



Creeks, Drainage, and Wastewater Advisory Committee (CDWAC)

February 11, 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	Sheila Harrison	SPU Project Manager
Jeremy Andrews	Y	Beth Schmoyer	SPU Project Manager
Marilyn Baylor	Y	Kevin Buckley	SPU Project Manager
Suzie Burke	N*		
C'Ardiss Gardner Gleser	Y		
Schyler Hect	N*		
Kaifu Lam	Y		
Seth McKinney	Y		
Noel Miller	Y		
Devin O'Reilly	Y		
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, guests, and SPU staff introduced themselves.
- January meeting notes are approved.

Around the Table

- One Committee Member reported that the Venema Creek project seems to be proceeding well.

- Another Member commented that he would like CDWAC to have more information about the timeline for completion of this project, and suggested an update possibly for April.
- Another member reported that a friend of his in the Mt. Baker Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) area has seen interest in the rain garden program from her community.
- The Program Manager reported that she had made some minor updates to the CDWAC workplan, and that the dates for presentations are estimated. She asked the Committee to approve the workplan for posting on the public website.
 - ✓ The workplan is approved for posting.

Update on the Plan to Protect Seattle’s Waterways: Kevin Buckley, SPU

See the power point presentation for more information.

- The Federal Consent Decree sets standards for controlling combined sewer overflows (CSOs). SPU developed two options for Consent Decree compliance:
 - The Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) , which addresses CSO control, and
 - The Integrated Plan (IP), which addresses both CSO control and storm water treatment.
 - The IP is SPU’s recommended option, because it offers significant water quality benefits over CSO control alone, and it’s a cost effective way to reduce mass pollutants.
 - The IP allows us to remove significantly more pollutants (fecal coliform bacteria, zinc, PCBs, and phosphorus) than the six deferred CSO projects.
 - The IP removes significantly more total suspended solids (TSS), which is our main metric for pollution, because pollutants attach to the suspended solid sediment.
 - Protecting our creeks is an important SPU objective.
- The Consent Decree required us to show that the Integrated Plan has significant benefit over the Long Term Control Plan in pollutant removal, water quality, and other impacts, and we have.
 - We have also demonstrated increased benefit to communities, the economy, and the environment.
- Implementing the IP rather than the Long Term Control Plan allows us to meet the requirements of the Consent Decree and the NPDES Wastewater Permit while simultaneously addressing storm water issues. CSO projects will all be done but will be sequenced differently.
- The primary goal of the IP is early return of environmental benefits to receiving waters by prioritizing CSO and storm water investments to improve water quality. The Plan includes:
 - Three storm water projects: an expansion of the street sweeping program, a South park Water Quality Facility, and natural drainage systems (NDS), all completed by 2025.
 - Deferred CSO projects:
 - The Joint SPU/King County West Ship Canal Tunnel Option in the Long Term Control Plan constructed by 2025.
 - Four neighborhood CSO storage projects from the Long Term Control Plan completed by 2025.

- Six neighborhood CSO storage projects from the Long Term Control Plan deferred 5-years for completion by 2030.
- With regard to the map in the power point slide presentation:
 - Black circles denote CSO storage tanks to be built by 2025.
 - Orange circles denote the delayed CSO projects.
 - Green areas indicate that natural drainage systems will also be used (happening in Pipers, Thornton, and Longfellow Creeks, where we are hoping to partner with Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to create cost efficiencies).
 - Purple shows the proposed expansion of the street sweeping program.
 - The blue dot is where the South Park Water Quality Facility will be located.
- The Present Value/Annual lbs. of TSS Chart in the power point slide shows the value of deferring some of the expensive CSO projects and going forward with storm water projects.
- The IP's approval process is moving forward.
 - The Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was issued in December 2014.
 - We met with the City Council's Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods (SPUN) Committee in mid-January. They are helping us with the ordinance process.
 - We're working now to address comments (mostly supportive) about the Integrated Plan that we received from the Washington State Department of Ecology.
 - We'll have more review by and input from the Mayor and the Council, and we hope to have the final plan to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to Ecology for approval by the end of May.

Some Questions and Comments from the Committee

- Question: Will you be building a new decanting station for the Vactor trucks?
 - Answer: We will be using the existing decant stations for the Vactor trucks to separate and treat the waste from street sweeping.
- Question: Where is the most expensive deferred CSO project?
 - Answer: The Portage Bay and Montlake projects are the most expensive, and have been deferred until 2030.
- Question: Is there a point in the approval process where it would be useful for CDWAC to provide input to the Council?
 - Answer: It would be appropriate for CDWAC to weigh in; Kevin will check on the timing.
- Question: Are other utilities doing similar integrated plans?
 - Answer: Spokane proposed one with packages of projects based on different levels of funding. SPU's plan asks for more time in meeting the CSO goals of the Consent Decree, rather than for additional funding.

