

November 5, 2007

## **Environmental Impact Statement Scope Determination for a New Solid Waste Handling Facility on San Juan Island**

### **Introduction**

San Juan County is in the process of siting a new solid waste transfer station at either the existing site or a new site (for information on the history of this, see Attachment I). To do this, the County is required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) if the County determines that the proposal is likely to result in significant adverse environmental impacts. The purpose of an EIS is to identify potential significant adverse impacts so that decision makers are aware of these when they select a site. An EIS can be used to identify reasonable alternatives (i.e., other sites) and ways to analyze the impacts. It can also be used to identify possible mitigation measures to be incorporated as conditions in subsequent permits to reduce environmental impacts. An EIS can also be used by decision makers to deny a proposal when significant environmental impacts cannot be reasonably mitigated.

The County has decided there will be significant adverse environmental impacts associated with siting a new or expanding the existing solid waste transfer facility. On May 23, 2007, the County issued a "Determination of Significance and Request for Comments on the Scope of the Environmental Impact Statement" which began the process to identify adverse environmental impacts. The scoping process included a 30-day public comment period and public scoping meeting (for a summary of the public scoping meeting, see Attachment II).

This determination of scope identifies the five sites that will be examined in the EIS. It also identifies the potential adverse environmental impacts that will be analyzed in the EIS.

### **Public Scoping Process**

- Public Notice --The County issued a public notice regarding the proposed project, the Determination of Significance, and the SEPA scoping process on May 23, 2007. The public notice is provided in Attachment III. The public notice established a 30-day (expanded scoping) public comment period ending on June 22, 2007, and a public scoping meeting on June 19, 2007.

- Public Scoping Meeting – A public scoping meeting was held from 6:00 to 8:00 PM on June 19, 2007 at the Mullis Senior Center in Friday Harbor. Prior to the meeting, County staff were available to answer questions on the proposal. During the public meeting, the purpose of scoping within the context of the overall SEPA review process was presented. Verbal and written testimony was solicited regarding alternatives to be considered in the draft EIS (DEIS), impact issues to be analyzed, and suggested mitigation measures.
- Public and Agency Comments – Copies of agency and public comment letters are available for review at the County Community Development and Planning office.

### **Description of Alternatives**

In selecting a site for the solid waste transfer facility, SEPA requires the County to look at all reasonable sites or at representatives of sites that share common features. SEPA also requires the County to examine what would happen if no action were taken.

On San Juan Island, solid waste transfer stations can only be sited, with a conditional use permit, in the following land use designations: Rural General Use (RGU), Rural Commercial and Rural Industrial. There is no Rural Commercial land on San Juan Island and the only Rural Industrial land has a shipyard on it. Therefore, the site either has to be located where it currently is, which is within the Town of Friday Harbor, or in one of the three RGU areas on the island.

In addition to the “No Action” alternative, the five alternatives sites that the County has identified for analysis in the EIS are the following:

- “Sutton Road Site”. The existing solid waste transfer facility is located at 212 Sutton Road (Tax Parcel Number 350234001). The land is owned by the Town of Friday Harbor and consists of 26 acres. Part of it is covered with a closed landfill. San Juan County Public Works owns 7 acres contiguous to and to the southwest of the existing site. The address of that parcel is 1258 Roche Harbor Road (TPN 350232004). It is in the Agricultural Resource land use designation. While a solid waste transfer facility cannot be sited on Agricultural Resource land, the County will examine what could be placed there which could support the solid waste transfer facility. The Town and County parcels are surrounded by Agricultural Resource land to the north, west and south, and Rural Residential land to the east.
- “Beaverton Valley Road Site”. This site is located at 1609 Beaverton Valley Road (TPN 351044001). It consists of 27 acres owned by San

Juan County Public Works. There is a County maintenance building on-site. The site is surrounded by RGU land to the west and south, and Rural Farm Forest land to the north and east.

