



Clark County Environmental Services

# 2013-2018 NPDES Stormwater Permit TECHINCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 26, 2013

2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Public Service Center, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Training Room

<b>Attendees:</b>	<del>Don Benton</del> , Ron Wierenga, Rod Swanson, Jane Tesner Kleiner, Fereidoon Safdari	Clark County - DES
	<del>Ali Safayi</del> , John Davis/ <del>Mike Soliwoda</del>	Clark County – Public Works
	Gordy Euler	Clark County - Planning
	<del>Jan Bazala</del> , Jim Muir, Bryan Mattson	Clark County – Comm. Dev.
	Eric Golemo	SGA Engineering
	Andrew Gunther	PLS Engineering
	Nancy Olmsted	Clean Water Comm.
	John Meier	AKS Engineering
	Peter Tuck	Olson Engineering
	<del>Jon Girod</del>	Quail Homes
	<del>Troy Johns</del>	Urban NW Homes
	Lance Lehto	Columbia West
	Alex Zimmerman	Creative Courses
	Robin Krause	CRWD
	Annette Griffy	City of Vancouver
	<del>Lisa Cox</del> /Dan Gariepy	Dept. of Ecology
Tim Kraft (consultant for Barrier Review Analysis)	OTAK	

## Agenda Topics:

2:30	<b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b>	Clark County staff
2:40	<b>2. Project Overview</b>	Ron Wierenga
3:00	<b>3. Review of known issues with code and manuals</b>	Rod Swanson, all
3:30	<b>4. Proposed manuals – Update Vision, Goals, LID, Customer Service</b>	Rod Swanson, all
4:25	<b>5. Next steps</b>	Jane Tesner Kleiner

**NOTES – As sent 7.9.13 (see attached)**



## SUMMARY NOTES:

1. **Welcome and Introductions** – Ron Wierenga opened the meeting with introductions and overview
2. **Program Overview** – (presentation)
  - Slide 14 – Edit to graphic....#2 and #3 after the “OR” you can pick off a prioritized list (#1 or 2) based on the size of the project
  - John Meier – Are there opportunities to vest under the current code? Need to follow up.....the new permit has a “rule” that describes the vesting process (page 18)....within 5 years. In appeal with the state from other jurisdictions, to be heard by the PCHB this fall. Projects vest under “current code” at the time of fully complete application.
  - Ron Wierenga – Provided an update on the “interim” adopted code, over the next 60 days to public outreach and finalization of that requirement.
3. **Review of Issues Matrix** – Rod ran through several examples that were listed in the Issues Matrix handout.
  - a. Standard infiltration tests – Eric G. – Department of Ecology does not have a strong position on needing a change the language as it is considered equivalent and it seems to be working. Infiltration in bioretention or basin, but not covered under UIC, is covered under the permit.
  - b. #21 MR 8 – under previous permit, it was nearly impossible. New permit needs to be updated. Dan – WWHM2012 does cover this issue.
  - c. SESC – Alex Zimmerman– The different requirements based on State, County and City can be a struggle for builders and operators. Perhaps there is potential to better align requirements. Simple projects (i.e. pole barn) need a building permit therefore needs a CESCL....can get expensive. Ways to simplify? Update thresholds potentially? John Meier- Why fill out a county form if folks have to fill out the DOE form? Tends to cause scheduling conflicts for some developers. Rod- Try to economize on Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (state and county).
  - d. SWPPP submittals – Peter Tuck - Might be good to submit later in the process. Move to pre-con could be appropriate. Develop to meet state requirements....would this be good enough to meet the county needs? Follow-up with Ali on “why do we require at this point?”
  - e. Nancy – attention should be given to how the feasibility of LID is determined within the context of the design engineering sequence. Questions that could be addressed are where to be more specific in the manual to run the feasibility test....what type of LID stormwater feature would be most suitable on the ground for each project? Develop some stop gaps for the project designers (i.e. preliminary vs. final submittals to help in this respect). The updated LID technical manual includes some of these elements, although, some may need adjusting.
  - f. Alex – there is a need to translate from the code to instructions for the users. Define why these are being required and how to get the work done properly. These projects require a lot more on-site inspection and oversight.
  - g. Annette – Aligning the codes with other requirements, how to align references to other sections and overlaps. (i.e. transportation will require one thing, but align with

- stormwater vs. fire / safety, etc.). Peter – a lot of work touches on Transportation requirements so we'll need to give some clear review of these potential conflicts.
- h. Coordination with other county staff – We are required to remove barriers, therefore it will take careful coordination with other affected groups (i.e. road standards vs. parking requirements). Based on last round of updates to the road standards, the effort went a long way to meet the requirements, but there is more work to be done. It would be great to have them align from City and County standards. Use a goal to align Phase 1 and Phase 2 permittee requirements where feasible. The City has different thresholds for the Phase 2.
  - i. Phase 2 jurisdictions need to adopt state or Phase 1 manuals, but can write their own (DOE will not review).
4. **Design Manual Framework** - Rod read through the layouts. Andrew – this could be more convenient to have a consolidated manual. Rod – the goal is to make our manual independent from the State document, but it will include State verbage (i.e. remove the background info that is good for a guidance manual but may not be necessary for a design manual). Eric – it could create a pretty large document. Ron has heard feedback to not adopt the state's manual outright, so what is a good balance to an independent County manual. What happens if the State significantly changes their document? Dan – the language has to follow the permit so there is limited expectation that there would be change prior to the next permit. Staff will be required to update the design manual every 5 years unless there is a change in the permit from DOE.
5. **Next Steps** –
- a. **Parking Lot issues** – add ideas to be addressed later on the post-it pad
  - b. **Next steps** –
    - i. What dates/times work best for you? Wednesday afternoons worked for most people.
    - ii. We'll get some dates on the calendar (Next meeting will be August 14, 2013, 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. 1300 Franklin St., 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Training Room
    - iii. Review of Barrier / Gap Analysis in future meetings with OTAK
  - c. **What do you hope to get out of these discussions** – Act as a conduit to clients; how to get more messages out to users; contribute to creating flexible and usable tools; other public outreach opportunities; costs are still a concern; generate interest in developing new green industries within the local suppliers and/or developer, contractor collaboration for the specialty items; generate potential for engineering firms to be the spokespersons for promotion of LID so the regulations are not viewed as onerous but are a simple guidebook for successful, sustainable projects.
  - d. **Other public outreach tools** – a Stakeholder Advisory group, public forums

## End of Summary