

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

Meeting 6 Summary

**Prepared for
King County Wastewater Treatment Division**

August 30, 2010

Prepared by

 **EnviroIssues**

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

Meeting Information

Meeting #6

Monday, August 30, 2010

5:30 – 8:00 p.m.

Fauntleroy Community Services Agency Building (Old Fauntleroy School)

9131 California Ave SW

Attendance

CAG members

- William Beyers
- John Comick
- Kate Dee
- Cheryl Eastberg
- Patrick Gordon
- Chas Redmond (Morgan Community Association)
- Don Stark
- Ron Sterling
- Tracy Tackett
- Jim Coombes
- Linda Cox
- Sharon Best
- Linda J. Sullivan (King County WTD)

Facilitation Team

- Penny Mabie (EnviroIssues)
- Amy Meyer (EnviroIssues)

WTD Staff and Consultants

- Kevin Dour (Tetra Tech)
- Jeff Lykken (Tetra Tech)
- Brian Matson (Carollo Engineers)
- Martha Tuttle (King County WTD)
- Mary Wohleb (King County WTD)

Also in attendance

- Chuck Linders
- Janelle Rogers

Welcome and Review

Penny Mabie, meeting facilitator, welcomed participants to the sixth Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting and thanked everyone for their attendance. She asked CAG members if there were any corrections to the Meeting 5 Summary. Since there were none, the Meeting 5 Summary will be made final and posted online. Penny announced that Ron Sterling had made an addition to the Meeting 4 Summary and asked if her revision had captured his thoughts completely. Ron will review Penny's revision and inform us when the Meeting 4 summary can be finalized and reposted.

Action: Ron Sterling will approve or disapprove of Penny's revision to his addition in the Meeting 4 Summary, and the summary will be finalized and reposted.

Penny reviewed the Meeting 6 Agenda which included the following goals and objectives:

- Finalize Meeting #5 summary
- Assess status of guiding principles and CAG consensus; assign additional work
- Review level of achievability of all potential alternatives
- Prepare for Meeting #7

Penny thanked Patrick Gordon for creating and distributing a revised Guiding Principles document. She said the focus of tonight's meeting will be the technical team's analysis of each of the 17 alternatives and their "achievability" considerations. She revisited the CAG Ground Rules, and then reviewed the materials which had been distributed and included:

- Patrick Gordon's revised Guiding Principles document
- Guiding Principles Revisions Tracking document
- CAG Recommendations Process document
- Alternatives Guide Sheet

Martha Tuttle, King County Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD), announced that maintenance work will begin on the Murray Pump Station on September 7, 2010, and will last for 20 days. Crews will be cleaning, patching, repairing and painting the wet well, the structure through which wastewater first flows when entering the station. The contractor will control noise and odor, and a source of electricity has been provided to avoid generator use. When possible, equipment will be removed at night to retain parking for park visitors. Additional information will be distributed in the neighborhood. She said that King County appreciates neighbors' patience and understanding, and that a 24 hour hotline number will be available for questions and concerns.

- Patrick Gordon asked where the wastewater is rerouted in the meantime.
 - Martha said that a bypass is put in place, but the exact location of the route is unknown.

Guiding Principles Review

Penny asked if the CAG had any concerns or revisions to Patrick Gordon's revised Guiding Principles document.

- Patrick reiterated that his intent was to consolidate thoughts and ensure the document had consistent formatting and language, but to retain the spirit of all CAG members' input.
- Bill Beyers noted the content of Patrick's introductory email to the Guiding Principles document is very important in terms of the guiding principles' use. He noted that it lays out a process of the reconciliation between the CAG's guiding principles and King County's evaluation criteria.
- Penny reminded the CAG that the guiding principles were never intended to be selection criteria. Their intent, rather, is to express the values that this group deems necessary to be considered by King County. CAG members' responsibility lies in articulating the values the CAG want to see included in the County's criteria. Some of the principles the CAG created have been prescriptive, others overarching, and others that could be applied equally to all alternatives.
- Don Stark asked if King County has looked at the CAG's guiding principles and identified any problems that need to be addressed now. The CAG does not want to move ahead with other steps before everyone understands what might be the proper evaluation criteria outcome.

