



Creeks, Drainage, and Wastewater Advisory Committee (CDWAC)

January 28, 2015 Meeting notes
Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue
Room 5965
5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
Co- Chairs: Kendra Aguilar & Noel Miller

Committee Members & CAC Staff	Present?	SPU Staff & Guests	Role
Kendra Aguilar	Y	Holly McCracken	DWW Planning Program Manager
Jeremy Andrews	Y	Tim Ramsaur	DWW Acting Division Director
Marilyn Baylor	Y	Susan Stoltzfus	SPU Communications
Suzie Burke	N*		
C'Ardiss Gardner Gleser	Y		
Schylar Hect	Y		
Kaifu Lam	Y		
Seth McKinney	Y		
Noel Miller	Y		
Devin O'Reilly	N		
Heidi Fischer, Program Support	Y		
Sheryl Shapiro, DWW Policy Liaison CAC Program Manager	Y		
	<i>*excused (provided notification)</i>		

PLEASE NOTE ACTION ITEMS ARE ✓ MARKED AND HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW

Regular Business

- Committee Members and SPU staff briefly introduced themselves.
- December notes are approved.

**Presentation: Drainage and Wastewater System Planning Area Prioritization, Holly McCracken, SPU
Drainage and Wastewater Planning Program Manager**

See the power point and memo for more information.

- An overview of the SPU Drainage and Wastewater (DWW) System Planning Program was given to CDWAC in October 2014 by Julie Crittenden. Holly briefly reviewed the substance of that earlier presentation, and further described the methodology by which SPU develops master plans for the entire city.
- The last “pipe-by-pipe” documented vision for DWW planning was back in the 1970s, when we didn’t have much information about environmental impacts and water quality.
 - We’ve completed studies, comprehensive plans, and performed capital and O&M planning since then, and our vision now is a long range plan that integrates drainage, wastewater, and environmental system planning. However, we also want to be flexible as we plan, by maintaining services and completing projects that are already underway. Further, by responding to emerging issues that require more immediate attention.
- Our plans are tied to the Strategic Business Plan (SBP).
 - We are tasked with meeting the needs of a growing population.
 - We refer to some of our plans as triage, which are concise plans that need to be implemented as soon as possible and have a narrower scope than the Master Plans.
 - We also consider climate change adaptation and service equity.
- Our main task is to coordinate numerous objectives and work closely with other departments, agencies, and developers. The planning department has a staff of five, and pulls resources from across SPU, between City Departments, and from external stakeholders to develop and implement the plans.
- An important word in planning is implementation.
 - In the past, we had problem definitions and solutions, but didn’t sufficiently align them with resources to enable efficient and complete delivery.
 - For example, the Densmore Basin study would have cost up to \$100 million. As a result, we didn’t have the staff or money needed to implement it.
 - Now, we are starting our plans with the ultimate delivery in mind.
- The planning areas are: Piper’s Creek, Thornton Creek, Ballard/Fremont, Green Lake/Aurora/Roosevelt, Magnolia/Queen Anne/Downtown, Capitol Hill to Montlake, Southwest, Southeast, Longfellow, and Duwamish.
 - To identify the areas, we looked at existing infrastructure and topography, since we are primarily a passive system.
 - The planning areas were not created with political boundaries in mind, even though this may have afforded some political advantages. Rather, they are based on scientific principles.
 - With regard to the new City Council Districts, the 5th District will include three of our planning areas, making it the most complex district from this perspective.
- We will implement all of the plans for the ten planning areas. Each one takes 2-3 years, and one is initiated per year.