- “Egg Lake Road Site”. This 40-acre site consists of two parcels of undeveloped RGU land. The address of one of the parcels is 1953 Egg Lake Road (363214002) and the other is identified as Lot 1 of Fishhook Lake Estates (TPN 363323001). These lots are surrounded by Rural Farm Forest land.
- “Golf Course Road Site”. This site consists of two parcels (TPN 352343008 and 352343006). Both are adjacent to Cattle Point Road and the address of one of the lots is 106 Golf Course Road. Combined, these two lots consist of 8 acres. There is RGU land to the north and west of this site, Rural Residential land to the east, and Rural Farm Forest land to the south.
- “Daniel Lane Site”. This 21-acre site is bounded by Daniel Lane to the east and Cattle Point Road to the south (C TPN 352331007, 352331009, and 352324006). It is surrounded by RGU land to the north, east, and southwest and by Rural Farm Forest land to the south and west.
- No action alternative.

### **Impact Issues to be Included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)**

#### **1. Transportation**

- Obtain and review available traffic volumes and data from the County.
- Conduct visual file review of the existing project site and alternative sites.
- Develop horizon year traffic volume projections using an historical growth factor and information on other area development. Applicable information defining the transfer facility operations and scheduling will be obtained. Based on this and available data from the existing facility, anticipated vehicle trip generation will be estimated to describe up to two peak demand periods.
- Calculate the intersection level of service (LOS) for existing conditions and for each alternative.
- Assess where existing and/or future deficiencies occur, including changes in road use from higher truck traffic.
- Identify appropriate mitigation, such as construction of turning lanes, changes to lane configurations or changes to intersection controls.

- Prepare a draft *Transportation Discipline Report* which is intended to be an Appendix to the DEIS for review by the project team and the County. Upon receipt of project team review comments, necessary changes will be made for the final Transportation Impact Analysis report for the DEIS. Develop the text for the Transportation Section of the Draft EIS based on the Transportation Impact Analysis report.
- Analyze all safety issues including changes to visibility and increased truck traffic and the impacts they will have on cars, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

## 2. Noise

- Compile noise regulations from local, state and federal agencies. Potential sound impacts will be considered in accordance with these policies and requirements.
- Measure sound levels in the project areas.
- Estimate future traffic noise levels using the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) Version 2.5. Noise sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the edge of pavement or modified ramps or roadways shall be included in the analysis. Existing county data will be used as part of the required model inputs. Existing noise measurements will be used to calibrate the model using peak hour volumes. Future year analysis will include the “No Action” and build alternatives.
- Evaluate projected noise impacts of facility operations. Noise measurements will be taken at the existing facility. Applicable noise data from other existing facilities will be researched as well to provide an accurate planning picture of the levels of noise predicted to be experienced by adjacent receptors.
- Present noise levels in a table for comparison of impacts.
- Recommend, if required, mitigation measures for both short-term and long-term impacts for all sensitive properties identified as impacted, in accordance with requirements of the state and other local agencies.
- Prepare a *Noise Discipline Report* to document the screening analysis of noise impacts of the proposed improvements. The discipline report will consist of sections examining existing conditions, construction, and operational impacts. The noise screening methodology and discipline report will comply with 23CFR772 and WSDOTs Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Procedures.

## 3. Air

- Prepare an air quality analysis that meets the EPA conformity and local regulations. The project-level air quality analysis will predict carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations from traffic with the MOBILE6.2 and CAL3QHC2

computer models (or latest versions). CO concentrations will be predicted for the existing year, year of opening, and the horizon year of 2030 for the proposed alternatives and no build condition. CO concentrations will be predicted based on traffic volumes and level-of-service (LOS). The air quality analysis also will identify construction impacts and mitigation, and will qualitatively assess emissions of air toxics from mobile sources. Measurements of existing air quality and meteorological conditions are not proposed.

- Evaluate long-term mitigation measures, if required.
- Prepare an *Air Quality Discipline Report* including applicable standards, agency coordination, existing air quality, modeling methods and assumptions, analyses of impacts, mitigation measures, construction requirements, particulates during construction, and a conformity statement.

