DOCUMENT C-2
ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT ON PROJECT SCREENING CRITERIA

Introduction

The Advisory Committee agreed to provide input into the screening criteria considered at the January 20, 2009 meeting. Any input would be compiled, distributed and discussed at the February 18 Advisory Committee meeting, with the goal of agreeing on a list of screening criteria. Below is the input that was received:

General Input:

[from Larry Kunzler] So how many people to date have submitted suggestions? I have to admit I have laid that stuff out four times and walked away from it each time. I guess the problem I am having is that being more project oriented I can look at any of the "criteria" and see projects where some of the criteria will not be met. Such as everything on option one from #5 on down would not be met on any levee project except for levee setback scenarios and then depending on what was being proposed (i.e. the 3 bridge corridor mess) maybe not even then. So then what happens? Perhaps adding the words "When/Where possible...." to each statement would work. Like what NMFS said in 2001 "The only project that meets the standard for EO 11988 is overtopping levees." So if none of the projects meet the "criteria" for EO 11988 does that mean that project is dead if we want Federal funds. Which is another reason for having a solid land use section that would identify what regs would apply for fed vs. non-fed projects and not to mix the Comp Plan with the GI process. How much different will a project/measure be if no federal funding is involved. The committee has never fully addressed that issue. To me its kind of like mixing apples and oranges. One set of criteria for fed projects, one for local if no fed money is required.

I still feel that a general statement of "Any project presented for consideration must meet the three E's, Engineeringly possible, Economically achievable, and Environmentally friendly. General statements that can be discussed and applied and once its determined that a project meets those three then the devil will be in the details. I just don't see anything positive coming out of this exercise by putting together a wish list of all things nice a project must have. Maybe I've just reached writers block but I am having a hard time struggling with the importance of detail in this exercise before we have looked at the projects ("measures" I don't know who coined that phrase but they should be tarred an feathered).

[From Dave Pflug]

1. Consider a screening provision that would allow an alternative that fails on its own to be acceptable when paired with another with another measure due to synergy.

2. When applying the criteria to a measure should we consider three possible outcomes; ‘fully meets’, ’partially meets’, or ‘does not meet’.

Specific Input on Option 1 and Option 2 Criteria:

The specific comments shown on the Option 1 criteria are from Bob Carey and Dave Pflug. The Land Use Technical Committee criteria, Option 2, are listed below with track changes from Bob Carey.

OPTION 1—COMBINED LIST FROM DIKE AND DRAINAGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEES

1. Does the project maintain[P1] or improve public safety and critical infrastructure protection compared to existing flood risk? In particular, does the project:
   a. Reduce the potential for levee failures?; and/or
   b. Increase conveyance efficiency of the existing levee system?; and/or
   c. Reduce the risk of catastrophic failure due to inadequate interior drainage?
2. Can the project be implemented without increasing the flood risk upstream and downstream of the project area? If no, can the increased risk be mitigated~~?~~ or addressed[P2]?
3. Can the project maintenance and operations be sustained[P3] locally?
4. ~~Does the project avoid adverse impact on soils and drainage in agricultural resource lands?~~

   ~~or~~

   Does the project avoid negative impacts or net loss of farmland, except as pertains to implementation of flood hazard reduction measures (including related ecosystem restoration goals~~and to benefit or restore ecosystem functions~~)?
5. Does the project demonstrate a significant net gain in natural riverine processes? In particular, does the project:
   a. Improve natural flood water conveyance?; and
   b. Preserve or improve channel migration, and floodplain processes and reduce bank hardening?; and
   c. Improve or restore riparian processes?
6. Does the project improve or preserve estuarine, nearshore and marine processes, habitats and resources?
7. Does the project demonstrate improvements to flood related water quality and contamination problems?
8. Can the project work in synergy with other planned actions (i.e., upstream and downstream effects need to be evaluated and addressed)?

5. Could the project be designed to benefit multiple objectives?
   1. Could the project be designed for ecosystem benefits?

~~Option 2—Recommended by Land Use Technical Committee~~

1. ~~Does the project provide critical infrastructure protection?~~ *[this is captured in 1 above]*

9~~2~~. Does the project provide protection for other existing infrastructure? *[need to be specific about what infrastructure – e.g. transportation infrastructure, water treatment]*

3. Does the project minimize ~~Are known~~ land use conflicts ~~minimal~~? *[again, it would be nice to be specific since this could include so much?]*

4. ~~Are known regulatory conflicts minimal?~~ *[minimizing regulatory conflict is important, but having this as a criterion concerns me – a really good project could have many conflicts – doesn't mean it is not a worthy project]*

5. Could the project be designed to benefit multiple objectives? *[this may be duplicative with the last criteria at bottom]*

~~6. Is the degree of environmental impact/mitigation acceptable and/or could it be designed for ecosystem benefits?~~ *[captured in 5-7 above]*

7~~. Can the project be implemented in a timely manner?~~ *[the county has been wrestling with flood control for many decades; we do not want to sacrifice quality in the name of expedience; and what is "timely" – 3 years? 10 years?]*

~~8. Is the project cost reasonable and sustainable?~~

~~Capital~~

~~Land acquisition~~

~~Maintenance~~

~~Cost benefit~~ *[this is pretty subjective and maintenance costs are captured above. Project cost reasonableness seems more of a design question. A better question might be: Would the project qualify for multiple funding sources (e.g. flood control, economic development, recreation, salmon/Puget Sound recovery). If cost/benefit is to be evaluated there should be a significant discussion to ensure inclusion of ALL costs and ALL benefites (e.g. clean water, recreation, productive farmland, etc.) – not a simple question.]*

9. ~~Will the project be acceptable to the community?~~ *[something about community support is important but we need to be more specific….what will it take to "be acceptable to the community". Otherwise this gets too subjective to be useful as screening criteria. I would recommend]:*

.

~~Shared burden~~

~~Impacts on privately owned land~~Does the project meet community goals? In particular, does the project

– Improve or maintain drainage on farmland

– Improve fish and wildlife habitat

– Increase public access and recreation opportunities

– Preserve open space

– Distribute costs equitably across beneficiaries