- We prioritize the plan development due to limited resources and system needs related to future opportunities, growth, and aging infrastructure.
- We employed six steps to prioritize the plans.
 - The first was to characterize each of the areas by
 - Basin Planning Areas
 - Infrastructure
 - Issues and Risks
 - System Layout Needs
 - O&M and CIP Activities
 - Demographics and Land Use
 - Climate Impacts
 - Plans
 - The second step was to get information about each of the following criteria for each area:
 - Opportunities
 - Service Equity
 - Our crews respond to all emergencies, regardless of where the households are in the City. To assess equity, we considered what the impact to a household might be for a sewer backup or other emergency. Recovery from such an event is harder for a household under the median income.
 - Flooding & Sewer Risks (Existing & Future)
 - Environmental Risks
 - Complexity
 - For example, in the Duwamish, there are many efforts underway now, including regulatory actions and capital projects. Sometimes it may be advantageous to let these projects be completed, and then pull all of their information into our plan.
 - Readiness to Plan/Information Needed
 - Tearing up and replacing a road to complete a drainage project is expensive, so we try to coordinate projects that require this with other organizations so we can share the cost.
 - The third was to apply the above criteria, using GIS analysis to rank each planning area in each criterion.
 - The fourth step was to identify the rankings. The top 3 areas at this point were the Duwamish, Magnolia-Queen Anne-Downtown, and Green Lake-Aurora-Roosevelt.
 - We then applied additional criteria concerning complexity and readiness of the projects and the area, and the top 3 areas did not change.
 - We then applied additional criteria concerning the areas' sensitivity to capacity shortfalls in relation to population growth, as well as service equity and sewer

risks. This moved the Duwamish area to the 4th position, and added Thornton Creek to the top 3.

- The fifth step was to determine the schedule.
 - 2014 – 2016
 - Green Lake – Aurora-Roosevelt
 - Magnolia-queen Anne-Downtown
 - Thornton Creek
 - 2017 – 2019
 - Duwamish
 - Southeast
 - Capitol Hill to Montlake
 - 2020-2022
 - Longfellow
 - Southwest
 - Piper’s
 - Ballard/Fremont
- The sixth step is to update and reprioritize as necessary, using adaptive management that uses new information as it become available, and refining the criteria and ranking process as needed.
 - We feel good about the first two plans: Green Lake (which has already been started) and Magnolia-Queen Anne-Downtown.
 - We are currently unsure whether Thornton Creek should remain in the number three spot. We will be doing the prioritization again, but only after Magnolia-Queen Anne-Downtown planning is launched.
 - CDWAC may be able to provide some assistance with future prioritizations.
- Holly passed out a memo: Drainage & Wastewater System Master Plans: Prioritization.

Some Comments and Questions from the Committee and Guests:

- Comment: Now that there will be City Council districts, SPU may get more input from different neighborhoods that may affect planning prioritization. Since people will have one person to contact on the Council, SPU may hear about problems they haven’t heard about before.
- Question: How are equity issues addressed?
- Answer: When people call SPU to report a problem, we enter the data into our database and into our GIS. We need to know about problems to address them, so if people are hesitant to call, it becomes an equity issue. We try to address that with other kinds of information gathering, like public meetings and neighborhood outreach, especially when we’re considering a new project. In South Park, and to a lesser extent, Beacon Hill, we went door to door, often with interpreters, to proactively illicit customer input. We are discussing a pilot program in the

Southeast planning area designed to engage people on flooding and sewer issues by meeting them where they feel safe talking about their problems.

- Any new data gained through outreach can be used in the second round of prioritization. Discussions on how to get the best input for the Green Lake/Aurora/Roosevelt Plan have already started, and the CAC Program Manager, who is also on the Race and Social Justice Team, will be on the Green Lake outreach team.

- Question: Does the number of calls about one problem make a difference in prioritizing? For example, two problems of similar impact in two different areas, but one gets 20 calls, and the other gets 1 call.
- Answer: Once we know about a problem and understand its impact, we use that information to plan, and more reports do not influence our action.

- Comment: It might be nice to also use observations from SPU field crews in prioritizing plans.

- Question: The planning methodology has good data and details. Is there a standard, or a reference from other parts of the country that indicate how these criteria play out?
- Answer: We did look at plans nationwide, and only one or two that we came across are doing the integrated work that we're doing. Not all of them use criteria or put those criteria into the planning documents, but we could explore this.

- Comment: The ranking for each criterion has been summed up for each area without adding additional weighting, when the criteria reflect different concerns, like protecting the environment, service equity, and risk.
- Answer: We did do some weighting in Phase 3, putting capacity shortfalls vs. population growth, and equity and sewer risks above the other criteria. We chose to put health and safety concerns first.

- Question: Have you done outreach to King County and Seattle Parks concerning master plans?
- Answer: We've been focused on SDOT so far, but we do work with King County frequently.

