



Creeks, Drainage, and Wastewater Advisory Committee (CDWAC)

March 21, 2018 Meeting Notes

Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue

Room 4901

5:30 pm – 7:30 pm

Committee Members	Present?	SPU Staff & Guests	Role
Ben Billick	Y	Sheryl Shapiro	CAC Program Manager
Christina Ciampa	N	Natasha Walker	CAC Program Coordinator
Colum Lang	N	Judi Gladstone	Division Director, Strategy and Governmental Affairs, DWW
Gary Olson	N	Madeline Goddard	Drainage & Wastewater Deputy Director
Mariela White	Y	Holly Scarlett	Drainage & Wastewater Planner
Michael Williams	Y	Susan Harper	Senior Program Manager, Strategy & Government Affairs
Maria McDaniel	Y		
Thy Pham	Y	Guests	
Schylar Hect	N	Lisa Mikesell	
Andrew Schiffer	Y	Tristan Fields	

1. Regular Business

- Sheryl introduced the three new Co-Chairs: Mariela White, Michael Williams, and Colum Lang. They will be sharing the duties throughout the 2018 meetings.
- While the new co-chairs are in training, Sheryl opened the meeting at 5:34 PM and reminded folks to sign-in.
- Committee Members, SPU staff, and guests introduced themselves.
- Meeting notes from February were approved.
- Sheryl indicated emergency exits, exit procedures, and bathrooms.

2. Drainage and Wastewater LOB Ranking Criteria

In 2017, the DWW Line of Business developed comprehensive criteria that could be used to prioritize within and across capital programs. We have been testing the criteria and weights against the current Capital Improvement Program (CIP) list and sample problems, in anticipation of using them within the Wastewater System Analysis, Drainage System Analysis, and Integrated System Plan to select and prioritize Drainage and Wastewater investments in future years.

SPU Drainage and Wastewater (DWW) Planner, Holly Scarlett presented the criteria and walked Committee members through an exercise of applying them to a sample problem. Through the use of an example application of the criteria, as well as a survey on <http://www.menti.com>, we gathered CDWAC feedback on weights to be used in Wastewater System Analysis, Drainage System Analysis, and

Integrated System Plan. The results were compared with the draft weight generated by SPU management. The results from the Mentimeter survey showed CAC Members and guests had given the following weight to the highest-level categories:

- Public Health, Safety and Environmental Impacts: 46%
- System Reliability/Risk: 27%
- Opportunities: 28%

CAC Discussion regarding Example #2 from PowerPoint Presentation:

- **CAC Member:** The two examples we have been exposed to (sewer backup vs overflowing ditch), have very different juxtapositions.
 - **Staff response:** That's a good point. It begs the question, where do our values sit?
- **CAC Member:** I'm trying to understand how you prioritize when the problem (the road flooding) is owned by another agency (SDOT).
 - **Staff response:** The drainage is our responsibility. However, we also consider issues of safety. For example, are bicyclists affected? Are there pedestrians waiting for buses?
- **CAC Member:** Is someone counting the time and cost to respond to these events?
 - **Staff response:** At SPU, we record every call we get and every response our crews make in a platform called Maximo. We even record our response rate.
 - **CAC Member:** I am wondering at what point the cost of a project would be cheaper than the cumulative response of crews responding to an issue.
- **CAC Member:** It seems like at a certain point, in prioritizing these projects, you'd need to understand the cost to fix the issue.
 - **Staff response:** Currently the way our ranking is setup, we look at the LOB priorities, then the cost, then the cost versus benefit.
- **CAC Member:** *[In response to whether Example #2 is considered a "severe impact"]* I would consider a "severe impact" both impassable and frequent.
 - **CAC Member:** You might also consider: Are there other arterials/detours? Is it easy?
- **CAC Member:** *[In response to question about whether once every 4 years is considered a low frequency of impacts]* It's not terrible.
 - **CAC Member:** Might want to consider the change in frequency between events; is that timeline shortening? Is it getting worse?

CAC Discussion on whether we should give weight to the regulatory criterion:

- **CAC Member:** Seems unnecessary and even wasteful to run it through the ranking criteria. It's a foregone conclusion, so why waste the time.
- **Guest:** I did assign like 20% to opportunities originally, but I think I would lower it now that I see it rolled up.
- **CAC Member:** You said the difference between our (CAC Member) rankings and Directors might be related to the ability to understand current vs future problems. Instead, I see it as about the impacts that I see, versus impacts to the system that only SPU sees. It doesn't bother me one way or the other if there is a pipe that needs maintenance that doesn't impact me, the environment, someone else – but if it impacts the City's bottom line I could see why that would matter to SPU.
- **CAC Member:** I felt like there were a couple things that overlapped, like time-sensitive coordination and operational efficiency: seemed like an investment that could prevent worsening/bigger issue later. I think if you consolidated them, they'd get a higher point.

- **Staff response:** Operational efficiency is about the burden on our crews. Time-sensitive, there's a project happening and it's not under our control, but it would behoove us to act now.
- **CAC Member:** What is the difference between operational efficiency and cost reduction? Both have a cost-reduction component to them.
 - **Staff response:** Operational Efficiency: Ongoing labor/staff times. While cost reduction is the ongoing cost of repairs. We could put them together and have less criteria.

