through this process. That's all I have to say.

9 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Is there anyone else
10 who would like to speak at this time? If not, the staff is
11 available in the foyer to discuss with you specific aspects
12 of the Draft Supplemental EIS.

13 Our plan, then, will be to -- my watch says 7:30, so
14 maybe at 20 minutes to 8:00 we will reconvene with the
15 possibility that someone may decide that they want to
16 provide testimony in the room here. So we will be back
17 here at 20 minutes to 8:00 and we'll look forward to
18 hearing your comments then.

19 [Brief pause in proceedings.]

20 MR. PETERSON: At this time we'll reconvene the
21 comment period. The opportunity for the spoken testimony
22 is now open. The way to do that is to register with Erica
23 Peterson in the brown coat standing at the head of the
24 stairs. Anyone like to speak at this time? Sir?

25

1 FURTHER COMMENTS OF JIM MACRAE

2

3 Again, my name is Jim MacRae, resident of Snohomish
4 County, 5120 215th Street Southeast,
5 Woodinville, by name, not by zip code, 98072.

6 One of the things that I also did not see in the
7 current documents, and I will confess I have not read them
8 all prior to this evening's meeting, but I didn't see cost
9 workups on the engineering that needs to be done to deal
10 with the seismic faults. And I wonder if you might want to
11 break those out explicitly to the extent from a SEPA
12 perspective that there may be budgetary constraints on some
13 of the other design characteristics of the system and
14 project, and hence might change some of the situation as it
15 was dealt with and covered in the original environmental
16 impact statement draft.

17 Secondary point, and it feeds on something that one of
18 the other speakers alluded to, and that is this document
19 which talks about no impact, no significant impact, minor
20 toxic effects in a worst-case scenario, things of that
21 sort. I made the point earlier, and I think I'm going to
22 reiterate it just in case I wasn't clear, but from a
23 risk-analysis perspective, you've done a very good job, and
24 I love that pie chart on the far right, of breaking out
25 what a tiny little slice of God's probability is a bad

1 event on this site, an earthquake, surface-rupturing
2 earthquake, all that bad stuff happening.

3 I'm not going to question the risk assessment other
4 than your assumption of independence in the three different
5 events, you know, enhance the decreasing probability of not
6 only having an earthquake there but having it big enough to
7 rupture the ground, and then also having that rupture of
8 the ground big enough to screw up one of your facilities
9 and cause environmental impact.

10 I would submit to you that those are not statistically
11 independent events. If an earthquake happens, the
12 earthquake happens. Everything else is dependent
13 conditionally on that probability, and hence they are not
14 by definition "independent," so you can't multiply the
15 probabilities. It's not a vanishingly small probability.
16 One percent, okay. I live close to the site, about a mile
17 and a half away, not enough to be called a "nimby." I
18 drink water from the sole-source aquifer that's underneath
19 it.

20 You've changed things from the original estimate,
21 SEIS, draft SEIS, DEIS, whichever one of those
22 thousand-page documents we read. You're now forcing water
23 in, dirty water, under pressure to the site, right into a
24 place that crosses Lineament X, whatever you're calling it,
25 in an area that the USGS-submitted historical documents

1 suggests pretty strongly is prone to liquefaction. I saw
2 in your documents that you were going to be moving the soil
3 away. So your mitigation is to remove that portion of
4 mother earth that could liquefy.

5 I submit to you that that is an extraordinarily
6 arrogant position to have. At a minimum -- back to my
7 original point -- since one of the defining characteristics
8 that led Mr. Sims to prefer this as one of the good sites
9 was that it was so darned expensive to remove the soil from
10 the other sites, you might want to work in the cost
11 estimates for digging down however many hundred feet you
12 might have to dig to remove the potential for liquefaction.
13 And then once you've done that, please redo your
14 environmental impact assessment to take into account the
15 hole and the fact that that hole could take anything that
16 spills, it could all mix up there and then Woodinville
17 could die. Thank you, very much.

18 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Would anyone else like
19 to speak at this time? If not, then, this will conclude
20 the public testimony, spoken testimony. You still have the
21 opportunity to submit testimony in writing. May 11th is
22 the deadline. Please submit your name and address. The
23 electronic means of submitting comment is also available.
24 Look in your blue folder. The address on line is there and
25 the address for written submission is also in your folder

1 there.

2 Thank you for your contributions tonight. Thank you
3 for taking the time and the effort and the thought to come
4 out and share your thoughts with us. This concludes the
5 meeting for tonight, the spoken part of the meeting
6 tonight. Thank you.

7 [Hearing ended at 7:50 p.m.]

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

