
MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS

The State of Washington *Criteria for Sewage Works Design* (Ecology, August 2008) has a number of miscellaneous requirements for a complete facility plan. The following sections provide documentation of these miscellaneous requirements including information on water quality management plan conformance, SEPA/SERP compliance, and public involvement.

9.1 WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN CONFORMANCE

King County's Regional Wastewater Services Plan addresses water quality management with respect to the sewer system and CSOs. The RWSP identifies wastewater projects to be built through 2030 to protect human health and the environment, serve population growth, and meet regulatory requirements.

The RWSP includes a CSO Control Plan that consists of the amended 1988 CSO Control Plan (1995 Plan Update), identification of 21 CSO control projects, and a goal for achieving control at each CSO location by 2030. The 2000 *CSO Control Plan Update* was included in the West Point NPDES permit application. The 2008 *CSO Control Plan Update* submitted to Ecology as part of the West Point NPDES permit identified the South Magnolia CSO Project as one of four high-priority projects.

9.2 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT COMPLIANCE

Compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act is a prerequisite to obtaining any permits/approvals for a CSO project. SEPA allows agencies to both consider and mitigate for environmental impacts of proposals as well as to provide opportunities for public participation prior to any final decision.

King County, as SEPA lead agency, will conduct SEPA reviews for this project. SEPA documents will be provided in Appendix D when available.

9.2.1 National Historic Preservation Act/Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires federal agencies to evaluate the effects of federal undertakings on historical, archaeological, and cultural resources, and to consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding adverse cultural resources impacts. A review of historic, archaeological, and cultural resources that could be impacted by the proposed alternative is summarized in Section 6.2.

9.3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The goal of public involvement and outreach was to inform interested citizens about the Combined Sewer Overflow Beach project in the South Magnolia basin and to provide opportunities for meaningful involvement in the CSO control planning process.

The public process objectives were to:

- Provide timely and clear information to stakeholders and the public about the purpose of the project and their opportunities to participate.
- Conduct a clear, systematic, and objective process for identifying and evaluating alternatives for CSO control and associated wastewater infrastructure (pump station, pipeline, etc.), and selecting preferred alternative(s) and site(s).
- Obtain input from stakeholders and the public on the alternatives and criteria before preferred alternative(s) and site(s) are selected by King County.

9.3.1 Agency Stakeholder Engagement Process

To facilitate stakeholder input, a workshop for local and state agency staff and tribal entities was held on May 7, 2009 to advise the development of the CSO control alternatives and their evaluation criteria. This workshop covered the four basins associated with the CSO Beaches project: North Beach, South Magnolia, Murray, and Barton. Agencies and Tribes were sent a letter of invitation and a reminder email. A meeting summary was sent to all attendees.

The workshop participants reviewed the CSO program, the range of approaches the County considered to address CSOs in the four basins, and its public outreach approach. Participants provided input on the approaches, existing conditions, current and future projects, plans and opportunities for coordination and methods for public outreach. The project team used this input to guide development of the range of alternatives that would be considered as well as to modify the existing public involvement plan where appropriate.

A technical memo was sent in the winter of 2010 to agency stakeholders as the alternatives were narrowed from nine to three. The memo explained how the short list of alternatives was determined and solicited written comments to inform the identification of an alternative for environmental review. Stakeholders will receive a letter explaining how their input was used to inform the process, as well as provide information about the upcoming SEPA process. Agencies were also notified via email of all public meetings.

Elected officials (King County Executive, Councilmember Larry Phillips, Seattle City Councilmember, Rasmussen), agencies (Department of Ecology, Seattle Public Utilities and Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods Committee, Suquamish, Muckelshoot and Tulalip Tribes) and regional committees (Metropolitan Water Pollution Abatement Advisory Committee and Regional Water Quality Committee) were briefed at key milestones for each basin.

9.3.2 Public Information

King County hosted public meetings and community group meetings and briefings between 2007 and 2010 to provide information about the development of CSO control alternatives and to facilitate active public participation in the planning process. In advance of the public meetings, postcards or newsletters were mailed to property owners in the basin area, people who had joined the mailing list, and representatives of community organizations who had expressed interest in the planning process. Email notifications were sent to the County's contact lists and community organizations with listservs for additional distribution. Notices of public meetings were available on the project and King County website and were provided to local and regional media through news releases.

