

**Georgetown Wet Weather Treatment Station  
Design Advisory Group**

**Meeting Summary**

**July 30, 2015 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.**

**South Seattle College Georgetown Campus, 6737 Corson Avenue South, Seattle**

**Overview**

On July 30, 2015 the King County Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) hosted the fifth Design Advisory Group (DAG) meeting for the Georgetown Wet Weather Treatment Station.

Topics for the July 30 meeting included:

- Sharing community feedback on the initial design concepts of the facility
- Presenting updated design concepts
- Gathering advisory group comments on the design concepts

**Welcome and Introductions**

Meeting facilitator Penny Mabie welcomed everyone and led a round of introductions. Penny reviewed the meeting purpose, ground rules and agenda.

**Public Comment**

There were no members of the public in attendance, and no public comment was given. Note that a member of the public came in later and provided comment at the end of the meeting.

**Review DAG and Community Feedback on Preliminary Design Concepts and Present Revised Concepts  
Outstanding Questions**

Michael Popiwny, King County WTD Project Manager, reported back on three outstanding questions from the previous meeting:

- Can we add a second story to the building?
- Will King County consider keeping the Taco Time property for community use?
- Can we have a community meeting space?

*Can we add a second story to the building?*

Michael shared that the County looked into adding a second story to the operations building and is not planning to do so at this time. WTD is funded by sewer rates and funds must be used for wastewater conveyance and treatment. All operations and maintenance needs for the Georgetown Wet Weather Treatment Station fit into one story, making a second story unnecessary. If a funding partner were to come forward to assist in the cost of constructing a second story that had a clear connection to community needs, the team would bring this to County management for review.

- DAG member Cari Simson asked whether individual DAG members could look for a possible partner.
  - Michael confirmed that DAG members could pursue a partner with funding and an interest in meeting community needs.
  - Cari also noted that if a partner were found, she believed that the County could recuperate construction and property acquisition costs by leasing the space.

*Will King County consider keeping the Taco Time property for community use?*

Michael reiterated that the Taco Time property will contain underground pipes and the regulator (structure housing large gates, electrical equipment, and control systems) for the treatment station. During construction, the Taco Time property will be used to store construction materials. Michael brought the DAG's request to WTD leadership and was informed that the Taco Time property will be resold after construction. WTD is funded by sewer rates and funds must be used for wastewater conveyance and treatment, so keeping the space for a park or air quality is outside the WTD's core mission.

- DAG member Allan Phillips asked if the Brightwater facility has open space for community use, and why that space was not resold after construction.
  - Michael shared that Brightwater is the County's third largest facility. For very large facilities with long construction periods, greater mitigation is required. The Brightwater facility contains approximately 70 acres of dual use space, which includes a salmon habitat and stormwater management as compensation for the taking of wetlands. The Georgetown Wet Weather Treatment Station is very small in comparison and the Taco Time site is not a direct comparison to the Brightwater open space. No park space is required for the Georgetown treatment station. The project team has heard the request for green space and has tried to incorporate that into the design where possible.
- DAG member Sherell Ehlers noted that the County is not taking wetland space for this facility, so no wetland mitigation should be required. However, the facility will be displacing commercial and retail space. The County should consider mitigation for the loss of commercial and retail space.

*Can we have a community meeting space?*

Michael reiterated the request to create a shared meeting space that could be used by facility staff and the community. The County is open to a community meeting space, but needs more details about how the space would be managed before they can make a decision. Details include how the space would be booked, cleaned and managed. Kristine and Michael will work on a plan to present to County management including these details, as well as details about who would use the facility and for what purpose.

- Allan asked how there can be funding for a community meeting space if there is no funding for a public park.
  - Michael said that he believed the cost of a community meeting space would be limited. Costs would include extra bathrooms, locking mechanisms, and some management and operations costs. The Brightwater facility has a meeting space. When groups rent the Brightwater space, the renter is required to clean the space. King County Parks staff manage bookings.

- DAG member Vicky Hardy suggested the Tukwila Community Center meeting space as a model for creating a space with low operations and management costs.

### Community Feedback

Michael shared the [Design Concept Preferences Feedback Summary](#) with the DAG. The County gathered feedback from the community on preliminary design concepts for the facility. The County hosted an online open house, which included the same survey questions asked of the DAG at Meeting #4. The team also gathered survey responses at the July Art Attack, Garden Walk, and an in-person open house. Michael noted that community design preferences closely mirrored DAG preferences. The design team used the feedback and design guidelines to update the design concepts.