The Co-Chair noted that the Committee would receive further updates about the Integrated Plan in the near future.

Overview of SPU Projects in South Park, Sheila Harrison & Beth Schmoyer, SPU

See the power point presentation for more information.

- South Park Area Characteristics
 - South Park is mostly a low-lying area, with lots of unpaved roads, with residential, commercial, and industrial uses.
 - It's a diverse neighborhood with a high percentage of low-income families with children, and SPU continues to address service equity issues there.
 - The community takes pride in their neighborhood, and they work hard to make it nice.
 - South Park was significantly impacted by the recent and lengthy closure of the South Park Bridge.
 - Restaurants in the area were hit hard.
 - There was a big party when the bridge reopened.
 - There are two basins: the combined sewer and the separated storm water.
 - Both need improvements.
- Improvements in the 14th and Concord combined sewer are planned to address flooding and backups.
 - The plan is to upsize 3- 4 blocks of pipes. We will be coordinating with King County, and taking an incremental approach to monitor how this improves the problem and affects the situation downstream. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2016.
- Cleanup at Terminal 117 of adjacent streets, a joint SPU/City Light project, is planned to address storm water pollution, and is scheduled to begin in 2015.
 - This is part of the Duwamish Superfund site. The project will work on cleaning up the polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) under the roadway, and installing functioning storm water collection.
- Question: Will the streets at Terminal 117 be in better condition after this project?
 - Answer: Yes. Streets will be restored to City standards following the cleanup of contaminated soil in the right-of-way.
- Comment: Maybe the slide for this project should read "Cleanup and Improvements," rather than just "Cleanup."
- Comment: This project demonstrates some of the value customers receive for their money.
- Question: Will the walkways at Terminal 117 look like those in Belltown?
 - Answer: The asphalt path will wind around bio-retention cells, and will not be as urban as those in Belltown.

- Question: What kind of feedback have you received from the community?
- Answer: We've received mostly positive feedback so far. The Port's habitat restoration project at T117 is more exciting to the community than the cleanup. The community is also weary of construction.

- Projects in the 7th Avenue South Storm Drain Basin are also in the works to address flooding and water quality issues.
 - This basin has three distinct areas: the upper basin, which is industrial/undeveloped, the middle basin, which is largely residential, and the lower basin, which is largely industrial and experiences significant and frequent flooding due to tidal influence.
 - The worst flooding occurs at 5th and Holden.
 - With no storm water treatment currently available, storm water discharges directly into the Duwamish Waterway.
 - Projects currently planned include a pump station to overcome the tidal influence, a water quality treatment facility to improve the water quality of runoff from the Lower 7th Avenue South drainage basin (that discharges into the Duwamish Waterway) and drainage conveyance improvements in the Lower 7th Avenue South basin to get the runoff to the pump station and water quality treatment facility.
 - By putting in the pump station first, we can provide limited flooding relief as early as possible and collect data that will help us design the water quality treatment facility.
 - The pump station will be built two feet higher than what we would have planned to accommodate a rising sea level.
 - The water quality treatment facility is currently in the options analysis phase of planning, and we are evaluating different technologies, including ballasted sedimentation, chemically enhanced filtration, and electrocoagulation.
 - We will be going after total suspended solids (TSS), but are also considering some technologies that remove dissolved materials (though we are unsure how effective these technologies are, and so will be conducting a piloting test).
 - We want to set up a system to which we can add additional modules if regulations change.
 - The water quality treatment facility is one of the projects proposed in the Integrated Plan and required by the Federal Consent Decree to reduce pollutants in storm water before it's returned to our waterways. The treatment facility must be constructed by the end of 2025.
 - The treatment facility is also part of the City's Source Control Implementation Plan for the Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund site. There have already been significant cleanup efforts there, and

more will be implemented over the next decade. We don't want storm water to hinder those cleanup efforts.

