

**Murray Basin Combined Sewer Overflow Project
Community Advisory Group**

Meeting 2 Summary

**Prepared for
King County Wastewater Treatment Division**

June 24, 2010

Prepared by



101 Stewart Street – Suite 1200
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 269-5041

Meeting Information

Meeting #2

Thursday, June 24th, 2010

6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Fauntleroy Community Services Agency Building (Old Fauntleroy School)

9131 California Ave SW

Attendance

CAG members

- Bill Beyers
- John Comick
- Jim Coombes (alternate for Ron Sterling)
- Cheryl Eastberg (Seattle Parks - Ex Officio)
- Patrick Gordon
- Scott Gunderson
- Chris Jansen
- Chas Redmond, Morgan Community Association
- Donna Sandstrom
-
- Linda J Sullivan (King County WTD)

Facilitation team

- Penny Mabie (Envirolssues)
- Brian Feldman (Envirolssues)

WTD Staff and Consultants

- Jeff Lykken (TetraTech)
- Shahrzad Namini (King County WTD)

Guest speaker

- Mark Henley, Washington State Department of Ecology

Also in attendance

- Cindy Mulliken
- Sue Brimhall
- Karen Berge
- Cindi Barker
- Donna Davis
- Amanda Lee

Welcome and Introductions

Penny Mabie, meeting facilitator, welcomed participants to the second Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting and thanked everyone for their attendance. Penny led a round of introductions and provided a brief overview of the planned agenda and meeting materials. The Murray Basin CAG process has been expanded to eight meetings and tonight the group will decide on the schedule and topics of future meetings. At this meeting the CAG will debrief from the June 19th Technical Information Session, have a recap of Sewer 101 and hear from the Washington State Department of Ecology on Combined Sewer Overflow regulations and permit requirements. Additionally, the CAG

will review a draft list of alternative solutions suggested by the community to date.-
Meeting goals and objectives are listed below:

- Finalize operating guidelines.
- Consider any additional information needs from the June 19th technical session.
- Ensure all CAG members understand the basics of wastewater systems and the current Barton and Murray Basin infrastructure.
- Develop common understanding of regulatory requirements and compliance schedules for the CSO program.
- Review work plan and timetable for future meetings.

Group Operations and Meeting 1 Review

Penny provided a brief recap of the discussion and action items from the first CAG meeting. The final summary from Meeting One will be posted to the County website following this meeting. The County's schedule for CSO projects was distributed to the CAG through email. The action item to explore a more user friendly interface for the County's website will be postponed until Martha Tuttle returns from vacation, but a more user friendly web address remains a possibility. A CAG Google Group has been created but not shared yet. The CAG had a discussion about posting privileges and whether the public would be able to view all CAG content, but not post comments or alter any public CAG documents or whether posting comments and editing documents should be publicly accessible.

The draft operating guidelines were presented to the group with changes marked in strikeout. The group reviewed the document and reached consensus on the final revisions and changes. Following this meeting the document will be finalized and posted to the webpage.

Questions and Discussion

- Donna Sandstrom explained the Murray Basin website contains inconsistent information. She is of the opinion that the Murray Basin project webpage should include all related materials, including press releases and other items, or have links to all items associated with the project.
 - Penny responded that Martha will discuss the website with Donna and explore making project information more convenient and accessible. She reiterated that all CAG materials, including agendas, summaries, and handouts will be uploaded to the site.

ACTION: Explore revising Murray Basin CSO webpage to include all related information or links to information, including press releases and background materials.

- Donna Sandstrom commented that the Google group creates an artificial wall by not allowing members of the public to comment. The group should be completely open for anyone to join.
- Chas Redmond reiterated that the group should be open for the public to post content, but should be monitored closely to prevent spam and offensive content.
 - Penny added that moderating the group is a possibility, but King County would have to approve that effort.
- Patrick Gordon commented that membership to the Google group should not be limited to the CAG and the group should not be exclusive. He agreed that moderation is needed to keep public noise down and prevent it from becoming unusable.
 - Penny suggested that a trial could be run with the Google Group open to the general public with a content moderator. If, during the trial period, public comments overwhelm the group, or drown out CAG discussion, the use of the Google Group would be re-evaluated.

ACTION: The County will consider the Google Group issue and explore internal County policies and practices to determine the possibility of hosting the Google Group as an open forum.

- Chas Redmond suggested that in addition to media, community groups should be added to the operating guidelines.
 - The CAG agreed to the proposed change. With that change, the CAG agreed the document could be finalized. Penny asked meeting attendees who know of a community group wanting to follow the work of the CAG, to please forward along group contact information.

ACTION: Update and finalize the operating guidelines.