### Updated Design Concepts

Mark Johnson, Signal Architecture + Research Project Architect, reviewed the design guidelines. He shared a variety of drawings of the facility that incorporate elements of the design guidelines (see the Annotated Presentation – linked [here](#)).

- Sherell asked whether the team would be required to meet the City’s Green Factor requirements for this project.
  - Jonathan Morley, Berger Partnership Landscape Architect, said that meeting the Green Factor requirements was not required because the area is zoned for industrial use. However, the project team incorporated many Green Factor elements into the design, such as green roofs.
- Vicky noted that green roofs require accessibility and maintenance. She also asked whether it would be possible to create a rooftop park or event space.
  - Sherell noted that Seattle Public Utilities refers to green roofs as “vegetated roofs” since the roofs are supposed to be brown in the summer. Some people think that because it turns brown the “green roof” has stopped working.
- Cari asked who will be responsible for maintaining landscaping for the facility.
  - Michael said that WTD landscape maintenance staff will be responsible for maintaining landscaping.
- Sherell said that the residents at Martin Court, the transitional housing across from the site, should be involved in the design process.
  - Kristine will connect with Martin Court to determine how they would like to be involved.
- DAG member Angielena Chamberlain asked whether there would be odor control for the facility.
  - Michael indicated that any areas of the facility that produce odor will have odor control units.
- Vicky noted that the trees included in the concept drawings look like mature trees, not what passersby will see after construction is complete. The drawings should indicate approximate tree age to avoid setting false expectations.
  - Jonathan said that the project team would keep that in mind for future sketches.
  - Allan noted that lines could be used to indicate when trees would be at certain heights.

- Sherell noted that she would like to see the wind screening go all the way across the east side of the processing building to make the building more opaque.
  - Michael noted that wind and rain protection is not needed all the way across.
  - Mark indicated that the buildings will appear much smaller in more detailed renderings. Specific design details, such as wind screening, can be addressed in future rounds of design concepts.
- Sherell asked if there was potential to make the large east facing wall of the processing building into a green wall.
  - Jonathan said that because the bottom of that building does not connect with the ground, a green wall would be difficult in that area. The team envisions that wall as an opportunity for the 1% for Art Program.
  - Angielena said that space could also be used for lighting to indicate facility operation.
  - Cari shared that King County Green Grants awarded a green wall to Georgetown for air filtration. This wall could be a model for the treatment station.

Jonathan Morley, Landscape Architect, Berger Partnership, reviewed the preliminary landscape elements of the facility, including green stormwater initiative requirements and strategies proposed to meet those requirements (see the Annotated Presentation – linked [here](#)).

- Vicky asked how permeable paving could be non-infiltrating.
  - Jonathan explained that the permeable pavement helps clean water by delaying drainage.
- Sherell asked about the distance between the street edge and the right-of-way along 4th Ave S.
  - Rachael Meyer, Landscape Architect, Berger Partnership, noted that there would be a total of eight feet between the property line and the curb line.
  - Jonathan shared that there will be some vegetation along 4th Ave S, and perhaps parallel parking; the team is meeting with the Seattle Department of Transportation to discuss requirements. There will also be a buffer of vegetation inside of the perimeter fence. The fence could also be designed to allow vegetation to grow on it.
- Sherell asked whether there were limitations on the height of street trees.
  - Jonathan indicated that trees are allowed but they must be smaller species so as not to interfere with utilities (e.g., telephone wires) along the street.
- Sherell asked if the green roof could be pitched so that it would be visible from further away.
  - Jonathan and Mark shared that the buildings along 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue South are smaller than the processing buildings. The size will support the pedestrian character along 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. The green roofs on these buildings will be visible from the second floor across the street.
  - Angielena suggested that the roof could be tilted toward the open space on the corner of 4th Ave S and S Michigan St to help provide water for possible plantings in that space.
- Vicky suggested that Prologis could be approached to purchase the Taco Time property and donate it as community green space.
  - Sherell noted that Prologis employees would also benefit from such a space.
  - Michael indicated that the County continues to coordinate with Prologis and that he would share this idea with them. He also stated that the community should share this

interest directly with Prologis or the City of Seattle. WTD has no ability to influence Prologis's decision on the Taco Time property.

- Vicky suggested that the members of the Georgetown business community and the Georgetown Community Council draft a letter to the City of Seattle and Prologis to propose this idea.

