

---

## 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 North Beach 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 for 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.

### 9.3 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS COMPLIANCE

All projects that receive financial assistance from the State Water Pollution Control Revolving Loan Fund (SRF) must meet the provisions of the State Environmental Review Process (SERP) (WAC 173-98-100). SERP compliance helps ensure that environmentally sound alternatives are selected and that these satisfy the state's responsibility to ensure recipients comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The following sections summarize compliance with the applicable federal regulations under SERP. King County will complete SERP for the proposed project, including preparation of a SERP Environmental Information Checklist.

### **9.3.1 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 possible 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.

### **9.3.2 Clean Air Act**

The Clean Air Act establishes a comprehensive program for improving and maintaining air quality throughout the United States. A review of air quality issues for the proposed alternative is summarized in Section 6.2.

### **9.3.3 Coastal Zone Management Act**

The project is not within designated shorelines. Therefore, the Coastal Zone Management Act regulations and requirements are not applicable.

### **9.3.4 Endangered Species Act**

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act prohibits federal agency actions from jeopardizing listed species or adversely modifying designated critical habitat. A review of endangered/threatened species and habitats in the project area is summarized in Section 6.2.

### **9.3.5 Farmland Protection Policy Act**

The proposed alternative area is not located on the inventory of prime or unique farmlands and will not impact or convert any existing farmlands to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the Farmland Protection Policy Act regulations and requirements are not applicable.

### **9.3.6 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act**

There are no fish-bearing streams or water bodies within the project area. Therefore, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act regulations and requirements are not applicable.

### **9.3.7 Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management**

The proposed alternative project area is not located within a mapped Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain. Therefore, the regulations and requirements of Executive Order 11988 are not applicable.

### **9.3.8 Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands**

The proposed alternative project area does not include any wetlands. Therefore, the regulations and requirements of Executive Order 11990 are not applicable.

### **9.3.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act**

The purpose of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is to preserve the scenic, cultural, historic, recreational, and geologic values of selected rivers. No federally recognized wild and scenic rivers are in the project area. Therefore, the regulations and requirements of this act are not applicable.

## **9.4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH**

The goal of public involvement and outreach was to inform interested citizens about the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Beach Project in the North Beach 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.

### **9.4.1 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.

#### **9.4.2 Public Meetings and Briefings**

King County hosted public meetings, community group meetings and briefings, and one tribal briefing 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 press releases. During the alternatives selection process, over 250 people attended a public meeting, community meeting or briefing, or tribal briefing.

##### **9.4.2.1 Public Meetings**

- October 19, 2009: A public open house was held to provide residents with broad background on the CSO control problem in North Beach, explain approaches identified to control CSOs, provide information on how to stay up to date on progress, and solicit input.
- March 30, 2010: A public meeting was held to present the three preferred CSO control alternatives and solicit public input.
- June 26, 2010: A technical information session was held to respond to citizens' requests for technical information and to answer questions about the process to identify and screen CSO control alternatives.
- October 19, 2010: A public meeting was held to review the county's decision process for selecting the recommended alternative, convey how community input influenced the decision process, share detailed information about the selection, and present next steps in the process.

##### **9.4.2.2 Community Group Meetings and Briefings**

September 24, 2009: Olympic Manor Club hosted a community meeting to inform local residents about the CSO control problem in North Beach and solicit public input.

November 16, 2009: Blue Ridge Community Club hosted a community meeting with the same intent as the Olympic Manor Club.

February 29, 2008: A meeting was held at Crown Hill Elementary to explore the use of the site for CSO control.

Between February, 2007 and July, 2010, nine community briefings were held for neighborhood groups, including Piper's Creek Watershed Council, Blue Ridge Community Club, North Beach Club, and the Broadview Task Force. The community briefings were held at the request of the community to address concerns specific to each community group.

#### **9.4.2.3 Tribal Briefings**

June 2010: King County briefed the Suquamish Tribe on the three preferred alternatives and solicited their input.

Public input from all meetings and briefings was used to identify an alternative for further review. Almost all of the respondents recognized the need to address the CSO problem in North Beach. Most respondents from both Blue Ridge and North Beach encouraged construction of the storage pipeline in the street to avoid any impacts on Blue Ridge Park. Many encouraged purchase of private property for construction use and any present or future need, avoiding use of Blue Ridge Park for these activities. Community members and the Suquamish Tribe have expressed concerns about potential health and environmental impacts related to the onshore CSO outfall at North Beach as well as the community impacts should the aging forcemain fail.

A very small number of residents responded that addressing the CSO problem outweighed concerns about impacts to Blue Ridge Park

#### **9.4.3 Public Information**

##### **9.4.3.1 Project Website**

In 2009 a project website, [www.kingcounty.gov/CSObeachprojects](http://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 summaries, 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.

### **9.4.3.2 Project Mailings**

A newsletter was mailed to about 5,000 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 fall 2010, a postcard was sent to basin residents to announce the recommended alternative and invite community members to a public meeting. The postcard referred residents to the website for further details and provided contact information for King County staff.

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

### **9.4.4 Comment Tracking and Response Process**

Over 200 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 incorporated into the alternative selection process and facility plan, and was used for planning public meetings and briefings. 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.