- The Georgetown neighborhood is trying to plan a community meeting about source control efforts, possibly for this spring. They would like to get the Washington State Department of Ecology involved, as well as some other organizations.
 - To further address flooding in the 7th Avenue South Storm Drain Basin, SPU hopes to partner with SDOT in the future to install street and drainage improvements.
 - Flood control in South Park is part of SPU's Strategic Business Plan. The Action Plan associated with the Strategic Business Plan includes increased investment to improve the pipe conveyance system carrying water to the pump station and water quality facility.
 - We can get significantly more done by partnering with SDOT. SPU is working with SDOT to find partnering options and coordinate SPU planning efforts with SDOT's process.
 - Individual property owners will also be asked to make drainage improvements in low-lying sites. We are exploring how best to work with people to accomplish this.
-
- Question: Are there septic tanks in this area?
 - Answer: No, customers are connected to the sewer system, which is functioning normally.
-
- Question: What is the cost estimate for the pump station project?
 - Answer: The pump station is expected to cost \$12 million.
-
- Comment: I would suggest putting some dollar figures into the presentation.
-
- Question: Is SPU partnering with businesses on the Source Control Plan?
 - Answer: We've been working with the businesses for years, but more as regulators. We do have good relationships with them.
-
- Question: IS SPU working with private residences about pollution resulting from lawn and yard care products?
 - Answer: Not as closely as with the businesses. The true source control in this area would be to get the pollutants out of the products, but that's a long road.
-
- Question: Could SPU put out a list of recommended lawn and yard care products?
 - Answer: Possibly. However, most have ingredients that pose problems, and right now, there aren't many alternatives.
-
- Comment: It might be helpful to have more visual clarity for maps in future presentations.

- Question: Why does South Park have a lot of unpaved streets? Are the causes well understood?
- Answer: The Program Manager answered that there are many different factors, and SPU is working to understand and address them.

- Some discussion followed about the importance of SPU coordinating efforts with SDOT.
 - One Member noted that coordination is an issue with many projects, can save citizens money, and is an equity issue.
 - Another Member suggested CDWAC might contact Council Member Sally Bagshaw to help support coordination.
 - ✓ **The Program Manager is working with Bob Hennessy, SPU's City Council Liaison, and will ask him for more information about coordination between SPU and SDOT.**

Sheila and Beth will be back to brief CDWAC on programs and projects as they develop.

Presenter Feedback Form

- Committee members filled out presenter feedback forms for Kevin Buckley, and for Sheila Harrison and Beth Schmoyer.

Elections of Officers for 2015

- The Committee discussed whether to have a Secretary position.
 - SWAC has a Secretary who drafts letters and shepherds the process of getting them signed and sent. He also helps to organize field trips.
 - One Committee Member expressed a preference not to be the Secretary, and no Members expressed a preference for having one.
 - The Committee decided not to have a Secretary.
- The Committee discussed whether to continue having two Co-Chairs, or switch to a Chair and Vice-Chair model.
 - SWAC has a Chair and a Vice Chair. The Vice Chair assists the Chair, and usually is the next in line to be the Chair.
 - One member noted that CDWAC seems to have a flatter dynamic, and another member commented that it seems to be working.
 - Another Member suggested that Committee letters can continue to be handled by various Members, on a case-by-case basis.
 - The Committee decided to continue having two Co-Chairs.
- The Program Manager asked Members to fill out their nominations for the Co-Chair positions, and noted that Members could self-nominate, and that Members could also decline a nomination.
- Using paper ballots, the Committee Members nominated the following Members for Co-Chair:

- Noel
- Devin
- Kendra
- Marilyn
- Schyler
- Kendra, who is currently Co-Chair, reported that she is now in a director's role at her job, and often needs to be available there in the later afternoons. As a result, she decided to decline the nomination.
- The Committee then voted on paper ballots.
 - However, three Members were not present, and will be given an opportunity to vote by email.
 - ✓ Final votes will therefore be announced over email in the next week.

Closing

- The Program Manager asked the Committee to review a brief description of CDWAC that will be appearing in SPU's Protect the Waterways brochure.
 - One member suggested adding "presented on topics including" before the bulleted list, to indicate that the list was not exhaustive.
 - Another Member suggested changing "communications materials" to "communication materials."
 - After some discussion, the Committee expressed a preference for changing "communications materials" to "public engagement strategies and outreach materials."
- The Program Manager asked for a volunteer to coordinate the field trip in March.
 - ✓ Jeremy volunteered.
- The Program Manager reported that joint CAC meetings regarding implementation of the Strategic Business Plan (SBP) will be happening regularly.
 - ✓ We will be sending out a Doodle poll soon to help us choose an April meeting date.
- ✓ The Program Manager also reminded Members to complete the annual CAC questionnaire by February 23.

Meeting adjourned, 7:37pm.