- Bill Beyers suggested that the operating guidelines should include the CAG schedule and timeframe. He expressed some frustration that the group was not talking about more technical issues and solutions right away.
 - Penny explained that the CAG schedule and process is being organized to provide a framework of information and to lay the foundation about issues to be considered as alternatives are weighed, so that when the CAG does provide their input on potential solutions, it is well-informed and useful to the County.

June 19th Technical Information Session

Penny led the group in a discussion about the June 19th Technical Information Session. She asked the group to provide their highlights and main takeaway points from the June 19th technical information session. Some who attended the session commented on the successful effort to put together a summary of very complex issues as well as noting with

appreciation that the County didn't push a specific solution. There was also recognition of the complexity of institutional issues and divisions of responsibilities.

Those are listed below: Penny also handed out a list of community-suggested alternatives that she had collected from the June 19th meeting and from other discussions with CAG members, and the CAG reviewed that list.

- We need more information about the relationship between King County and Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) regarding CSO's and stormwater management.
- We need more information about the area of Murray Basin that has separated stormwater and sewer pipes.
- We need more detail and technical data about storage volume calculations and overflow data.
- The information about green solutions in Murray Basin and Barton Basin was appealing, informative and encouraging.
- What is the feasibility of community suggested alternatives.
- What are cost constraints and impacts?
- We must be aware of potential regulatory developments that could change requirements; i.e. – changes in stormwater discharge quality requirements.

Questions and Discussion

- Chris Jansen expressed that static maps, which lack interactive features, make it difficult to understand the relating infrastructure. An interactive map which contains stormwater data in compliance with Ecology regulations would be useful to help determine where more capacity can be found.
- Bill Beyers commented that the session after lunch was a very creative and interesting talk about green sewer alternatives. The potential of green alternatives was well illustrated and it displayed a response to the concerns of the public from the County and the consultants.
- Patrick Gordon commented that it was a great effort to explain a complex set of issues. The meeting was a huge improvement and explained the CSO problem well.
- Cheryl Eastberg commented that she had heard tunnel storage in Lincoln Park was a possibility and would like to hear more about that alternative.
 - Penny explained that Ron Sterling had previously mentioned a tunnel, but in their interview, he told her he was not speaking a massive tunnel under Lincoln Park. He clarified his suggestion was to place a storage tank large enough to manage both Murray and Barton basin overflows in Lincoln Park, perhaps under the parking lot off Fauntleroy, and tunnel a piping system to connect the storage tank to the Barton and Murray pump stations. Another CAG member clarified they had also heard a solution that placed a storage facility in Lincoln Park down by the shoreline.

- Scott Gunderson noted that the list of possible solutions should mention that a solution must be outside of Lowman Park and a statement needs to be made from the Seattle Parks Department that it will not be located in the park.
 - Penny responded and indicated that this will be addressed in the guiding principles. Parties will be brought in to form constraints and guidelines that are feasible and meet everyone's interest. Based on these constraints and guidelines the group will look at different alternatives and see which meet the interests of the combined group.
- Patrick Gordon noted when looking at alternatives it would be important to figure out what could be done to make an alternative feasible rather than determining why it cannot work. It would be beneficial to have a positive outlook on alternatives rather than a negative.
- John Comick commented that the group should be aware of any long term city or county plans in the area, to ensure a decision is reached that is not a stop gap solution and does not require more work ten years later.

Sewer 101

Jeff Lykken explained the County maintains a collection system that conveys wastewater flows from local collection pipes through to either the West Point or the Renton Treatment Plants. Some of the system uses gravity to move wastewater and other parts require pumping stations to move the water. Using graphics and diagrams Jeff provided an overview of the County's collection system in the Murray and Barton Basins. Geographical Information System (GIS) information shows specifically how local (City) infrastructure is connected to County systems. Jeff noted that the Murray Basin has fewer connections than the Barton Basin. Roughly 110 acres of the entire Murray and Barton areas flow into combined storm/sewer systems. Stormwater not connected to the combined sewer system in the basins currently is collected and flows into Puget Sound without any form of treatment. Much of the stormwater sourced from the Murray Basin originates from homes with gutters connected directly to the combined system.

Questions and Discussion

- Chas Redmond asked what the capacity for a wet overflow is at the Alki Beach wet weather treatment plant and if that limit has been exceeded. He also asked if there are any constraints which prevent Alki from taking additional water from other basins.
 - Mark and Jeff explained that Alki is limited to about ten million gallons per year and that any discharged water is treated and disinfected. Alki is also reaching its capacity for treatment and conveyance, which means any excess water will discharge somewhere else in the system.