- Comment: A city in Europe recently did a revamping of one area of town and blew out the sewer lines. They didn't want to just replace them, and took an in-depth approach to create a comprehensive plan with great integration.

- Comment: References to how other cities rank the planning criteria might strengthen the plan.

- Question: In the last round of master planning, population growth was not as expected. What's being done to adapt to that?
- Answer: We are trying to address this, and are considering where new developments may occur, including near transit stops and routes, when adjusting our plans. We are working with

the Department of Planning and Development and the Office of Economic Development for the latest growth projections and our goal is to upsize in the right areas, at the right time.

- CDWAC Members can call or email Holly with further questions.

Pilot Presenter Form

- The Program Manager passed around the new Presenter Feedback Form. She noted that she is also working on a form that will allow presenters to provide her and members with feedback about their experience.
 - The form will be used for members to provide written feedback about programs and policies that are the subject of presentations, as well as about the presentations themselves, and will be shared with the presenters. This will be helpful in promoting mutual learning for staff and Committee Members.
 - The first page asks Members to respond by answering multiple choice questions, and the second page asks for more information by providing short answers.
 - The Committee took a few minutes to fill out the form regarding the presentation they had just received on the SPU Drainage and Wastewater Planning Program.
 - The Program Manager then collected the completed forms.
 - The Program Manager asked the Committee Members for any suggestions to improve the form's ease of use.
 - One Member suggested compressing some of the questions to shorten the form a bit.
 - The Program Manager asked the Committee whether, going forward, they preferred to fill out the form by hand in the meetings, right after the presentations, or the next day, after receiving an electronic copy of the form, or maybe both?
 - One Committee Member expressed a preference for filling the form out in meetings, to avoid forgetting to fill it out later.
 - Another Member agreed, and suggested perhaps offering it online in the future to make it easier to keep the results.
 - Another Member agreed that it might be useful to get something written down right away.
 - The Program Manager noted that if Members took the form with them, getting them back may be difficult.
 - The Committee and Program Manager decided that the form will be filled out in the meetings, right after the presentations.
 - However, if Members wish to hold on to their form to add comments later, the Program Manager will make copies of the form for them. The program support will also send out electronic copies of the form to Members after the meetings.
- One Member asked whether the Committee has a place to store documents.
 - Another Member suggested looking into Google Documents.

- Another Member suggested Google Groups, noting that only those invited would have access.
- Another Member reported that it's not necessary to have a Gmail account to join Google Groups; any email address will work.
- ✓ Schyler agreed to look into setting this up for CDWAC.
- ✓ The Program Manager will look into whether document sharing is possible through a City technology platform.

Review of January 13 - Strategic Business Plan Joint CAC Meeting

- The Program Manager gave a summary of the meeting.
 - ✓ Notes from the Joint CAC Meeting will be available to CDWAC soon.
 - Director Ray Hoffman presented an overview of the Strategic Business Plan (SBP), along with Melina Thung, the Deputy Director of Utility Services (and in charge of SBP implementation), Karen Reed, Communications Director, and Michael Davis, Director of Environmental Justice and Service Equity Division.
 - CDWAC received a list of 71 Action Items in today's meeting materials. These are from the SBP. Originally, there were 27 action plans, and additional efficiency actions. These all got combined into the list of 71 Action Items.
 - These action items will be addressed over the next 6 years. We are working on the implementation schedule now to determine which items will begin in 2015, and will share that information with the City Council, employees and then with the CACs.
 - The 71 Action Items address four major areas:
 - Protecting Public Health and the Environment
 - Operational Excellence
 - Transform the Workforce
 - Customer Service
 - The SBP is about 10% of SPU's work, the rest is baseline operations.
 - We've committed to a rate path of an average annual increase of 4.6% across all lines of business for the next 6 years.
 - Each Committee created a list of 10+ Items of Interest from the list of 71 Action items.