- Linda noted that tonight's meeting will address Don's question. She said that King County will add to their existing evaluation criteria according to the CAG's input, but will not change their existing criteria.
- Penny asked if the CAG had read through the Guiding Principles closely enough to move forward.
 - Bill Beyers said that he had not yet had time to analyze the guiding principles against King County's criteria. He said if no one had done that exercise, the CAG should not yet move forward with the guiding principles.
 - Penny asked if that was a necessary step, as these guiding principles are only meant to reflect the CAG's values. She asked that the members look over each principle very carefully and be sure the principle clearly reflects the CAG's values, as each member will have to stand behind them at the end of this process.

Action: CAG members should review the draft guiding principles carefully so that they can be finalized and used to evaluate alternatives.

- Linda reiterated that she is not surprised the community's criteria is more detailed in identifying community concerns, and the County's criteria includes greater detail regarding technical issues, operations and maintenance. She said that is to be expected, and that she is hopeful that although the CAG's criteria are not as technically detailed, they still value those technical details. Likewise, the County will be sensitive to the community's values.

Level of Achievability Review

Linda Sullivan announced that this meeting would be a turning point. Information and data have been building up for weeks, and she expressed her hope that the group could discuss these topics as well as their opinions candidly. Linda listed some themes she has seen throughout the CAG's guiding principles, which include: minimizing or eliminating construction at the bottom of Murray basin, and questions such as why, how much, and how flows are coming from Barton basin to Murray basin. She said that those, and many other latent questions will surface as the discussion progresses. She noted that in general, the CAG's guiding principles are well aligned with the County's screening criteria. Achievability is the key issue to begin discussing tonight.

Linda then mentioned concepts the CAG did not include in its list of guiding principles, such as: King County's schedule, and if the CAG sees it as flexible or unreal. She said that King County is invested in that schedule, and their intent is to meet the CSO regulations. These are the first of 15 or more CSO projects to come, and it is the County's job to ensure the regulatory requirements are met. She noted that the CAG need not necessarily include that issue in their guiding principles.

- Patrick Gordon said he feels that schedule is certainly reflected in the CAG's guiding principles, and has sensed from the beginning of the process that the CAG has committed to solving that problem with King County.
- Bill Beyers said he is interested in seeing how the term "achievable" plays out within the framework of the trial schedule for the County's first four projects and within the schedule of the NPDES permit. If 15 more projects must be completed by 2030, what will happen if our hypothetical solution has not been started by the County's scheduled date of December 2013?
 - Linda explained that in terms of schedule, the County will not quibble about a matter of months. The first four CSO beach projects, of which Murray basin is one, were identified

by the Department of Ecology and King County together, and the dates are reflected in the NPDES permit. She said she had referred to 15 projects that needed to be complete by 2030 – it is important that the County complete those projects and requirements, and the Department of Ecology will evaluate how King County accomplishes that.

- Penny added that Mark Henley, Water Quality Permit Manager, Department of Ecology, had said during Meeting #2 that in addition to the 2030 compliance goal, there will be individual compliance goals established for each project as well, like there are for the four beach CSO projects.
- Don Stark said he is skeptical about the Department of Ecology and King County’s schedule goals. All parties involved need to be smart and strategic when planning for these projects, so that we avoid being forced into an alternative that includes tearing trees out of a park merely because the Department of Ecology wants to stay on schedule.
 - Linda noted that it is important for us to understand areas of agreement.
- Sharon Best asked what the Department of Ecology’s “consequence” would be if the schedule is not kept.
 - Penny referred Sharon to the Meeting 2 summary.

