

DRAFT TEAM MEMORANDUM

Project Name: Puget Sound Beaches Project **Date:** 8/19/09
Client: KCDNRP WTD **Project Number:** 7562A.10
Prepared By: Brian Matson
Reviewed By: Criteria Focus Group
Subject: Developing Criteria for Evaluating CSO Alternatives
Distribution: Team

Introduction:

This memorandum describes the process that will be used to develop criteria for evaluating CSO control alternatives for the Puget Sound Beaches Project.

Decision Making Process Overview:

A five step process will be used to select the preferred CSO control alternative in each basin, as described below:

Step 1: Identify potentially viable CSO control approaches.

Step 1A: Define Criteria Categories that will be used to determine viability of CSO control approaches.

Status - done. Nine (9) Criteria Categories have been selected, as described later in this memorandum.

Step 1B: Screen CSO control approaches using Criteria Categories.

Status - done. All four approaches (or combinations of approaches) remain in consideration.

Step 2: Confirm potentially viable CSO control approaches with agency stakeholders.

Status - done. The May 7, 2009 Agency Workshop No. 1 was used to present the overall CSO control approaches being considered. Input gained from the workshop will be used to help develop and refine alternatives and criteria in Step 3.

Step 3: Develop and evaluate CSO control alternatives.

Step 3A: Develop evaluation criteria to be used within the Criteria Categories.

Status - ongoing. The process used to develop and apply the criteria is described in this Memorandum.

Step 3B: In each basin, develop up to nine (9) CSO control alternatives for evaluation.

Status - ongoing. Model calibration is complete. See attached for more information on the process of matching CSO control approaches to candidate sites.

Step 4: Incorporate input from Step 3, and screen potential CSO control alternatives from nine (9) down to three (3) final alternatives in each basin.

Step 5: Incorporate input from Step 4, refine the evaluation, and in each basin select the recommended alternative from the three (3) final alternatives.

NOTE: During Steps 3 through 5, a series of Agency Workshops and Public Meetings will be used to gain input that will inform criteria development, alternative analysis, and ultimately alternative selection.

Definitions:

CSO Control Approach - Four (4) separate approaches are considered, including: 1) Convey and Treat; 2) Storage; 3) End-of-pipe Treatment; and 4) Peak Flow Reduction.

CSO Control Alternative - A given CSO control approach (e.g. Storage) applied at a given site within the basin.

Criteria - The standards that will be used to judge and select the recommended CSO control alternative within each basin.

Criteria Categories - Broad categories used to group criteria, and communicate to external stakeholders and affected public. The seven (7) categories and respective Category Leaders are listed in the table below:

Category	Description	Category Leader
1.	Land Use / Acquisition / Permitting	Pam Erstad / Hein Dung
2.	Environmental Impact	Sue Meyer
3.	Technical	Basin Leads
4.	O&M	Ron Kohler
5.	Cost	Shahrazad Namini
6.	Compatibility / Policy	John Phillips
7.	Community Impact	Martha Tuttle / Monica Van der Vieren

Category Leader - An individual or individuals from the CSO planning team assigned to develop criteria information used to evaluate CSO control alternatives.

Criteria Focus Group - A smaller group within the CSO planning team that will review information developed by the Criterion Category Leaders before use.

Rating Scale - A scale that includes Low, Moderate, and High that will be used to judge how an alternative "scores". On the scale, a "Low Impact" is good, and a "High Impact" is poor.

Instructions for Criteria Development:

Category Leaders should develop criteria for alternative analysis in three steps as follows:

1. Select up to five (5) criteria for each category.
Example: In the O&M category, one criteria may be "Reliability", another may be "Site Access", etc...
2. Develop up to two (2) questions to be answered for each criterion. These questions will be used to "test" the impact of a particular alternative on the criteria being considered.
Example: For the "Reliability" criterion, one question may be, "Does the alternative rely on complex automation for successful operation?". Another question may be, "Has the alternative proven to be a reliable CSO control method in other installations?"
3. Develop a description of how the criterion will be measured using the rating scale (i.e. Low, Moderate, and High impact).
Example: For the question, "Does the alternative rely on complex automation for successful operation?", a "High" score would be described by, "The alternative requires substantial automation of mechanical equipment for performance." A "Low" score would be described by, "The alternative is relatively simple and requires limited automation and equipment for performance."

Schedule:

Criteria for alternatives evaluation will be developed according to the following schedule:

Activity	Responsible Party	Date
Review and discuss criteria development process at Team Meeting	Criteria Focus Group	6/10/09
Complete Step 1 - select up to five criteria per category	Category Leaders	6/17/09
Review and present selected criteria at Team Meeting	Criteria Focus Group	6/24/09
Complete Step 2 - develop up to two questions per criterion	Category Leaders	7/01/09
Review and present criteria questions at Team Meeting	Criteria Focus Group	7/08/09
Complete Step 3 - describe how each criterion will be measured using the rating scale	Category Leaders	7/15/09
Review and present rating scale descriptions at Team Meeting	Criteria Focus Group	7/22/09

Resources:

1. Attachment 1 - TM 203.1, August 2007
2. Attachment 2 - Alternatives Analysis Table and Examples