9.3.2.1 Public Meetings

- October 22, 2009: A public open house was held to provide an overview of the CSO control problem in South Magnolia, to explain approaches identified to control CSOs, provide information on how to stay up to date on progress, and solicit input.
- March 23, 2010: A public meeting was held to present the three proposed CSO control alternatives and solicit public input.

9.3.2.2 Community Meetings and Briefings

- June 19, 2007: King County presented information on the CSO control program at a regularly scheduled Magnolia Community Council meeting.
- October 11, 2007: A community meeting was co-sponsored by the Magnolia Community and King County to introduce the Wastewater Treatment Division and the South Magnolia CSO control project.
- October 20, 2010: King County presented information on CSO control in South Magnolia to the Port of Seattle Neighborhood Advisory Committee.

Public input from all meetings and briefings was used to identify an alternative for further review. All respondents recognized the need to address the CSO problem in South Magnolia. The community expressed a desire for a green infrastructure solution but understood that feasibility of GSI to address CSOs in Magnolia was limited by topography, soils, and the high storage volume required to meet control requirements.

Respondents expressed strong concern and opposition to the proposed underground storage tank in the ravine on 32nd Avenue W, citing slope stability issues, construction impacts, and proximity to the shoreline area. Several community members promoted the Port of Seattle storage site for an underground storage tank, with encouragement to restore the surface as wildlife habitat to enhance the Smith Cove Park area. The Magnolia Community Club expressed interest in mitigation available to the community as part of these projects. People expressed concerns about environmental protection during construction and restoration.

9.3.3 Public Information

9.3.3.1 Project Website

In 2009 a project website, www.kingcounty.gov/CSObeachprojects, was established to make information on the development of the CSO control approaches available to the public. A link to the project website was made available on the Wastewater Treatment Division's homepage and provided to the public in meeting notices, press releases, newsletters, emails and at meetings.

Notice of all public meetings and stakeholder workshops were posted on the website. After public meetings, written summary, presentations, and handouts were made available on the website. Interested parties were able to sign up for the project mailing list and were provided a phone and email contact for King County staff.

Technical information was made available on the website as a separate link (<http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/wtd/Construction/Seattle/BeachCSO/Library/TechInfo.aspx>) to allow interested citizens opportunities to better understand the decision process. Individuals could request CD copies of the technical information as needed.

9.3.3.2 Project Mailings

A newsletter was mailed to basin residents in fall 2009 with information about the upcoming decision process for CSO control projects and options for community involvement and participation. The newsletter included a mail-in form to sign up for email updates and/or hard copies of web materials. A second newsletter was sent in spring 2010 to announce the three selected alternatives for CSO control and provide information about a public meeting to discuss the alternatives. Newsletters were also provided as a PDF by email and mailed to local and state agencies and tribes.

In addition to targeted mailings, at key milestones news releases were sent to local and regional media, including blogs, and to city and state agencies for distribution.

9.3.3.3 Comment Tracking and Response Process

Members of the public submitted feedback or input in a variety of ways. Stakeholders and members of the public were invited to ask questions and provide comments at all of the stakeholder workshops and public meetings. The consultant team and representatives of King County responded to comments and questions during those meetings. A summary of public comment and response from each meeting was posted in the meeting summary available on the project website, and a 'frequently asked questions' page was included on the website.

King County community relations planning staff received the comments that were submitted via the website, an online survey, email and phone. The comments were saved by County staff for their records. Some comments were intended to inform the CSO control decision process and did not require a response. For questions and comments that did require a response, King County staff responded via email or phone.

Public input from all meetings, briefings, and comments was used to identify an alternative for further review. Based on the strong level of public input during the decision-making process, specific requests from stakeholders, and King County's commitment to public involvement, the County is planning continued public outreach throughout the design and construction phases. An updated public involvement plan will be developed for design and construction to keep the community and stakeholders engaged and informed, and to respond to concerns during design, environmental review, and construction.

This page intentionally left blank