#### **4. Stormwater/Groundwater**

- Conduct stormwater and groundwater evaluations of the project alternatives.
- Develop a conceptual stormwater management evaluation to determine likely volumes of stormwater to be generated at each of the sites as well as potential downstream or off-site consequences.
- Develop analyses of likely groundwater impact issues, including use and the likelihood of contamination.
- Determine suitable mitigation measures that ameliorate identified impacts.

#### **5. Litter, Odor, Vectors**

- Develop a template of litter, odor, and vector issues associated with facility development using information provided by the county.
- Formulate mitigation measures that can be applied to each of the alternatives for a comparative analysis utilizing AMEC's experience with solid waste facilities and input from other team members.

#### **6. Household Hazardous Waste Storage**

- Evaluate, for each alternative, the short-term (typically less than a year) storage of household hazardous waste as an operational issue. Accommodation of safety procedures in handling these materials will also be part of this evaluation.

- Prepare a *Household Hazardous Waste Technical Memo* for the potential project areas being reviewed. Mitigation measures that could be implemented will be developed as part of this investigation and report.

## **7. Wetlands**

- Identify and delineate all wetlands and their associated buffers where they occur within the alternative project sites, in compliance with local, state, and federal laws.
- Document these wetlands in a *Wetland Discipline Technical Memo* which will analyze potential wetland impacts.
- Propose suitable wetland mitigation sites as well in order to provide a comprehensive comparative analysis of alternatives.
- Explore wetland banks and partnering opportunities as possible mitigation and compensation for impacts, as necessary.

## **8. Land Use Plans and Policies**

- Utilize and incorporate relevant information developed through a land use technical analysis.
- Describe the relevant land use implications of each of the alternatives, including the No Action alternative.
- Present an analysis covering DOE requirements, the Comprehensive Plan (including Essential Public Facilities provisions), County Code, and Zoning and Ordinances.
- Discuss permitting issues for each alternative, including coordination with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for action alternatives located near the San Juan Airport.
- Identify issues associated with FAA coordination including measures to eliminate bird strike potential and foreign object debris or litter blowing across the runway for the relevant action alternatives. County airport overlay requirements will be addressed.

## **9. Visual Impacts**

- Utilize existing information regarding impacts from light and glare and incorporate further potential impacts.
- Analyze visual impacts to residences due to action alternatives involving expansion or construction of a new facility.

- Identify potential buffers for visual impacts, if needed.

### **Next Opportunity for Public Comments**

- DEIS Comment Period—Issuance of the DEIS will kick off a 30-day public review and comment period. All comments submitted on the DEIS will be specifically addressed in the Final EIS. A legal notice will be published in the local papers when the DEIS is available for review. Individuals who indicated at the scoping meeting that they wished to be notified will also be contacted. If anyone else wants to receive notification, please contact Shannon FitzGerald at the San Juan County Community Development and Planning Department at 370-7591 or at [shannonf@co.san-juan.wa.us](mailto:shannonf@co.san-juan.wa.us).
- DEIS Hearing—During the DEIS comment period, a public hearing will be held as another means of soliciting comments from the community on the DEIS and its analysis of impact issues. Prior to the public hearing, the County will hold an informational meeting to provide information and answer questions on the DEIS.

## Attachment I

### History

Since May 18, 2006, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) has been evaluating San Juan Island's solid waste issues including collection, transfer, processing and disposal of waste. Assisting the SWAC is a technical team composed of engineering, planning, environmental review, and meeting facilitation consultants.

The technical team began their work by identifying a method to evaluate the needs of the county, listen to the desires of the citizens, and incorporate regulatory requirements. Limiting the scope to San Juan Island, the SWAC was able to focus on the real and perceived deficiencies of the existing facility.