Madeline Goddard: We are looking at these percentages when you apply them to projects. For example, we are planning a new facility for staff, which is not impacted by Public Health, Safety and Environmental Impacts. How does that end up ranking? Results of other projects surprised us. For example, stream health being prioritized over sewer overflows. Or, if there are multiple benefits in the Public Health, Safety and Environmental Impacts category, do they also get credit in the "Multiple Benefits" category?

- **CAC Member:** I understand it is elegant to use the same ranking criteria for all projects, but at some point, you're comparing apples and oranges. Is there a reason you can't use different criteria for different projects?
 - **Staff response:** That's what we have now. We have different criteria for different kinds of projects, and it becomes a challenge to prioritize from a large, diverse list.
- **Guest:** Did you think about adding deeper criteria; for example, >1 block of homes impacted.
- **CAC Member:** There are ways you could do to make it more general. Like you could combine some of the categories. For example: "benefits surface water bodies" could replace pollutant discharges and flows to creeks/wetlands. Water quantity and water quality are different, but they both impact surface water habitat.
 - **Staff response:** You could combine them if you're still allowing for the quality versus quantity.
 - **CAC Member:** If you have high flows to a water body, you likely have issues with water quality. So, by virtue of the fact that you have two ranking criteria assigned to that, you're pumping up the percentage given to any of the projects.
- **CAC Member:** Could also do a tiered ranking: is there an impact to the body of water? If yes, then what is the severity?

Madeline added that as the Drainage and Wastewater Line of Business finishes their Integrated System Plan, the list of projects will be large, and the LOB will need a process for prioritizing and explaining why some projects have been deferred.

- **CAC Member:** It sounds like you're trying to compare everything on a 1:100 scale, but you're comparing very different things. Can you use L/M/H for impact of System Reliability? And then it would be a simpler process for identifying the 5 impacts and measuring it across the criteria.
- **CAC Member:** I would be interested to see what the top 20 projects are, versus the top 20 that were deferred.
- **CAC Member:** And where do emergencies fall?
- **CAC Member:** All these kinds of exercises begin with a brainstorm, that is then picked apart. But after we do that, and come down to these percentages and we lump it all together, is that what we do? Or should we be using a statistical decision tool?
 - **Staff response:** We used Decision Lens to get to this point, but in the end, it is still a judgement call by the Deputy Director. There is some subjectivity and bias in how you use the scoring.

Holly walked members through how the criteria might be adjusted to accommodate/prioritize a new facility, as an example. Holly added that the LOB is open to changes, and that this ranking would be brought back to the Committee in the future for additional feedback.

3. CAC Program Updates

- **Drainage & Wastewater 101:** Sheryl shared a spreadsheet with potential topic areas. Members shared their interest levels, as well as their level of understanding of the topics. The results will be tallied after the meeting.
- **Upcoming all CAC Meeting / May CDWAC Meeting Schedule:** A save the date was distributed for May 16 for an All-CAC Meeting. We hope to invite SPU's General Manager/CEO, Mami Hara. It will be partially our SPU 101, but it will be different from 2017 given our new Mayor, Council members and post-Strategic Business Plan. We also hope that it will feature a discussion about the CEO's vision of a community-centered utility and the Community Partnerships Program. **A doodle poll will be sent to see if CDWAC would still like to meet in May,** since the All-CAC meeting conflicts with our normal meeting date.
- **April 11 WSAC Meeting:** The topic is about proposed charges related to connection and installation for taps, some of them are for water and some are for wastewater. CDWAC may have its own presentation; either way, we will be sharing the meeting materials, in the event that CDWAC members would like to attend the WSAC meeting and help review the public communication documents being shared.
- **Joint Field Trips with WSAC:** We are coordinating a June field trip to the Cedar River Watershed and Education Center. **Look for a Doodle poll regarding dates.**
- **Membership:** This month would have been Schyler's last meeting, but she was unable to attend. Sheryl took a moment to acknowledge Patrick Jablonski, who is now an Alum but joined the meeting to say farewell. CDWAC is currently at 9 members and is chartered for 12 members. Sheryl is conducting on-going recruitment.

6. Community Insights, Around the Table

- **A CAC Member shared** that they saw a presentation from SPU at a Stormwater Conference, regarding influent/effluent for Swale on Yale. They thought it was a "very cool presentation, and cool to see the results that we are seeing in the installation. It's a receiving swale and takes about 60% of the runoff from Capitol Hill. The volume of runoff is incredible, and the data they are seeing for managing pollutant loads is impressive relative to the design standards."
- **A CAC Member shared** they had just attended The Line P Program workshop, about Ocean Station Papa, an old weather station in the Pacific. "They've been monitoring that specific station for 60 years, and the Institute of Ocean Science still visits the station. There is a blob that came through the North Pacific in 2014, and looking at how it affected the ecological habitat."
- **Staff Member:** 3rd Annual Conference on the Salish Sea is April 4-6. Sheryl will be there at the vendor fair promoting our Committees and several DWW outreach/education programs.

Adjourned 7:28 PM