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Key Points

• Why did we say that we saved $375M when we signed the Consent Decree?

• How did the Consent Decree and associated planning align with the 2015-2020 Strategic Business Plan?

• Why did the 2018-2020 planned spending change?

*What did we know and when did we know it?*
Activities Leading up to Consent Decree

March 2008 EPA conducted an audit/inspection
• Inadequate sewer overflow prevention and response
• 20 Dry Weather Overflows between 2004-2007, including 3 due to power outages at pump stations
• Tidal inflow at 5 CSO outfalls
• A direct sanitary sewer connection to a CSO Outfall
• Majority of combined sewer basins were uncontrolled
• CSO Long-Term Control Plan was in early stages of development

August 2009 EPA issued an Administrative Order requiring SPU to complete early actions

Throughout, SPU focused on how best to meet its objectives
• Reduce risk of third party lawsuits
• Gain increased cooperation from King county
Consent Decree

Went into effect July 3, 2013

Sets expectations for combined sewer overflows (CSOs), dry weather overflows (DWOs), and sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs):

- CSOs – Must control to ≤ 1/outfall/year on a 20-year moving average, per the State performance standard (WAC 173-245-020(22))
- DWOs – These are prohibited
- SSOs - Must set and meet an SSO performance standard with the goal of eliminating all SSOs. (≤4 SSOs/100 miles/year over a two-year average)
Adaptive Management

Saved approximately $375M by continuing use of asset management principles to achieve high performance.

---

City, state, fed plan would protect local waters from pollutants

Proposed agreement expected to save ratepayers more than $375 million

SEATTLE — Blame it on the rain.

Every year, Seattle’s iconic rain washes millions of gallons of untreated sewage and stormwater into the city’s waterways, threatening human and aquatic health and the region’s quality of life.
Consent Decree - Required Plans

• Required the City to develop and implement plans:
  o Long Term Control Plan (LTCP)
  o Post Construction Monitoring Plan
  o Capacity, Management, Operations and Maintenance (CMOM) Performance Program Plan
  o Fats, Oils and Grease (FOG) Control Program Plan
  o Joint Operations and System Optimization Plan
  o Floatable Solids Observation Plan

• Allowed the City to develop and implement an Integrated Plan in lieu of the LTCP
DWW Capital Improvement Program, 2018-2023

- Regulatory, Integrated Plan, Perscriptive: 38%
- Regulatory, Performance Based: 21%
- Sediments, Superfund: 5%
- Rehabilitation: 6%
- Transportation, Move Seattle: 13%
- Transportation, Other: 2%
- Discretionary (e.g. flooding, landslides): 7%
- Equipment: 1%
- Technology, SPU: 1%
- Technology, City-wide: 1%
- Rehabilitation, Facilities: 5%
- Miscellaneous: 0%

Taking care of what we have (pipe rehabilitation)

Primarily Ship Canal Water Quality Project
## Plan Development Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wastewater Consent Decree</th>
<th>2015 Strategic Business Plan</th>
<th>Plan to Protect Seattle’s Waterways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>July - Consent Decree entered into federal register</td>
<td>April – Began working with Customer Review Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>well aligned</td>
<td>June – Completed working with Customer Review Panel, SBP sent to Council</td>
<td>May – Issued draft plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>August – Council adopted SBP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>changed cash flow assumptions made in SBP</td>
<td></td>
<td>February – Agreement with King County to jointly construct tunnel rather than 7 independent storage projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May – Council adopts plan</td>
<td>September – EPA &amp; Ecology approve plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes as the plan was finalized had a significant impact on cash flow, but not overall program cost.
Discussion