Later meetings of the SWAC looked at multiple options for handling solid waste including pyrolysis, gasification, incineration, composting, landfilling, landfill mining, and transfer stations. These meetings also identified goals for incorporating reuse, reduction, and recycling. Several discussions brought up the debate of the self haul of household waste versus required curbside collection. Concluding discussions looked into the construction of a new transfer station and its location, either at the existing site or a new site.

The June 19, 2006 meeting developed a list of priorities found in a preferred outcome. These included: emphasis on recycling, safe operation, responsive to community needs, financially secure, cost effective, minimal impact to community, adequately buffered, efficient operation, county management of all systems, implementation of Department of Ecology priorities, equitable county wide and island wide, and consistent with the solid waste plan.

The SWAC invited community members and other interested individuals to an open house on August 10, 2006. Between 120 and 150 attendees listened to the findings of the SWAC and were able to share their opinions as well.

Conclusions reached by the SWAC are as follows:

- Construction of a new landfill on the island is unfeasible due to higher up front and long term costs, difficulties associated with siting a landfill, and higher risk of contamination to air quality, ground and surface water.
- Pyrolysis and gasification are not proven technologies and too many obstacles exist for their utilization.
- Composting is not a proven technology on an operational scale as shown by the difficulties experienced by other similar facilities.
- Incineration is an impractical option due to air and groundwater contamination risk, high costs, and the fact that it could not handle all forms of waste.
- Reduction, reuse, and recycling must be planned for and incorporated in the development of solid waste facilities.

- Curbside collection would likely be a less costly option; citizens of San Juan Island strongly prefer to self-haul their waste and should be allowed to maintain that option.
- Solid waste facilities should be concentrated on one site.

To develop a new facility will require approximately two years for siting and construction. The availability of an appropriate site is limited by road and ferry access constraints, existing land use zoning, adequacy of size, and available water supply. The benefits available from a new site would include: greater queuing room for traffic, two scales, a pull through truck bay, space for a reuse drop of facility, and space for household hazardous waste collection.

To redevelop the existing facility is limited by the landfill covering the majority of the site, which creates additional liability associated with potential groundwater contamination or gas migration, building height restrictions, and steep slopes limiting construction of stormwater ponds and increasing construction costs. The benefits available from redeveloping the existing site would include: accessible power and water, incinerator facility could be reconfigured to receive wastes or recyclables, possibility of incorporation of county property on neighboring Sutton Road, and little disruption to customers due to familiarity.

Requiring commercial curbside collection for residents would necessitate redevelopment of the existing site, development of a new site, or the use of an off-island facility to accept the waste. Benefits available from curbside collection are a reduction in traffic congestion, operational costs, and liability and safety issues for the public. Additionally, collection of recyclables could be added to the curbside service.

Based on the findings described above, the San Juan County Solid Waste Advisory Committee concluded that San Juan County should take immediate action to site, design and construct a new transfer facility to serve San Juan Island. The facility should offer reuse and recycling opportunities and accept self-haul waste from individuals.

## Attachment II

### SAN JUAN ISLAND'S SOLID WASTE TRANSFER STATION SUMMARY PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING JUNE 19, 2007

#### OVERVIEW

On June 19, 2007, the San Juan County Department of Community Development and Planning hosted a public meeting concerning an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for San Juan Island's Solid Waste Transfer Station. Forty members of the community attended. The purpose of the meeting was to receive public comment about what should be taken into account in assessing the environmental impact of constructing a new solid waste transfer station either at the existing site (near Sutton Road) or at a new site. Participants were also asked to address the questions:

Are there reasonable alternatives to constructing a new solid waste transfer station either at the existing site or a new site?

What measures might be used to mitigate the potentially adverse environmental impacts of constructing a new transfer station for San Juan Island?

After a series of brief presentations, meeting attendees posed questions and presented comments to County staff and the project's consultant team.

The meeting began with reports from Shannon FitzGerald with the San Juan County Department of Community Development and Planning, Gary Harshman of AMEC Environmental and Ed Hale of the San Juan County Public Works Department. The three briefly described State Environmental Policy Act compliance, the upcoming Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, and the project's 2007 anticipated schedule and milestones.

