DOCUMENT C-3

FATAL FLAW AND PROJECT SCREENING CRITERIA

INTRODUCTION

The Advisory Committee completed the following work efforts on the project fatal flaw screening criteria at their February 18, 2009 meeting. Discussion occurred on a very general option – Option 1 below, and a more detailed option – Option 2 below. General discussion included the following point: When applying the criteria to a measure should we consider three possible outcomes; 'fully meets', 'partially meets', or 'does not meet'.

OPTION 1

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 it's determined that a project meets those three then the devil will be in the details.

The Advisory Committee took action on a motion to adopt as their current fatal flaw criteria the three "E's", stated above, with the understanding that more detailed criteria would be developed at a later time using the work already completed by the Technical Committees and Advisory Committee. The motion failed by consensus, but carried by vote: 7 in favor, 6 opposed, 1 absention. The two meeting rule applies and the Advisory Committee will discuss and consider at their March 16 meeting.

OPTION 2

Note: Items highlighted in green were generally agreed upon by the Advisory Committee. Specific questions for the Dike and Drainage District are shown below under Criterion 1 and Criterion 3.

1. Does the project maintain or improve public safety and critical infrastructure protection relative to existing flood risk? In particular, does the project: *(Dike and Drainage Technical Committee: Define "maintain" and reason for including this word. AC questioned "maintain" which was interpreted to be no improvement from status quo) No input received from the DDTC as of 3/10/09.*
   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 addressed and/or mitigated?
3. Can the project maintenance and operations be sustained locally. (*Dike and Drainage TC – Please define "sustained". What does this mean specifically?) No input received from the DDTC as of 3/10/09.*

4. Does the project avoid adverse impact on soils and drainage in agricultural resource lands, except as pertains to implementation of flood hazard reduction measures (including related ecosystem restoration goals))?

Note: Advisory Committee did not discuss any of the criteria below in detail.

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)?
9. Could the project be designed to benefit multiple objectives?
   a. 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

The following potential criterion was suggested by an AC member, but not discussed at the meeting:

- 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.