I/I Reduction Program Frameworks and Initial Evaluation

May 3, 2018

Nicole Smith and Steve Tolzman of King County WTD Penny Mabie, Steffran Neff and Bob Jacobson of Brown and Caldwell



Department of Natural Resources and Parks Wastewater Treatment Division



II. Overview of current I/I program work

III. Present frameworks and evaluation

V. Considerations for your review (homework)

VI. Next Steps

Proposed Schedule of E&P Topics

MONTH	I/I TOPIC
May	Introduce evaluated frameworks
June	Discuss agency feedback on evaluated frameworks
July	None
August	Continue to discuss evaluated frameworks; Select recommended program
September - December	Present and discuss recommendation with full MWPAAC

Goals for Today

- Introduce frameworks and criteria ratings
- Provide guidance for your review

Briefing Package Contents

- Summary of framework options
- Frameworks for potential regional private side sewer programs
- Summary of evaluation criteria
- Initial application of the evaluation criteria to the frameworks

Context for Program Frameworks

 Frameworks are high level summaries based on assumptions for how the program "could" be implemented

 Frameworks provide enough detail on potential program to inform evaluation and a decision on whether to proceed with studying implementation

Future Implementation Plan

- Implementation plans would detail the framework contents – moving from assumptions to actuals
- A step by step process of program development and implementation would be defined and include:
 - Details on Framework content
 - Roles and responsibilities for implementation
 - Implementation schedule
 - Program costs

Criteria Informed by I&I Study Goal

Evaluate concepts for I/I reduction programs to comprehensively reduce I/I through the separated sewer portion of the regional wastewater system to inform the region on future steps for the program

Program Evaluation Criteria

Six criterion used to rate and compare programs:

- Effectiveness
- Legal and political implications
- Property owner impacts
- Local agency impacts
- WTD impacts
- Equity and social justice

High Level Evaluation Summary

- Most potential to reduce I/I long-term
 - Options 6, 7, 8
 (general and point of sale inspections)
- Most complex and costly programs to develop and implement
 - Options 6, 7, 8

(general and point of sale inspections)

High Level Evaluation Summary

- Easiest and less costly to develop and to implement:
 - Options 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (standards, training, and resources)
 - Options 9, 10 (grant/loan)
- Little to no impact on I/I reduction if developed independently:
 - Options 1-5 (standards, training, and resources)
 - Options 9 and 10 (grant/loan)

Considerations for your review

- Initial observations on results?
- Are there any surprises in the ratings?
- Are there criterion that are more important/higher priority?

Considerations for your review

- Suggestions on weighting criteria?
- Initial recommendations on options to move forward to implementation plan development?
- Suggestions for combining options into packages to move forward into implementation plan development?

Consideration for your review

 Implementation plan development can be recommended for one or more stand-alone option e.g. options 1 – 8

OR

 Implementation plan development can be recommended for groups/packages of options e.g. point of sale inspection program that includes a grant/loan program, regional BMPs, and inspector training

Next Steps

- Local agency feedback (May 3 June 7)
 - Review draft frameworks with consultant-suggested ratings
 - Determine which single option(s) or package of options your agency would recommend for implementation plan development
- June 7 meeting
 - Discuss recommendations
- August 2 meeting
 - Select program(s) for implementation planning

Questions?



Contacts: Nicole Smith, Water Quality Planner <u>Nicole.Smith@kingcounty.gov</u>

Steve Tolzman, I/I Program Manager <u>Steve.tolzman@kingcounty.gov</u> 206-477-5459