Jeff Lykken introduced his presentation about the achievability of each of the 17 alternatives. He noted that very valuable information has surfaced from the CAG process which has encouraged the technical team to consider new options. He explained that in order to focus on achievability, the technical team established five key achievability metrics with which to grade some common features of the alternatives. These include: Stakeholder involvement, parks impact, reliability, constructability, and cost.

1. Siting in Parks

Three alternatives involve significantly impactful construction in parks (KC1a, KC3a, and CAG2). A distinction was drawn between alternatives that included very large facilities in a small place, which would effectively change the “use” of the park space, as opposed to alternatives such as CAG1 which sites a storage facility underneath a parking lot. In the case of the latter, the park space could be returned to its original use.

- Cheryl Eastberg said that although parking lots are better options than green spaces, the impacts from construction in a parking lot are large, as well. There would be on-going maintenance that would impact that public space into perpetuity.
 - Jeff explained that the five metrics are not the only issues considered, but that they are the ones that they will explain further tonight.
 - Ron Sterling added that there could possibly be safety hazards created by constructing in parking lots due to limited parking and ferry traffic.

Jeff explained that any alternatives that would site facilities in parks have significant challenges in achievability and stakeholder involvement. If the CAG recommends an alternative with new facilities in a different park, there is a risk that a new set of stakeholders will be upset. With regard to the County’s schedule, a new round of stakeholder conversations and process would present a challenge.

- Cheryl Eastberg asked if Jeff was hypothetically suggesting Lincoln Park. She also asked if his point about stakeholder involvement meant that going through with an alternative in some parks is better than others.

- Jeff confirmed that the use of Lincoln Park for storage would create a new set of stakeholders. He explained that from a schedule standpoint, the County must have a facility plan in place at the end of the year. There will be additional stakeholder involvement if we simply move the problem to a different park.
- John Comick said that no matter which alternative is chosen; people will come out of the woodwork with concerns. It does not make sense to limit alternatives with metrics such as stakeholder involvement. We have informed people from the other basins and this information has been in the local blog. No matter how much we offer it, there will inevitably be people who say they did not hear the information.

Jeff reiterated Kevin Stoops' explanation of Seattle Parks Department's requirements for siting facilities in parks which include demonstrating that there is no other feasible alternative, attaining agreement from the Seattle City Council, and potentially enduring a lengthy appeal session. He explained that, again, from a schedule standpoint, those risks are difficult to overcome. Cost is another category here, but will be addressed later.

2. Expansion of the Barton Pump Station

There are three alternatives which include the expansion of the Barton pump station (CAG1, CAG5, and CAG6). There are two major achievability considerations for this feature which are stakeholder involvement and constructability. Stakeholder involvement includes the same risks as feature #1, except there are some differences considering the extensive work with the Barton community over the last several years. The County would essentially have to start over with the stakeholders who took a great deal of time working with the County to come up with the current plan.

- Linda Sullivan asked if the CAG members understood how alternatives they have suggested would impact the Barton pump station and the process that King County has undergone with the Barton community related to work on the Barton pump station. She noted that the similarities between the Barton and Murray basin communities are striking, and each has a pump station on its shoreline. In the past, King County's approach to upgrading pump stations (not CSO facilities) was programmatic -- that is, replace generators in several pump stations as part of one program, replace odor control equipment as part of another program, etc., etc. For an agency that maintains many pump stations, this was an efficient way to accomplish upgrades. However, it meant construction was too frequent and impacted communities. In 2006-2007, King County identified a single comprehensive project for a significant upgrade to the Barton station. A separate project was identified for the Murray pump station. These were pump station projects, not CSO projects. In 2008 King County took the Barton community by surprise when it purchased a residence adjacent to the pump station. The community feared this was part of a plan to expand the pump station into the community. At the time, King County did not have a plan for the house. Over time, King County identified an alternative for construction which does not expand the existing Barton pump station. In the time since, design has progressed and King County has established a positive working relationship with the Barton community. King County also has worked with Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to mitigate ferry impacts. An agreement is pending which addresses impacts to WSDOT by ensuring construction schedules are staggered and not impacting north lane traffic during peak hours and peak seasons. A less desirable solution would have rerouted ferries to Colman Dock, on King County's tab. All of this work is related to design plans that are scheduled to go into construction in 2012.

