

MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force Review of Conveyance and CSO Control Policies

Presented to the Metropolitan Water Pollution Abatement
Advisory Committee meeting

December 10, 2014

Development of Draft Policy Recommendations

- MWPAAC RWSP Task Force develops draft policy recommendations as a work in progress
- Engineering and Planning Subcommittee offers input on RWSP Task Force recommendations
- Rates and Finance and Sewage Disposal Agreements Subcommittees provide input on the set(s) of reviewed policies if applicable
- Draft proposed policy recommendations with additional input from subcommittees goes to full MWPAAC for input and any revisions
- Draft proposed policy recommendations go to the RWQC Intergovernmental Staff Work Group for discussion

Development of Final Policy Recommendations

- MWPAAC RWSP Policy Review Task Force will review the complete set of policy recommendations as a final draft
- Full MWPAAC to consider and approve a final recommendation on RWSP policy amendments

Conveyance Policy Summary	Task Force Proposed Amendments
Introduction/explanatory material to conveyance policies.	Made material current by deleting mention of building Brightwater conveyance, and added language to include all of the county's regional conveyance system (combined and separated).
CP-1 discusses design standard for separated system; direction to develop parameters on project scheduling with MWPAAC; and notes the exception of the effluent transfer system design standard.	Added design standard for conveyance associated with combined system; made current that parameters have been established, and provides guidance for ongoing review of parameters.
CP-2 provides guidance on constructing conveyance facilities and directs that no parallel eastside interceptor or Kenmore interceptor be constructed.	No proposed amendments made to existing policy.
CP-3 provides guidance on evaluating and confirming planning assumptions for conveyance improvement needs.	No proposed amendments made to existing policy.

Conveyance Policy Summary	Task Force Proposed Amendments
<p>CP-4 discusses the timing for updating the conveyance system improvement program and the types of information to include in the updates.</p>	<p>Added language to show the update is comprehensive, and adjusted timeframe for comprehensive updates. Added language on conducting periodic mid-term reviews with local agencies as needed to check assumptions, growth patterns, and verify priorities.</p>
<p>CP-5 provides guidance on uniform criteria for financing, development, ownership, operation, maintenance, repair and replacement of conveyance facilities.</p>	<p>Deleted the word “natural” from the term “natural drainage area(s)”.</p>
<p>CP-6 provides guidance on integrating water reuse planning and I/I results in planning for conveyance and treatment facilities.</p> <p>CP-7 directs the County to evaluate demand management alternatives to meet identified conveyance needs.</p>	<p>Combined CP-6 and CP-7 into one policy; proposed amendments include the focus of policy on project-specific planning, and call for considering evolving technologies, such as water reuse, GSI, I/I, zero discharge buildings during planning of specific projects. Proposed amendments provide factors to include in the evaluation, and if feasible alternatives are identified, the policy calls for coordination with the local agencies on such efforts.</p>

CSO Control Policy Summary	Task Force Proposed Amendments
Explanatory materials – describes the intention of the CSO control policies	Clarified that the policies guide controlling CSO discharges and sizing CSO facilities in the County’s combined system.
CSOCP-1 describes the reasons the County plans to control its CSO discharges by the end of 2030.	No proposed amendments were made to the policy.
CSOCP-2 provides guidance for the County to continue to work with state and federal agencies to develop cost-effective regulations that protect water quality and to meet existing requirements.	No proposed amendments were made to the policy.
CSOCP-3 discusses the highest priority for control of CSO discharges, which is in accordance with the long-term control plan approved by Council in 2012.	No proposed amendments were made to the policy.
CSOCP-4 provides guidance for the County to coordinate with Seattle’s MS4 process as appropriate.	No proposed amendments were made to the policy.

CSO Control Policy Summary	Task Force Proposed Amendments
<p>CSOCP-5 provides guidance on the County’s facilities not being designed to intercept, collect, or treat new sources of stormwater. The policy also discusses that the County may evaluate the benefits and impacts to the county system from accepting stormwater from Seattle that is not currently in the combined system.</p>	<p>No proposed amendments were made to this policy.</p>
<p>CSOCP-6 discusses that the county shall accept contaminated stormwater runoff from industrial sources in accordance with the County’s industrial waste rules and regulations.</p>	<p>No proposed amendments were made to this policy.</p>
<p>CSOCP-7 provides guidance on when the County should consider implementing green stormwater infrastructure (GSI) into CSO control projects.</p>	<p>Language was added to make this policy more broad for consideration of a wider range of technologies, in addition to GSI; and added “long-term viability” to the list of considerations.</p>
<p>CSOCP-8 provides guidance to the County for considering joint CSO control projects with Seattle.</p>	<p>No proposed amendments were made to the policy.</p>

CSO Control Policy Summary	Task Force Amendments
CSOCP-9 provides guidance for implementing the County's long-range sediment management strategy.	No proposed amendments were made to the policy.
CSOCP-10 provides guidance on assessing CSO control projects, priorities, and opportunities for each required CSO Plan amendment.	No proposed amendments were made to the policy.
CSOCP-11 provides guidance on the elements of a CSO program review that is submitted to Council prior to completion of a CSO plan amendment.	Added language to include evaluating the assumptions used to size CSO facilities as part of the program review process.
CSOCP-12 calls for the County to implement its CSO control projects in accordance with consent decree and Council-approved schedule.	No proposed amendments were made to the policy.
CSOCP-13 calls for the County to prepare a water quality assessment and monitoring study, consistent with Ordinance 17413.	No proposed amendments were made to the policy.