Todd Peterson of Norton-Arnold & Company, the facilitator, guided the ensuing discussion. Citizens presented their comments and concerns about the project and process and what they would like to see happen in the future.

#### SUMMARY

What follows is a summary of the comments, questions and ideas presented during the meeting's discussion:

**General Concerns.** Meeting participants were divided about where to site a newly constructed solid waste transfer facility for San Juan Island. As detailed below, some advocated the continued use of the site near Sutton Road while others recommended choosing "*a site with room for expansion, which is not already environmentally compromised. Build it from scratch correctly, with room for recycling.*"

**Airfield Conflict.** Several participants expressed concern about siting a new transfer station in close proximity to the southern end of San Juan Island Airport. They commented that building the transfer station near the airfield would incur liability, would be out of compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations and would increase the number of bird strikes. A representative comment: *“Safety is critical. Siting a transfer station at the southern end of the airfield would increase bird strikes and endanger pilots. The FAA would never approve it.”* Several citizens noted that as the Island’s population continues to grow, flights to and from the island will increase, and a runway extension to the south will be inevitable. One citizen said that as housing becomes more expensive on the Island, more people will have to commute to work from the mainland, necessitating larger planes and a longer runway. These citizens said that a new transfer station does not belong near the airfield. It was pointed out, however, that the 20 year master plan for the airport does not include a runway extension.

**Economics.** A number of people had questions about the economics of the project. How much is it going to cost? How will it be paid for? What services will be available at the transfer station? Can all be services be offered at one location or should there be two sites? Representative comments: *“San Juan County needs to share cost analysis information with the public as soon as it’s available.”* Participants asked that the economic analysis present a cost/benefit study of all sites under consideration. A citizen said that proximity to the ferry should not eliminate consideration of more inland sites.

**Environmental Requirements.** As noted during Solid Waste Advisory Committee and public meetings in 2006, complying with state environmental regulations continues to be a high priority. Attendees wondered what services could be accommodated at the current site. One participant advocated analyzing the use of land to the south of the area currently in use. Several participants noted that having comparable transfer stations to look at in terms of size, drainage and services would be helpful. One commented: *“We know the current transfer station has problems but what solutions and type of expansion are possible there?”*

One citizen said it was time to move beyond Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) thinking and to consider the environmental health of the island. *“Do the right thing now with new technology and construction, not the easy fix.”*

**Develop Design Proposals.** Several citizens recommended that the County develop specific design proposals/schematics for citizen evaluation and response. One participant said, *“We need a concrete proposal and price.”*

**New Site vs. Existing Site.** Some attendees recommended constructing a new transfer station at a new site as soon as possible, especially in light of the state of the current facility. Those advocating the selection of a new site said that the transfer station’s current location near Sutton Road is:

Too small

Too steep

Constrained and contaminated by the old landfill and solid waste incinerator

Too expensive to expand

Unsafe for workers

Out of compliance with Department of Ecology regulations  
Causing the death of trees adjacent to the property

A representative comment: *A new transfer station could operate more effectively and efficiently (than the current site), accommodate future growth and meet environmental standards.*

Others said that there has been too much emphasis on a new transfer station for San Juan Island, and that the existing facility could do the job if redeveloped responsibly. These participants said that other sites being considered are unacceptable for safety or environmental reasons or were acquired without adequate public involvement. They said that the process of site selection was costing too much and going on too long; rather than spending money on analyzing unacceptable alternatives, the County should put the money into making the current site work. One participant commented, *"I am concerned about the size of a new site and how much impervious surface will be created."* Some attendees emphasized that the County should clean up and continue to use the site historically dedicated to waste management rather than degrading a new site.