Jeff explained that for alternatives requiring any expansion of the Barton pump station, construction would run over the footprint of the existing structure and into residential areas. This is a constructability challenge.

- Patrick Gordon said he did not recall knowing that expanding the Barton pump station required any space beyond the existing footprint. He mentioned that the CAG has no intention of moving the problem to someone else.
 - Penny noted the process in which this came about was that the CAG suggested the alternatives, and then the technical team responded with what it would take to accomplish those alternatives. The technical team found that it would take a large expansion beyond the existing Barton Pump Station footprint to accomplish some of the alternatives.

3. Upper Basin Storage

There is one alternative that addresses upper basin storage (CAG8). The achievability considerations for this feature are stakeholder involvement, because multiple upper basin sites must be engaged, and reliability, because there would be significant control complexity issues. The group should also understand that there would still be a need for significant storage at the bottom of the basin, despite multiple upper basin storage sites.

4. Reliance on Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI)

There are three alternatives that encompass this feature (CAG3, CAG4, and CAG7).

- Cheryl Eastberg asked if the use of this feature would require partnership with the City.

Jeff explained that GSI is difficult to rely upon. He asked what degree of public participation King County should rely on. Some of the alternatives factor in 100% participation and others are partial. Realistically, participation will fall between those two extremes. Also, GSI is a relatively new technique in CSO control and has not been tested extensively.

- Tracy Tackett agreed that GSI has not been tested extensively, but was confident that it could be designed in a way that would work. She mentioned that the high amount of public participation for some alternatives was more of a concern to her.

Jeff also noted that GSI could be considered for “phased implementation” or extra “relief” technology if the County is not able to achieve CSO control via its initial solution implementation.

- Chas Redmond noted that Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) has managed to get us to 70% compliance with recycling, and that reliability does not seem like a good metric here.

Cost Considerations Discussion

Jeff then introduced a slide on cost considerations. The previously discussed achievability considerations were listed, and planning level costs were listed for all 17 alternatives. The planning level cost for each alternative includes estimated construction costs, land and mitigation costs, and permitting costs. These costs do not include life-cycle costs that are typically considered such as power consumption, cleaning, maintenance, et cetera, because during an initial screening they are not as impactful for comparison purposes as the initial costs. When the list of alternatives has been narrowed, life-cycle costs will be factored in. The matrix also indicates relative costs, comparing each alternative to the lowest cost alternative.

Jeff noted that park mitigation costs have been estimated and included at \$8 million for those alternatives that would permanently alter the use of Lowman Beach Park and Lincoln Park. Alternatives such as CAG1 which could return Lincoln Pak to its original use have estimated park mitigation costs of \$1 million.

