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

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

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

So two methods of commenting in writing, using the comment form. There are boxes out in the foyer and also at the sign-in table where you can leave those comment forms or mail them in. And then we have the court reporter.
tonight who will take your comments verbatim.

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

We will begin our listening, actually, by giving some background on the project, on the Draft Supplemental EIS. If you would like to speak, please sign up with Erica Peterson right there at the sign-in desk at the top of the stairs. I will call speakers from the list, so I will need to have you sign in so that I know you would like to speak. Given the number of people who are here tonight, you will have five minutes to give your testimony, and we will give you a warning sign when you're nearing the end of your five minutes so that you can wrap up and be sure to make all the points that you would like to make. Then I will remind you that the time is up when we reach five minutes.

So it's important, I believe, to have background information on this Draft Supplemental EIS, so I've asked Shirley Marroquin to give us that, and then we'll welcome your five-minute comments after her presentation. So Shirley?
Okay. I'm not used to using microphones, so let me know if you can't hear me or anything like that. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

I want to call your attention to this figure right here. Each dot on this graphic represents an earthquake that has been recorded since 1900. Working with the USGS, we have learned a lot about the seismic forces in our region and on the Brightwater site in particular. Our area is prone to earthquakes. The central Puget Sound region is criss-crossed by faults. The Southern Whidbey Island fault is one of more than six major fault zones that USGS has identified in our area. The Seattle fault is perhaps the best known of these. And for your reference, the Nisqually earthquake in 2001 measured a magnitude 6.8 but caused no rupture at the ground surface.
As part of the larger Southern Whidbey Island fault study, USGS studied a lineament that crosses the northern portion of the Route 9 site, called "Lineament 4." A lineament is a linear arrangement of land forms such as streams, low ridges, and ravines that may have been formed by seismic faulting, erosion, or glaciers.

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

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

We developed three scenarios to arrive at a worst-case assessment of potential impacts. And there is a table on the wall just to the other side of the slide that lists those scenarios. Scenario A is a major ground-rupturing quake on Lineament 4, which is to the north. Here it is.
Scenario B is a ground-rupturing quake on Lineament X, which is to the south. And then scenario C is a ground-rupturing earthquake on a hypothetical new fault somewhere under the treatment facilities. So it would be located somewhere between the two.

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

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

Moving to Scenario A. Scenario A is very unlikely to occur during the design life of the plant. It assumes very hard shaking from a major ground-rupturing earthquake on Lineament 4, which we know to be an active fault. You see that on the north side. There are no treatment process facilities such as water holding basins on or near this lineament. In this case, the Brightwater facility would undergo hard shaking but would survive the earthquake with minor damage that could be repaired within a few days.
The design of the plant has been strengthened to protect it in an earthquake that exceeds a magnitude 7. The Brightwater plant as currently designed will withstand ground shaking comparable to recent damaging quakes in Northridge, California, and Kobe, Japan, which measured 6.7 and 6.9 magnitude, respectively.

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

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

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

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

Any contaminated water in the ground could be cleaned up before it reached Little Bear Creek. There are no recorded downstream water users who could be affected;
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still, this scenario is very unlikely to occur.

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

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

A rupture under the buried water-holding basins, right here, would affect groundwater. But because groundwater flows away from the Cross Valley wells under the site, there would be no effect on the public water supply. The soils in this area are very tightly packed, so the spill would move very slowly, giving King County time to clean it
up. There will be underdrains that carry groundwater under
the tanks to the stormwater control system and eventually
Little Bear Creek. Plugging these after a quake would
confine any leakage to the ground, and it could be
intercepted and pumped out of the ground before it reached
the creek.

The worst impact would occur under Scenario C if such
a fault were to develop and rupture under the solids
digesters located right there. King County could contain
any leakage on site from a smaller event that lacked the
force to pull the steel-reinforced digester walls apart.
Even though they are constructed with reinforcing steel to
protect their structure, if they were to crack wide open,
wastewater solids would empty onto the ground and make its
way through the plant site and enter Little Bear Creek.
This material would take oxygen out of the stream and
raise the water temperature so that fish and other
organisms downstream would die. There would be very strong
odors. In a few hours' time, the solids would make it to
the Sammamish River and Lake Washington, although impacts
wouldn't be nearly as great because those water bodies are
larger and can absorb more. Even though King County would
begin cleanup as soon as possible and remove contaminated
material, it would take a long time for Little Bear Creek
to fully recover. Clean upstream water would begin that
recovery process immediately, but it would likely take at
least a year or two for the spring to be restored to
health.