### **Possible Adverse Environmental Impacts for Inclusion in the EIS**

The Determination of Significance for this project lists the following potentially adverse environmental impacts resulting from the construction of a new solid waste transfer station on San Juan Island:

- Traffic
- Noise
- Lights
- Air quality (odor, dust)
- Vectors (rodents, insects, birds)
- Litter
- On-site storage of household hazardous waste
- Storm water
- Wetlands

To this list, scoping meeting participants added:

- Airport/flight safety specifically in relation to bird strikes
- Increase in impervious surface
- Water consumption
- Steep slopes
- Seepage into groundwater
- Contamination of neighboring properties wells by hazardous waste via wash down processes which use fresh water
- Safety of wildlife
- Visual buffer
- Sound buffer
- Light pollution at night
- Social equity/fairness/environmental justice assessment

- Provision of essential services/potential need to add new services
- Compliance with environmental laws
- Economic impacts on surrounding residential and recreational properties, i.e. impact on real estate values.

### **Facility Services.**

Several participants noted that the solid waste services offered will determine the size of the transfer station and will drive the siting process. It was therefore important, they felt, to define those services. (At the meeting, standard transfer station services were identified as: managing self-hauled and commercially hauled waste, recycling and complying with County and State health and environmental regulations. Green waste recycling, expanded household hazardous waste collection and materials exchange were defined as possible future options.)

Others noted that some of the services being proposed for a future facility (for example, waste exchange and green waste composting) are already being provided by local businesses, which should be supported. Some of those in attendance recommended putting a price on “optional” solid waste services such as green waste recycling and materials exchange.

Participants pointed out the option of operating both the existing facility and a new transfer station on the Island.

### **Education**

Participants emphasized the value of education in promoting waste reduction.

**Environmental Impact Statement Process.** Participants asked that the timeline for the EIS and site selection be made clear. Some pointed out the need for a long-term solution that meets immediate needs and complies with regulations. Several citizens said that the EIS must provide uniform economic and visual analysis for all sites under consideration. Others noted that the EIS needs to clearly identify the size, location and services offered at all proposed sites.

**Next Steps.** Citizens’ comments will be addressed in a Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement developed by San Juan County. Citizens will have the opportunity to comment on the draft EIS and on a conditional use permit issued by the County for the Island’s solid waste transfer facility. The San Juan County Council will make the final decision about the site for the facility.

**Attachment III  
WAC 197-11-980**

**DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE  
AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON THE SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
STATEMENT FOR A PROPOSED SOLID WASTE TRANSFER STATION**

**Description of Proposal:** The San Juan County Public Works Department is proposing improvements to the current solid waste transfer facility which will entail significant upgrades to the existing facility or necessitate a new facility at a different location.

**Background:** Due to inadequacies of the existing solid waste facility, it can no longer operate safely given the amount of material that it is receiving. Last spring, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), with considerable input from the public, began examining the solid waste collection, transfer, processing and disposal needs of San Juan Island. As a result of this process, the SWAC concluded that San Juan County should take immediate action to design and construct a new solid waste transfer facility at either the current location or a new site. This was presented to the County Council on and the Council directed the SWAC to move forward with siting the facility.

**Project Proponent:** San Juan County Public Works Department

**Lead Agency:** San Juan County through the Community Development and Planning Department

**Determination of Significance:** Both San Juan County Public Works Department and Community Development and Planning have determined this proposal is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement (EIS) will be prepared as required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), RCW [43.21C.030](#) (2)(c). An environmental checklist and threshold determination do not have to be prepared because the proponent and the lead agency have decided that a Determination of Significance (DS) will be issued and an EIS will be prepared.

If you have comments on the decision to issue a DS, please send them to the Community Development and Planning Department address under the scoping section of this notice by June 13, 2007. The DS may also be appealed by submitting a written request for review to the Director of the Community Development and Planning Department at the address below. An appellant must be prepared to make specific factual objections. The Community and Planning Department staff contact in this notice can provide you with information on the appeals process. The appeals period begins June 14, 2007 and closes July 5, 2007.