CDWAC's 10+ Items:

Focus Area Grouping: Protect Health & Environment

- A-01, Climate Changes, Follow Up on Joint Presentation
- A-02, Decentralized Green Systems
- A-05, Street Sweeping

Focus Area Grouping: Customer

- A-25 Service Equity
- E-03 Call Center
- A-26 Web Presence

Focus Area Grouping: Transform the Workforce

- E-43, Apprentice Programs

Focus Area Grouping: OpEx – Service Quality

- A-06, DWW Planning & Policies
- A-07, Flooding and Sewer Backup Prevention
- A-10, Emergencies & Disasters
- A-11, Seismic Vulnerability
- E-10, Update the Wastewater Model

Focus Area Grouping: OpEx – Financial Strength

- A-13, Require New Developments to Pay for a Share of the Utility’s Systems Resulting from Growth

Focus Area Grouping: OpEx – Technology Planning

- E-32, Update GIS Platform

Focus Area Grouping: OpEx – Strategy Effectiveness

- E-26, Update the Strategic Plan Annually
- E-34, Update Levels of Service to Reflect Service Targets Based on Customer Expectations and Mandated Services

- One Committee Member, who attended the Joint CAC Meeting, noted that the main takeaway was that the CDWAC Members present on January 13 came up with a list of items that they thought was the most appropriate for CAC involvement, given their knowledge and expertise. He added that the items will need to be added to CDWAC’s work plan.
- One Committee Member noted that most of the CDWAC Items of Interest were in the service quality sector.
- The Program Manager noted that the following items received a vote of interest from each Committee:
 - Service Equity
 - Requiring New Developments to Pay for a Share of the Utility’s Systems Resulting from Growth
 - Emergency Planning
- Potential roles for CACs in customer outreach and giving SPU feedback were also discussed at the Joint CAC Meeting.
 - CDWAC reported the following possible CAC roles:
 - Being informed
 - Informing/sharing information with community
 - Participating in district-based election discussions
 - Helping to shape the Communications Plan
 - Content
 - Message
 - Format
 - Outreach locations

- Conducting outreach/facilitation
 - “Beta” testing public outreach format/materials
 - Communicating with City Council
 - Video-taping members on field trips (previous video was staff-centered) – Seattle Channel
- One Committee Member asked if there had been discussion at the Joint CAC Meeting about how City Council Districts might impact the CACs.
 - The Program Manager responded that the topic of City Council Districts was not part of the Joint CAC Meeting, but that it is definitely on her mind, and noted that the membership across all the CACs is fairly well balanced among all areas of the City.

CDWAC Work Plan

- The Program Manager reminded Members to please read and comment on handouts, even if they are unable to attend the particular meeting.
- The Program Manager asked the Members if they had any suggestions for adjustments to the CDWAC Work Plan before it is posted to the website.
 - One Member responded that we might place an asterisk (*) by the items that are connected to the SBP and another Member agreed.
 - ✓ The Program Manager will make this adjustment to the Work Plan.
- Another Member asked how Work Plan topics were chosen.
 - The Program Manager responded that she gets input from the Committee Chairs, as well as from the Drainage and Wastewater Division Director and then it is brought to the whole Committee for review and approval.
- Once the Work Plan is posted it will have the date on which the version was finalized, but it can always be updated and reposted.

Wrap Up

- With regard to Number 11 on the Work Plan, Thornton Creek, the Program Manager spoke with Katherine Lynch, and she is willing to give CDWAC a tour for our March meeting on the 11th at 5:30pm.
 - She’s unable to do a weekend tour.
 - The tour will allow CDWAC to see the project and then to weigh in on the messaging of proposed new signage.
 - After the tour, the rest of the meeting will be held at the Northeast Library. The Committee could meet somewhere in the north end (maybe Northgate), or maybe meet at the Seattle Municipal Tower and car pool.
 - There are a number of things going on with the City Council; if something comes up and that needs to be addressed by CDWAC in March, we can postpone the field trip until April.
- The Program Manager noted that as the time was 7:30 pm, officer elections will be postponed until the February meeting.

- ✓ She asked the Members to think about whether they might like to elect a secretary (SWAC 's Secretary drafts their letters), whether they would like to continue having two Co-Chairs or switch to the Chair and Vice-Chair model, and who they might like to nominate (self-nominations are also fine).
- The Program Manager reminded the Members that due to the altered January schedule, the next meeting will be in two weeks.

Meeting adjourned, 7:30pm.