- Ron Sterling noted that there must be some accounting for alternatives that affect costs in the adjacent basin. The costs presented do not reflect reduced costs or cost savings if a Murray solution includes the Barton CSO solution.
 - Jeff noted that Ron is correct, but that he will have to think about which alternatives that includes.
- Chas Redmond wondered why only one cost is shown and not a range.
- Kate Dee asked if these costs portrayed above-ground facilities, or if it included costs for burying portions underground.
 - Jeff explained that the original cost estimates were made when the design was all above grade.
- Bill Beyers said that these costs do not account for congestion, impacts to neighborhoods, and other social costs. There are ways to determine valuation by certain hedonic pricing methods, and the County's assessment of costs is a very narrow concept of cost. As a community member, Bill said he is concerned with more than what the County is presenting.
 - Jeff explained that he avoids running that level of cost analysis for this many alternatives. He noted that the types of cost Bill were referring to are almost never included in this type of an evaluation purely from a dollars standpoint. These types of impacts are typically addressed in criteria such as community impacts, environmental impacts etc. and don't get into any type of monetary value being established.
- Regarding alternative KC1b, Sharon Best asked what it means that "constructability" is checked as an achievability consideration, but that it is the lowest cost alternative.
 - Linda explained that cost is detached from other considerations for this exercise. The check-marks reflect impediments to achievability.
 - Jeff explained that it does not mean the alternative cannot be done, but rather that it brings significant challenges.
 - Kate Dee said that the challenge means more money. Either you can do an alternative or you cannot. Kate expressed that she was currently in favor of the cheapest alternative on the board.
 - Linda said that permitting, for instance, could be a constructability issue. When King County talks about parks impact or permitting impact, it means that there is a significant risk in selecting an alternative that could have a prolonged approval process. The County does not want to select an alternative that has been predicted to evoke more public process.
- Patrick asked if the issue of challenge or appeals and permitting is wrapped up in constructability, as well as stakeholder involvement, are we doubling its negative impact.
 - Penny explained that when permitting had to do with issues like steep slopes it was considered under constructability, but if it had to do with community impacts it was marked under stakeholder involvement.

- Kate Dee pointed out that there were no check-marks next to the option that suggested eminent domain.
 - Jeff said he did not want to give the impression that the listed achievability factors are the only factors being considered. The exercise presented tonight was simply a chance for the County to provide initial feedback on the achievability of alternatives that included some common features which appeared to be major impediments to implementation.
- Don Stark said that this is not about constructability, but rather political uncertainty. He suggested there be more columns, and that the existing achievability considerations be segmented into “real” and “not-so-real” pieces so that the CAG can understand what matters.
 - Bill Beyers noted that stakeholder involvement should be checked for every alternative, or it should be eliminated as a column and simply assumed for all alternatives.
 - Linda said that some alternatives would elicit strong public opposition, which is captured by the check-marks.
- Kate Dee said that she feels King County has been talking to the CAG for all of this time for the purpose of buy-in.
 - Linda said that King County has an obligation to let communities know when they are considering major impacts to them. Some of those impacts are discussed publicly, some would be surprises.
 - Penny added that the County’s intent with this achievability consideration was not to build buy-in, but rather to identify where an intensive public process might be necessary in case the chosen alternative might galvanize another equally long discussion.
- Ron Sterling noted that the permits required for some alternatives might extend project schedules beyond King County’s achievability standards, but that is not the CAG’s responsibility. It is not the CAG’s place to predict what will or will not be mitigated. He asked what the Department of Ecology would do if someone at the City Council did not approve of the CAG’s recommendation, and this process lasted an additional two years. He asked if the State could hold King County responsible for delays that City Council causes.
 - Linda said that she did not know what the Department of Ecology would do. She agreed that it is not the CAG’s responsibility to predict what will make it through the appeal process. King County’s intent was to help the CAG understand the County’s opinions and risks, and decisions that must be made. All kinds of risks will certainly be considered.
- John Comick said that the CAG may feel that a particular risk is less than King County’s assessment of it. He thought the CAG may have a different take on risk, having lived in the community. He also asked if reliability and constructability could be divided up, to isolate issues that are technically off the table.
 - Penny reminded the CAG members that their next step is to apply the guiding principles to all of the alternatives. She agreed that the CAG might think differently about values and risks than King County, but that the four achievability risk factors were important for the County to consider.
- Chas Redmond said, in relation to Bill’s comment about social costs, he looked up the number of cars on Lincoln Parkway and found it was roughly 4600 cars per day. That equates to 92,000 minutes of lost time if a 20 minute detour is put in place. The element of constructability should contain community impacts such as this.

