

**Murray Basin Citizens Advisory Group (CAG)**  
**Proposed Guiding Principles Revisions (Patrick Gordon)**  
29 August 2010

The following revisions are proposed to the Guiding Principles forwarded by Penny Maybe on Friday 27 August 2010. In them I have attempted to retain the intent expressed in each concept, but revise the language to accomplish the following:

- Express a framework principle that captures the values and an agreed-upon planning intent that can be applied to the project regardless of a particular solution
- Eliminate language that is directed solely at a specific solution to either advance or eliminate it
- Reduce redundancy among the current 17 Guiding Principles
- Capture the intent of the Guiding Principle concept, but eliminate references to specific measures, solutions, locations, etc. in order that the principle can be applied across the series of alternatives
- Be utilized to establish a framework for defining and weighting evaluation criteria to be utilized in the review and evaluation of County and Community alternatives. *(This point is crucial in my mind. Guiding Principles by definition are not evaluation criteria. Rather, they should articulate a set of agree-upon values that are utilized in the development of alternative solutions. Evaluation criteria should be developed and weighted in a manner that incorporates the values expressed in the Guiding Principles).*

In the following proposed revisions, I reference a numbered sequence that coincides with the order in the chart referenced above (ie Guiding Principles 1 through 17). As before, the intent is not to prioritize or rank them in any order.

**Draft Summary of Guiding Principles**

**1. Share Responsibilities For Solutions**

*(Combined 1. Equity Among Communities, and 4. Downstream Impacts)*

The responsibility for reduction/elimination of CSO overflows into Puget Sound resides with each neighborhood, community, basin and municipality that contributes to the problem. The burden and impacts of the solution should be shared both quantitatively and qualitatively within the respective basin in relative proportion to its contribution to the problem, in order that there are no “downstream” impacts. *(In other words, don't push the problem on to the next basin downstream).*

**2. Prioritize Siting and Locations for CSO “Facilities”**

*(Combined 2. Parks and 3. Private Property Siting Locations/Preferences).*

In compliance with the intent of the current City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan and Land-Use Ordinances, considerations to preserve and protect the unique scale, character, natural features and vegetation of parks, neighborhoods and communities should be in the forefront in the prioritization for siting CSO facilities.

Siting of CSO facilities should be strategically prioritized in order to preclude or

minimize the increased “footprint” of such facilities on land not currently used for “utility” purposes; and every effort should be explored to utilize existing public right-of-way, public surplus property, and under-utilized public property in lieu of parks and private property obtained either through acquisition of eminent domain.

### **3. Embrace Environmental Stewardship**

*(Combined 5. Green Solutions vs Gray and 6. Environmental)*

Solutions for CSO overflows should incorporate the highest aspirations for environmental stewardship and serve as models for environmental sustainability through improvements that enhance water and air quality, reduce noise, enhance marine habitat and migration, pursue both land-side and water-side practices that minimize the negative environmental footprint of all elements of potential solutions, and broaden community awareness of the need and methodologies for control.

Considerations should be given to employ solutions and materials that do no further harm to the environment and make quantifiable, effective and long-term improvements, both as an end goal for the project and as a guide for methodology and implementation.

### **4. Analyze Costs on a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Basis**

*(Former 7. Costs)*

Evaluate solutions for CSO facilities on the basis of a Total Cost of Ownership analysis that considers short-term project costs and long term operational costs.

Short-term project costs should incorporate acquisition, mitigation and initial construction costs, as well as a comprehensive listing of all “soft” costs for consulting, environmental reviews, permitting, financing and other agency considerations. Long-term costs should consider maintenance, labor, replacement and other operating costs in a fifty year time frame.

### **5. Minimize Short-Term Construction Impacts**

*(Former 8. Short-Term (Construction) Impacts)*

Solutions for CSO facilities should be implemented in a manner that minimizes impacts on and disruptions to individual properties, neighborhoods and communities in terms of use of streets and sidewalks, noise, avoidable disturbances, and property values.

Construction should be accomplished within applicable street-use and other permitting regulations that address access, safety, security, monitoring and allowable time periods for work.

### **6. Minimize Long-Term Operational Impacts**

*(Former 9. Long-Term Impacts (Life Cycle)).*

Solutions for CSO facilities should incorporate considerations to minimize or avoid unsightly and inappropriate visual structures, operational noise and odors,

disruptive access facilities, and other permanent conditions that will negatively impact the use, character and value of adjacent properties or spaces.

**7. Strive For Long-Term, Comprehensive and Adaptable Solutions**  
*(Combine 10. Long-Term Reliability and 12. Storage Size (Safety Factors)).*

Solutions for CSO facilities should exemplify durability, simplicity, expandability, adaptability and ease of maintenance over a fifty year lifetime (minimum), and provide capacity within a reasonable margin of error and cost to accommodate future unpredictable climatic changes and weather patterns.

**8. Incorporate and Leverage Community Values and Assets**  
*(Combine 11. Incorporating Community Values in Facility Siting, and 14. Leverage Community Assets).*

Solutions for CSO facilities should be designed and constructed in a manner that acknowledges and protects a neighborhood and community character, its unique places and spaces, its scale, land-uses, and the amenities that define and support its identity and values. When possible, solutions should enhance these neighborhood and community assets through improving streets, sidewalks, community facilities and open spaces.

**9. Implement Comprehensive Solutions**  
*(Former 13. Comprehensive Solutions)*

Solutions for CSO facilities should follow a bold vision and be adaptable over time. They should be planned and implemented in a fully coordinated effort between and among regulatory bodies (State, County and City), agencies and departments in a manner that anticipates and incorporates planned and anticipated projects in order to avoid conflicts, unnecessary overlaps and re-work, and to leverage the opportunity to maximize the value achieved for the effort.

**10. Incorporate Best Practices**  
*(Former 15. Leveraging Best Practices)*

Solutions for CSO facilities should be planned in a manner that seeks out all opportunities to incorporate newest technologies and proven best practices and approaches to provide the County, City and Community with outcomes that achieve their collective aspirations for addressing CSO overflows.

**11. Avoid Unintended Consequences**  
*(Former 17. Unintended Consequences)*

Every effort should be taken during the planning and selection process to review each alternative for compliance with these Guiding Principles and to assess them not only for effectiveness, appropriateness and compliance, but also to explore potential unintended consequences. Proposed solutions should be evaluated by neutral (non-advocate) parties to ensure there are no unintended negative consequences to the environment or the Community.