**EIS Process:** The EIS process is used to identify and analyze probable adverse impacts from the proposal, reasonable alternatives to the proposal, and mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts from significant to insignificant. This process starts with the issuance of this Determination of Significance (DS) which also begins 30-day public comment and appeals periods that ends on June 22, 2007. A public scoping meeting will

be held on June 19, 2007. Along with the public comment period, the scoping meeting is a chance for the public to provide comments on the proposal.

Following the scoping meeting, a scoping document will be produced that summarizes the concerns and identifies which impacts will be analyzed in the draft EIS. Once the draft EIS is prepared, there will be a 30-day public comment period and public hearing on the draft EIS. A summary of comments received on the draft EIS will be produced and considered in the preparation of the final EIS. Following the release of the final EIS, there is a 21-day appeals period.

**Scoping:** Agencies, any affected tribes, and members of the public are invited to comment on the scope of the EIS. The County is specifically looking for comments on: 1) any potential adverse impacts; 2) insignificant impacts that can be eliminated from the EIS review; 3) reasonable alternatives to the proposal; 4) mitigation measures for any adverse impacts; and 5) licenses or other approvals that may be required for the project.

The 30-day public comment period on the scope of the EIS begins on May 23, 2007. All comments must be received or postmarked by Friday, June 22, 2007.

Please send your comments on the DS and scope of the EIS to: Shannon FitzGerald, Community Development & Planning, P.O. Box 947, Friday Harbor, WA 98250. Comments can also be faxed to 360-378-3922 or emailed to [shannonf@co.san-juan.wa.us](mailto:shannonf@co.san-juan.wa.us) or dropped off at the Community Development & Planning office at 135 Rhone Street in Friday Harbor.

A **public scoping meeting** will be held for the purposes of providing information and receiving comments on the scope of the EIS. This meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 19, 2007 at the Mullis Community Senior Center, located at 589 Nash Street in Friday Harbor, from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm.

**Location of Proposal:** The sites and areas that will be analyzed in the EIS include the following and any other sites that are made available prior to the development of the EIS:

- **Existing location at 212 Sutton Road (Tax Parcel Number 350234001)**
- **1609 Beaverton Valley Road (TPN 351044001)**
- **One or more of three potential sites south of the airport which include:**
  1. **106 Golf Course Road (TPN 352343008 & 352343006);**
  2. **No assigned address, but located between 1104 and 994 Cattle Point Road (TPN 352331007 & 352331009)**
  3. **203 Daniel Lane (TPN 352324006 & 352331008)**

San Juan County has identified the following as either having possible adverse environmental impacts or possibly being impacted by the proposal. We welcome your input on these and any other areas of concerns.

- Traffic
- Noise
- Lights
- Air Quality (Odor, dust)
- Vectors (rodents, insects, birds)
- Litter
- Household Hazardous Waste On-Site Storage
- Stormwater
- Wetlands

**Available Documents:** Information produced as part of the SWAC review of alternatives to a solid waste transfer station can also be found at the Public Works office at 915 Spring Street (M-F 8-4:30) the Community Development & Planning office at 135 Rhone Street (M-F 8-4:30) and the San Juan Island Library at 1010 Guard Street (MWF 10-6; TuTh 10-8; Sat 10-5; and Sun 1-5).

For more information on the EIS process, please contact Shannon FitzGerald at the Community Development and Planning Department at 360-370-7591 or [shannonf@co.san-juan](mailto:shannonf@co.san-juan).

For information of the solid waste transfer facility, please contact Ed Hale at the Public Works Department at 360-370-0500 or [edh@sjcpublishworks.org](mailto:edh@sjcpublishworks.org).

**Responsible Official:** Ron Henrickson      **Position:** Director, Community Development and Planning Department

**Contact:** Shannon FitzGerald

**Phone:** (360) 370-7591

**Address:** P.O. Box 947  
135 Rhone Street  
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

**Date:** May 18, 2007

[Statutory Authority: RCW [43.21C.110](#). 84-05-020 (Order DE 83-39), § 197-11-980, filed 2/10/84, effective 4/4/84.]