- Penny said she hears the CAG asking for factors such as constructability and reliability to be divided out. She asked if the group would like to know more about how the County applies those factors, or if the CAG's guiding principles line up with those factors?
 - Chas replied that the CAG members need costs. If choosing a particular alternative means that Lincoln Parkway is closed, and 4600 people need to find another way to move around, there may be another component that has a lower impact in that area.
 - Penny asked if the CAG thinks King County can realistically come up with those numbers for all 17 alternatives.
 - Linda said there are five categories of screening criteria, and one is permitting and traffic disruption. She said she is hearing that the CAG wants to call the County's attention to the significance of traffic impacts. She asked that they continue to do so, so that when King County goes through screening, the team will see that flag next to traffic impacts, and the CAG's community expertise is more valuable than a traffic assessment.
- Bill Beyers asked why there is only a single cost figure, and not a range. He requested that the County distribute the information used to come up with the single figure. Looking at the CAG's guiding principles, this group might have different concepts of cost than King County does. At some point, those two must come together, and if the phrases do not match up, that evaluation will be difficult. He suggested that the County supply a matrix of the 17 alternatives against Linda's broad categories of evaluation criteria.
 - Penny noted that the packet of maps distributed to the group included language that matched the County's criteria.
- Cheryl Eastberg suggested that each of the headings be defined in the key of the Alternatives Comparison - Cost slide. She said she would be interested in hearing what Jeff thought they were when he created the slide, and it would be a starting point for the CAG to see what costs might be missing. She also said that the CAG needs to consider permanent versus short-term impacts. People might worry that they will not be able to drive their car for a week, but it might be better than permanently losing a green space.
- Patrick Gordon said there is no real consistency between the achievability factors and the six categories on King County's Factors for Comparing Alternatives document. There should be six columns that mimic that document. At that point, the CAG can build a document that lives through the entire conversation, and is consistent for everyone.
 - Linda said she is hearing the CAG ask King County to walk through a screening with them. However, there were 12-18 project team members who participated in that lengthy process, and the few King County representatives here cannot speak definitively for those people. Instead, the County is attempting to create thumbnails to convey the features that it considers to be significant deterrents in the viability of particular alternatives. If we, as a group, could discuss the substance of these documents, we might be able to get past consistency issues.
- Chas Redmond said that he considers alternatives CAG7 and KC5a identical, and they do not vary much in price, however, one is considered less reliable than the other.
 - Jeff explained the reason King County gave a check-mark to KC5a on reliability is because that particular alternative required building a large diameter storage pipe in Beach Drive by open-cut. The project team no longer believes that can be done there due to depth. The team looked at what elevation would be needed to intercept flows at Murray pump station, and the depth exceeded what can reasonably be open-cut. Beach Drive would have to be tunneled, which is more expensive, and different constructability

issues arise there. There would be large traffic impacts for 2-3 months at a time, and the depth is getting to the point of slope instability.

- Kate noted that 2-3 months does not seem like a long time. Also, all alternatives that involve cutting up Beach Drive include above ground features at Lowman Beach Park. That kind of impact will be permanent. Each of the street alternatives involves putting odor control and electrical at the park, and activity and maintenance will still occur at Lowman Beach Park. Park impacts should be “check-marked” on every street alternative.
- Linda Cox, on behalf of Scott Gunderson, asked if the technical team had asked Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) about their current plan for repairing Beach Drive.
 - Jeff said that they had not asked SDOT again, since the first time when SDOT replied that repairing Beach Drive was not in their current or future plans. SDOT plans in the area include Metro improvements along Fauntleroy Way.
 - John Comick said that SDOT does not have plans to fix Beach Drive because they do not have the money to do so. In any case, the street has failed. So far, SDOT has only tried to fix streets that have not failed. John also asked if any of the alternatives proposed are not technically feasible, and for King County to inform the CAG of those alternatives now as opposed to later.
- Jim Coombes asked what the plan to narrow down the 17 alternatives is.

