

Workshop Details

Monday, July 31, 2017

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Fairhaven Middle School Grounds

110 Parkridge Rd, Bellingham, WA 98225

Overview

On July 31, the City of Bellingham hosted a second community workshop to share progress on the Resource Recovery at Post Point project. Between 15 and 20 community members attended the workshop. The meeting objectives were to:

- **Inform** residents and stakeholders within the surrounding neighborhoods and throughout the City about the project, particularly the results of the project alternatives screening process, and Triple Bottom Line Plus (TBL+) evaluation.
- **Engage** interested stakeholders to solicit their perspectives, values, and guidance regarding TBL+ alternative screening results.
- **Grow list of interested stakeholders** to keep informed and engaged throughout the project.

The first portion of the meeting was an open house format, where participants could review informational posters and discuss the project with team members. Team members then provided a presentation about the project, followed by a question and answer period.



Community members listen and ask questions during the project team presentation.

Presentation Summary

Tadd Giesbrecht, consultant team project manager, began the presentation by describing the:

- **Project need:** The existing solid stream incinerators need to be replaced due to aging infrastructure and obsolete technology.
- **Project history:** Post Point's liquid stream was upgraded in 2014, however the project did not address the solid stream process at that time.
- **Project goal:** Identify a replacement option with resource recovery opportunities that is consistent with community values and the City's *Legacies and Strategic Commitments*.

Tadd gave an overview of solid stream processing and replacement alternatives, and described the steps of the alternative development and screening processes.

In **Step 1**, the team used **pass/fail criteria** to screen the full array of alternatives to identify reliable, safe, and feasible options. The screening process revealed a clear preference for anaerobic digestion, as well as multiple options for both end uses and biogas applications. Tadd described four digestion-based conceptual alternatives that the team developed following Step 1. These alternatives vary in terms of post-digestion process, where digestion would occur, and beneficial end uses.

In **Step 2**, each alternative was evaluated side-by-side using the four parts of the **Triple Bottom Line Plus (TBL+) screening criteria**: environmental, financial, social and technological. TBL+ criteria align with the City of Bellingham's *Legacies and Strategic commitments*. Tadd revealed that Alternative 3 (Class A product, digestion at Post Point and off-site soil blending) performed highest in the evaluation and is the preferred alternative. It also meets the community preferences for a Class A product with maximum environment benefit, which were expressed at the first community workshop in May 2017.

Question + Comment Summary

During and after the presentation, the project team answered questions from the community members in attendance. Questions are paraphrased and grouped by theme below:

- **Truck traffic** – How would materials and products be transferred offsite? Would truck traffic increase? Is barging an option?
- **Cost and Funding** – Is a cost projection available? How will this be financed? Is there a difference in cost between Class A and Class B? Does the “financial” aspect of TBL+ consider capital and operational costs?

- **Federal context** – Would potential changes to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) affect feasibility and funding?
- **Examples of comparable systems** – What other Washington jurisdictions use the of solid stream processes being proposed? How would this compare?
- **History** – Why was biosolid incineration chosen initially at the Post Point facility?
- **Environmental effects** – How will this affect Bellingham Bay? Will we still pour waste into the bay? Do we know what is in the waste stream (e.g., antibiotics, heavy metals)?
- **Odor** – How will digestion affect odor? If product will be trucked off-site, will there be odor from the truckloads, or from loading product into the vehicles? The community has significant concerns about the health impact of fumes and odors.
- **Community impacts** – In recent years, odors and other neighborhood impacts have been difficult to endure for neighbors near Post Point, and significant investment should be made to mitigate anticipated community impacts associated with this project.
- **Timing** – What are the next steps and the project timeline? What is the next step with City Council?
- **Visual impact** – Will there been a change in the physical appearance of Post Point? Is there an opportunity for additional landscaping and other improvements for residents and recreationalists in the area at a reasonable cost?
- **TBL+ evaluation process** – Is there somewhere we can get more details on the process? Could community members meet with project staff to understand in more detail how criteria were applied and weighted?
- **Location** – Where would potential offsite activities happen?

Following Workshop 1, the project team developed a set of Frequently Asked Questions based on the workshop discussion. The FAQs will be amended to address new questions heard at Workshop 2: <https://www.cob.org/gov/projects/Pages/Resource%20Recovery.aspx>

Comment Form

A comment form was available in hardcopy at the event, and will also be available online from July 31 - August 11 at: <http://bit.ly/2vQyc6i>.

The form asks community members to respond to the following questions:

- Does the preferred alternative (Alternative 3: Class A Digestion & Off-site Soil Blending) accurately reflect the City's *Legacies and Strategic Commitments*? Why or why not?
- Do you think that Alternative 3 (Class A Digestion & Off-site Soil Blending) realizes (and maximizes) the benefits of resource recovery and reuse for the City of Bellingham? Why or why not?
- Do you have any other feedback or questions the project team should consider? Who else should we inform about the project (e.g., community groups, individuals)?

This summary will be updated with public feedback and input at the close of the comment period.