### **DAG Next Steps and Future Community Engagement**

Michael shared next steps for the DAG and future community engagement for the project. The design team will be working to bring the project to 30% design by early 2016. The County will bring the DAG back together to share updated designs at that time.

Kristine explained that she and Michael will continue to meet with other agencies about opportunities in Georgetown. Kristine indicated that she will reach out to City of Seattle Parks. Kristine also shared that the County is offering a WaterWorks Grant to support sound investments in clean water and the community. Applications are accepted through September 16. Kristine said that she would share the link with the advisory group. Michael also noted that the County would be willing to offer a letter of support if any Georgetown groups were interested in applying for the grant.

Kristine indicated that the team will continue to update Georgetown community groups (e.g., Georgetown Community Council, Georgetown Merchant's Association) upon request throughout the coming months.

- Angielena noted that most of the Manufacturing and Industrial Council members do not live in Georgetown. She suggested churches and community groups as better places to share information and get feedback from Georgetown residents.
- Vicky noted that efforts should be made to reach out to the Hispanic community in Georgetown.

Penny asked the DAG about their experience with the Design Advisory Group process. DAG members indicated their approval by nodding their heads.

- Angielena noted that the process is concise and that she feels that she is being heard.
- Allan noted that he is not pleased about the lack of a park, or consideration for Georgetown's need for more green space.

### **Public Comment**

- Mike Winters, property owner on the selected site, offered his business as a place to display project information. He also suggested that part of the space could be used as a public market for street vendors, but that should not take away from green space. Charging stations for electric cars and bikes could also be installed. He also asked whether there was a City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan for this area.
  - Michael noted that there is a transportation corridor plan for E Marginal Way S and that the County is in conversations with the City about this.

- Kristine and Michael will follow up with Mike about the possibility of displaying project information at his business.

**Next Steps and Action Items (see table)**

**Attendance**

Design Advisory Group Members

Allan Phillips

Angielena Chamberlain

Cari Simson

Hannah Kett (alternate for James Rasmussen)

Sherell Ehlers

Victoria (Vicky) Hardy

Public

Mike Winters, property owner

King County

Michael Popiwny, Project Manager

Will Sroufe, Deputy Project Manager

Kristine Cramer, Community Relations

EnviroIssues

Penny Mabie, Facilitator

Chelsea Ongaro, Notetaker

Signal Architecture + Research

Mark Johnson, Project Architect

Berger Partnership

Jonathan Morley, Landscape Architect

Rachael Meyer, Landscape Architect

Pending - on hold

In progress

Complete - results still need to be shared

Closed

Ongoing

Last updated: August 3, 2015

Task	Date Assigned	Due	Status	Response
Share with appropriate staff at KC that the Georgetown community is very interested in Rainwise	1/29/15 - DAG #1		In Progress	Kristine proposed partnering with Georgetown Community Council on a WaterWorks grant proposal get RainWise in Georgetown. Sherell brought it to the GCC Directors. Kristine is exploring level of community interest (8/20)
Gather information on the facility's technology and the decision making process for using the selected technology. Share information with the DAG.	1/29/15 - DAG #1		Closed	Information shared via email and at DAG #2 on February 12. Information can be shared via small group meeting by request.
Use both Georgetown listserv and Georgetown Gazette for communications	Ongoing	1/22/15 2/5/15 3/5/15 6/15/15 6/22/15 7/22/15	Ongoing	Complete for DAG #1 Complete for DAG #2 Complete for DAG #3 Complete for DAG #4 Complete for Online Open House and In-Person Open House Complete for DAG #5
Send e-alert Monday following DAG meetings	Ongoing	2/2/15 2/16/15 3/16/15 6/22/15 8/3/15	Ongoing	Complete for DAG #1 Complete for DAG #2 Complete for DAG #3 Complete for DAG #4 Complete for DAG #5
Develop strategy/schedule to brief community groups (GCC, etc.) during DAG process. Share and coordinate strategy with the DAG.	1/29/15 - DAG #1	5/21/2015	Closed	The team confirmed their strategy with the DAG at DAG #3 and conducted briefings throughout June.
Update Charter text to include "programmatic and aesthetic design"	1/29/15 - DAG #1	2/9/2015	Closed	Shared revised charter with DAG at DAG #2. Posted to the website.