Penny distributed the CAG Recommendations Process document, and explained that the first cut of alternatives will be difficult, but that is what the CAG needs to do next. It does not make sense to fully assess 17 alternatives, so the CAG’s next step must be to decide which alternatives or features of alternatives are worthy of further consideration. If an alternative is worthy of more analyses, it would be above the line. If an alternative falls below the line, it should be left behind. The CAG should run through its Guiding Principles, and partner them with alternatives that are acceptable to solve the County’s CSO problem. Penny noted that Linda must give direction to her team to prepare for the next meeting, so she asked the group to identify key information they need that will allow them to narrow the list of alternatives.

- Cheryl Eastberg said she would need a rough breakdown of what went into the cost estimates.
 - Jeff said he will provide that detail.
- Don Stark would like some notion of the present value of all life-cycle costs.
 - Jeff explained that the technical team does not have those available, and that they will not have a large impact with regard to making cuts. The life-cycle costs will certainly add to the bottom line, but for comparison purposes, will not change these alternatives.
- Kate Dee would like to know which of the alternatives are physically impossible for certain reasons. For example, if a piece of property is federally designated as wetlands, is it off the table? If so, why is it still included?
 - Penny said that up to this point, the County has been deliberately neutral with the alternatives presented by the community as well as the County’s original nine alternatives, and have not thrown any out.
 - Bill Beyers said the CAG was never provided the information about those constraints; otherwise they would not have proceeded with that alternative.
- Chas Redmond asked if the most expensive “red” boxes in the cost comparison slide were the alternatives that included significant piping or pumping.

- Jeff confirmed that the majority of the high cost alternatives include both large pump stations and storage.
- John Comick asked what happens if one of the alternatives negates the need for another, does that show in the cost column.
- Chas Redmond asked if King County knew of any “lurking” alternatives that the CAG had not come up with.
 - Jeff said he was not aware of any.
- Don Stark said that with regard for GSI implementation, there is no certainty on its measurement or effectiveness here, but have we thought of buying GSI retention uphill, meaning that incentives are provided to encourage people to disconnect or install GSI?
 - Tracy Tackett said that the participation rates that have been entered into the GSI alternatives assume that it is being funded – people will have incentives to participate already.
- Patrick Gordon asked if it is possible to reframe some of the documents to be more consistent with the King County criteria sheet.
 - Linda confirmed that they could reframe the achievability matrices to be consistent with King County criteria documents. It can be recast at a higher level, where categories will include factors such as land use, permitting, cost-effectiveness, community-impact, etc.

ACTION: Reframe achievability matrix to be consistent with the Factors for Comparing Alternatives document.

- Bill Beyers asked that the text description for each alternative be given to the CAG.
 - Linda explained that King County had already provided that information to the CAG.
- Chas Redmond asked if any other stakeholder groups have lessons to pass on to us, or documentation from other CSO projects that would benefit the CAG.
 - Linda said criteria documentation has been used for two other basins where project teams have executed screenings. Despite the fact that recommendations have been made, no public announcements regarding alternatives have been made yet since additional issues continue to arise. King County is still waiting for our “lessons learned.”
 - Jeff noted that the Murray basin has been the toughest of the four CSO Beach Project basins to address. Many of the constraints and complications presented here at the Murray basin were not issues at the other basins.
- Kate Dee asked that the technical team consider all alternatives with the stipulation that storage tanks and all ancillary facilities be put underground.
 - Linda explained that King County has already committed to placing tanks and ancillary facilities underground if they are placed in a park. The CAG may create any guidelines it wants.

Closing

Meeting #7 will be:

Wednesday, September 15, 2010

5:30 – 8:00 p.m.

Fauntleroy Community Services Agency Building (Old Fauntleroy School)
9131 California Ave SW

Action Items

- ✓ Ron Sterling will approve or disapprove of Penny's revision to his addition in the Meeting 4 Summary, and the summary will be finalized and reposted.
- ✓ CAG members should review the draft guiding principles carefully so that they can be finalized and used to evaluate alternatives.
- ✓ Provide detail and breakdown of cost estimates for each alternative.
- ✓ Reframe achievability matrix to be consistent with the Factors for Comparing Alternatives document.