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

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

King County is taking a proactive approach in planning
for earthquakes. In the 1990's we began to retrofit older
facilities to reduce hazards and decrease potential for
damage to our facilities. The proposed plant design has
been changed and made safer in light of the analysis in
this SEIS. The latest building codes take into account the
potential shaking that can occur in this region, and they
are updated all the time to reflect the latest information,
including recently gained information about Lineament 4.

And of course these building codes are applied to these facilities, including Brightwater.

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

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

Second point. Damage to the plant would not in itself pose a serious risk to public health or safety. It would
not affect the Cross Valley drinking water wells.

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

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

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

Thank you for your attention, and now it's time to continue with the public hearing.
MR. PETERSON: If you would like to give testimony, please sign up with Erica who has the list here. A reminder that you have five minutes. The time keeper is Marla here in the center of the room. She will give you a warning card when you have one minute to go.

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

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

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

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

MR. PETERSON: Okay. Greg Stephens?

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

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

COMMENTS OF GREG STEPHENS

Good evening. My name is Greg Stevens. I live at 21926 State Route 9, Southeast, Woodinville postal zone. That is directly across the street from the northwest end
of this site. My thanks to the panel tonight and to the staff that have come to help further the educational process that our community has been going through for the last several years.

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

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

I was president during the 1971 San Fernando earthquake in the northern part of Los Angeles and I was privileged to survive, many other people did not, as it did incorporate many surface ruptures and scarp and slip fault as well as vertical displacement-type rearrangements of the landscape. There was considerable infrastructure disruption to pipelines, buildings, roads, bridges, and everything else you can imagine, including my parents' home. I feel that I am fairly qualified to make comment on
The kinds of things that we could suspect might occur in a major seismic event.

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

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

This gives us pause, I would hope, but it also gives us education to arm ourselves and to provide much better insight and planning for the kinds of things that will happen someday. Whether it's in our lifetime or this facility's lifetime, they will indeed happen. It's incumbent upon us to plan for severe events, perhaps even more severe than anyone in this room might anticipate, because public health is something we cannot play dice.
with. And the environment that our children and
descendents live in can in large part be determined by the
things we do now.

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

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

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

VAN PELT, CORBETT & ASSOCIATES, (206) 682-9339
participation in this process as possible.

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

COMMENTS OF EMMA DIXON

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

Would the trenching of the footprint of the facility really be financially cost prohibitive given the 4.5 billion and rising cost of this project. Repeatedly in the document there's reference to the lack of data regarding Lineament X and potentially Lineament C in the middle, and that ambiguity could be conclusively established one way or
the other by trenching. So why not pursue all possible avenues to understand and be certain what conditions are all across the site.

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

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

The SEIS states that the King County Executive will consider the new environmental information contained in the final SEIS along with other factors, such as cost and likelihood of earthquakes, and reevaluate the decision made in December of 2003 to locate the Brightwater treatment plant at Route 9. How can that be done when the document
is purely in support of the previously made decision? Why doesn't it discuss any alternative options and compare the costs and potential risks to the surrounding community in all the options? Will the public be provided with the other pieces of data and information that will be factored into the reevaluation of the site decision?

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

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

In the SEIS, figure 2.2 shows quite a cluster of earthquakes around the conveyance route which coincidentally appears to be similar to areas of some of the six potential lineaments identified in the USGS in the
April 2004 report. Shouldn't King County investigate those lineaments further and understand the actual characteristics there too?

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

MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Jim MacRae?

COMMENTS OF JIM MACRAE

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

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

Would you build a house on top of a known active earthquake fault? Just think about that for a minute. Would you build a house there? Would you place a school on top of a known active earthquake fault? Would you engineer a biochemical time bomb and place it on top of a known...
active earthquake fault? The Brightwater staff and their
team of consultants seem to think yeah, risks/benefits,
yeah, it's okay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. PETERSON: Thank you. The floor is open for your comments. If you would sign up with Erica Peterson. Anyone else wish to speak?
Good evening. My name is Linda Gray, 22629 78th Avenue Southeast in Woodinville, 98072. First of all, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I live not more than a quarter mile from the Route 9 site, so I will be very heavily impacted as will my neighbors from the sewage plant if it gets placed over a significant number of active earthquake faults.