Task	Date Assigned	Due	Status	Response
Define primary treatment and advanced primary treatment. How are they different?	1/29/15 - DAG #1	2/9/2015	Closed	Advanced primary treatment has more advanced solids settling technology as compared to standard primary treatment. Coagulants and flocculants are added to the treatment process to accelerate the solids settling process.
Find additional specifics on what is coming into the facility (stormwater, water runoff, industrial waste, residential sewage, etc.).	1/29/2015		Closed	<p>Currently, overflow events average 75% stormwater and 25% sewage. After the treatment station is built, the one allowed CSO is projected to be 95% stormwater and 5% sewage. This is because that one event per year (on average) accounts for the biggest storms, with the most stormwater entering the system, in comparison with current overflows which can occur with smaller amounts of rain.</p> <p>King County has an industrial waste program that supports industry and business in meeting federal regulations for the discharge of industrial waste. Industries along the Duwamish, such as metal plating businesses and Boeing's North Field, must go through stringent pre-treatment before they can discharge their waste into the sewer system. These businesses are inspected at least annually to ensure compliance. So most industrial waste that would reach the Georgetown Wet Weather Treatment Station has already been treated. There is no additional treatment planned at the station. For more information on King County's Industrial Waste Program, visit <a href="http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/wastewater/IndustrialWaste/Regulations.aspx">http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/wastewater/IndustrialWaste/Regulations.aspx</a>.</p>
Develop technical FAQs and post to the project website	2/12/2015		In progress	
Finalize and post DAG charter to the website	2/12/2015		Complete	



Task	Date Assigned	Due	Status	Response
Share information with the DAG about how large the facility will be and how much space will be leftover for public use	2/12/2015	3/12/2015	Complete*	*Complete based on site P-13 discussions
Bring a map of the area with pictures of adjacent terrain to the next meeting to support accessibility of site discussion.	2/12/2015	3/12/2015	Complete*	*Complete based on site P-13 discussions
Is there a way to improve connections to the site?	2/12/2015		In progress	City of Seattle and King County held coordination meeting 7/30. Follow up is on-going.
Is the City of Seattle interested in a south end skate park? Is there a way to partner with the City?	2/12/2015		In progress	City of Seattle and King County held coordination meeting 7/30. Follow up is on-going.
Develop draft design guideline themes and share with DAG members via email for revision and approval	2/12/2015	2/20/2015	Complete	
Send the Equity and Social Justice Ordinance to the DAG	2/12/2015	3/12/2015	Complete	
Review summaries for mention of a facility that is economically sustainable in design guidelines	5/21/2015	6/18/2015	In progress	Reviewed flipchart notes and DAG Meeting 2 Summary and did not find mention of an economically sustainable facility. Design Guidelines were updated accordingly.

Task	Date Assigned	Due	Status	Response
Update and share the design guidelines with the DAG	5/21/2015	6/18/2015	Complete	Design Guidelines were shared and approved at DAG #4
Follow up with DAG members about public meeting locations	5/21/2015		Complete	Meeting took place at the South Seattle College Georgetown Campus on 6/23
Consider alternate shapes for the processing building (round vs. square)	6/18/2015	7/30/2015	Complete	It would be challenging to change the building shape and meet treatment requirements. However, the team presented an idea for making the perimeter fence rounded at DAG #5.
Consider request to maintain the Taco Time site after construction to provide more public open space for Georgetown	6/18/2015	7/30/2015	Complete	The project team has been informed that the Taco Time property will be resold after construction. This information was shared at DAG #5.
Consider request to make the operations building two-stories to include community space or space for lease; commit to seeking partners to fund a dual-purpose building	6/18/2015	7/30/2015	Complete	All operations and maintenance for the treatment station can fit into one story, and building a second story is cost prohibitive since it's not needed for direct treatment station operations.
Bring printed copies of the project newsletter to the South Seattle College Georgetown Campus for distribution	6/18/2015	7/7/2015	Complete	
Develop a plan with details about operations and management of a potential community meeting space.	7/30/2015		In progress	
Connect with Martin Court housing to discuss design preferences	7/30/2015		In progress	Meeting scheduled for 8/31
Connect with Prologis to suggest the possibility of purchasing and donating the Taco Time site for public use.	7/30/2015		In progress	
Meet with other agencies to discuss the intersection of projects in the Georgetown area.	7/30/2015		Ongoing	Meeting scheduled with SDOT for 8/25
Share the King County WaterWorks Grant Program information with DAG members.	7/30/2015		Complete	
Reach out to community groups to provide updates in the Fall	7/30/2015		In progress	
Connect with Mike Winters, property owner, about displaying project information at his business.	7/30/2015		In progress	