- Scott Gunderson asked about the volume capacity of the 63rd Avenue pump station.
 - Jeff explained the system capacity is roughly seven million gallons and is pumped through the Duwamish River system.

- Bill Beyers asked for clarification about the ratio at which water enters the Murray Basin, the city system, or flows anywhere else as a third option. He added that if most of the water is traveling into Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) and County systems, where does it originate in the basins and how much is flowing each way.
 - Jeff commented that the ratio is contained within the modeling but may not be written up in a separate document.

Combined Sewer Overflow Program

Mark Henley is the current permit manager for King County wastewater treatment plants and the CSO program and the author of the current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the County's West Point facility. He explained the County has a compliance schedule within the NPDES permit that focuses on water quality within the Puget Sound and specifically targets beach projects like the Murray Basin CSO. Current regulations about CSOs require that the greatest reasonable reduction must be conducted in the earliest possible time, forcing the County's current timeframe. The County asked Ecology for an extension regarding this rule and Ecology management did not find an extended timeline to be in the State's best interest. King County has been directed to submit a preferred alternative for this project within the required compliance deadline for the facility plan. Ecology does believe there is some flexibility after the Facility Plan has been submitted to make changes to it through an amendment process. The amendments will allow more time for changes to be made and for additional community input.

Mark added that any amendments made to the County's Facility Plan could jeopardize the plans for construction and completion, potentially leading to a violation of the County's permit. The goal of the project is to control the Beach CSOs to no more than one overflow per year, on average. If after completion, overflows are still not under control, the County would face fines or other administrative action to make additional changes and improvements. Ecology does not dictate where this project is located or what types of facilities are put in place, but does mandate that improvements to the CSO system be implemented. The County must select a preferred alternative to keep with their current schedule and prevent future violations.

Green infrastructure does have the potential to help alleviate many of these problems, but is currently unproven in terms of direct effects. Public participation in the voluntary activities and other factors reduce the certainty of green systems. This means that other systems must be in place that can handle predicted water flows if the green systems are ineffective. Murray Basin is roughly one million gallons and overflows must drastically be reduced.

Questions and Discussion

- Donna Sandstrom asked if anyone in King County is currently implementing green stormwater initiatives in conjunction with grey systems. The CAG is very interested in green systems and hopes to find a win-win solution that meets the County's objectives and doesn't alter Lowman Beach Park.
 - Mark explained that in the Windermere Basin, Seattle is currently using green stormwater techniques in conjunction with a two million gallon storage tank. Seattle is also implementing green alleys and roadside rain gardens in Ballard. The design is currently underway and will be implemented in about 2014.

- Jon Comick asked to what level the green systems need to be proven before they can meet permit requirements and replace grey systems and if grey systems are always required.
 - Mark responded that if uncertainty is present, Ecology will ask for more information. With many green systems that level of information is not present. Ecology must be confident that the system can handle estimated water flow.

- Chas Redmond asked how modifications fit into the established timeline and if an effective solution isn't found, will time be available to come back and re-evaluate other alternatives.
 - The facility plan must be submitted to Ecology for review by December 31st 2010. The plan can be modified for two years following the initial submission. The actual facility must be approved before construction plans are submitted and construction must begin by 2013. There is room to reconsider alternatives, but the County must determine the alternatives' schedule impacts and design requirements.

- Bill Beyers commented that a sentiment is present that many feel the current piping system reflects older logic and not the logic of 2010. He asked if a stormwater holding pen would require treatment before being discharged.
 - Mark explained that presently no treatment of stormwater is required under regulations, but best management practices (BMPs) must be implemented to control pollutants entering the water. Street sweepers are a good example of a BMP.

- Chas Redmond asked if water regulations originated with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and were passed on to Ecology.
 - Mark responded that in the State of Washington, the EPA has delegated authority to Ecology. In other states other situations are present.

Work Plan Discussion

Penny reviewed the Doodle poll with the group and due to the group size and schedules of CAG members, no one night works perfectly for all members. Tuesday night was proposed for future meetings and the group decided on the schedule for the remaining CAG meetings:

Meeting 3 - July 8, 2010

Meeting 4 - July 20, 2010

Meeting 5 - August 3, 2010

Meeting 6 - August 17, 2010

Meeting 7 - September 9, 2010

Meeting 8 - September 14, 2010

Action Items

- Post meeting calendar on website and distribute to CAG members.
- Update topics and schedule list to include additional issues and information needs identified at this meeting.
- Revise and finalize the Operating Guidelines.
- Donna and Martha to discuss improvements to Murray Basin CSO web page when Martha returns from vacation.
- Explore making Google Group open to public and develop long-term plan for group use and moderation.