I am here to request that King County do another draft environmental impact study because they failed to identify all the possible scenarios that could happen with the potential earthquake fault ruptures on the Route 9 site. They failed to look at cascading events on how they would take care of the site should the power go out and be destroyed, if the roads are destroyed. We live in a valley that's very hard to get in and out of. If you think you're going to clean up a million plus gallons of sewage in a couple of days, I find that hard to believe.

You talked about Dr. Yates, he's an expert hired by the organization on the part of SKEA. In today's Woodinville Weekly, he was quoted as saying "Brightwater is a critical facility, meaning that its failure due to an earthquake would be so catastrophic to populated areas nearby that the project and the public must be protected..."
against even a rare event."

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

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

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

And as Dr. Yates said, this area has ruptured over
nine times within the last 2,700 years. He says that's a very, very high probably that it will happen again. And finally, what kind of mitigation is hoping that it's not going to happen? I find that hard to believe, and since I live here, hard to accept. Thank you.

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

MR. MACRAE: I do have one other comment. I've already introduced myself, Jim MacRae. Given the possibility of release of bioagents into the environment, I would imagine under OSHA regulations that you do have the employees at the site appropriately vaccinated against hepatitis strains and things of that sort. I would suggest that as part of your mitigation strategy, if you choose, and Mr. Sims chooses to go forward with this most inappropriate site, that you offer free vaccinations to the surrounding population, including the specifically sensitive populations that I mentioned earlier for the agents that would be expected to be part of any exposure, should the worst-case scenario or a real worst-case scenario occur. Thank you.

MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Ms. Gray?

MS. GRAY: I forget to mention one thing, and
that was that in addition to needing to have another draft supplemental statement because of the fact that they didn't evaluate all the scenarios, they also didn't look at other alternatives based on the information that they now have. And the fact that there really is no mitigation, other than hoping it's not going to happen, what other sites were included in this draft to look at as alternatives? There are none. Thank you.

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

COMMENTS OF JOHN SCHMIED

Good evening. My name is John Schmied. I live at 12826 Northeast 185th Court, Bothell 98011, across the street and up the hill. I'm an educator. I've been working on this project, attending meetings on this project for the last four years. I was a citizen of the community siting team. I'm a teacher in the nearest junior high school, at Skyview Junior High in Northshore. I'm a local resident. And one of the things -- I've got some observations about this whole thing, the last four years. We haven't always agreed. Matter of fact, very often we have disagreed. All the time we've been disagreeing.
But the thing that has helped me is there's a very active information flow between the citizens and the county. Sometimes it comes hard but it's coming, and the SKEA people have done a very good job in doing that. And what that's resulted in is an enormous amount of education for our community. And I think that's really important because we need to know more about what's going on in our community.

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

Strengthened structures were included, things that I really look forward to because I had been a Coast Guard ship driver for many, many years. I had to winter over in the Arctic Ocean because our backup systems were not in place properly. And I wanted to make sure that that happened in my community, that we did have backup
systems -- wouldn't be stuck in the Arctic Ocean again --
and many more things.

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

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

So I think we do have some issues that need to come
out in education, more than just processing the wastewater.
You know, I got a school that was designed for 800 people, it's got 900 kids in it right now. And because of all the processes, the siting processes gone on, we're going to have 1,250 in three years. I don't know where we're going to put them. I don't know where their wastewater's going to go. But these are issues that we have to get out in the open and keep talking about and be willing to keep working through this process. That's all I have to say.

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

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

[Brief pause in proceedings.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

You've changed things from the original estimate, SEIS, draft SEIS, DEIS, whichever one of those thousand-page documents we read. You're now forcing water in, dirty water, under pressure to the site, right into a place that crosses Lineament X, whatever you're calling it, in an area that the USGS-submitted historical documents
suggests pretty strongly is prone to liquefaction. I saw
in your documents that you were going to be moving the soil
away. So your mitigation is to remove that portion of
mother earth that could liquefy.

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

MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Would anyone else like
to speak at this time? If not, then, this will conclude
the public testimony, spoken testimony. You still have the
opportunity to submit testimony in writing. May 11th is
the deadline. Please submit your name and address. The
electronic means of submitting comment is also available.
Look in your blue folder. The address on line is there and
the address for written submission is also in your folder
Thank you for your contributions tonight. Thank you for taking the time and the effort and the thought to come out and share your thoughts with us. This concludes the meeting for tonight, the spoken part of the meeting tonight. Thank you.

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