



Clark County Environmental Services

2013-2018 NPDES Stormwater Permit TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE #8

Wednesday, May 7, 2014

3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Public Service Center, 6th Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin St.

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Attendees: | Don Benton , Ron Wierenga, Rod Swanson, Jane Tesner Kleiner, Fereidoon Safdari, Chris Clifford | Clark County - DES |
| | Ali Safayi, John Davis | Clark County – Public Works |
| | Gordy Euler | Clark County - Planning |
| | Jan Bazala, Jim Muir, Bryan Mattson | Clark County – Comm. Dev. |
| | Eric Golemo | SGA Engineering |
| | Andrew Gunther | PLS Engineering |
| | Jim Carlson | Clean Water Comm. |
| | John Meier | AKS Engineering |
| | Peter Tuck | Olson Engineering |
| | Jon Girod | Quail Homes |
| | Troy Johns | Urban NW Homes |
| | Lance Lehto | Columbia West |
| | Alex Zimmerman | Creative Courses |
| | Robin Krause | CRWD |
| | Annette Griffy | City of Vancouver |
| Tim Kraft (consultant for manual update) | OTAK | |

Agenda Topics:

| | | |
|------|--|---------------------|
| 3:00 | 1. Welcome | Clark County staff |
| 3:05 | 2. Feedback from last meeting – any follow-up | All |
| 3:15 | 3. Design Manual Update Project • Discussion on Review Draft | All |
| 4:50 | 5. Next steps • SAC meeting on May 8 (4-6 pm at Elections bldg.) • BOCC work session on May 14 (11:15 am 6 th floor PSC) • Finalize “Final Draft” and submit to DOE in June • Next meeting - TBD | Jane Tesner Kleiner |

NOTES: Guests – Kelly Uhacz (Battle Ground); Trista Kobluskie (Otak)



For other formats, contact the Clark County ADA Office: **Voice** (360) 397-2322; **Relay** 711 or (800) 833-6388; **Fax** (360) 397-6165; **E-mail** ADA@clark.wa.gov.

MEETING SUMMARY

Open Discussion on the Review Draft – How is the flow of Book 1 and Book 2 for the users?

- General overview is a good manual and includes the necessary information.
- Infiltration chapter received the bulk of the work and represented one of the biggest challenges to address.
- The challenge will be when we start to really apply the manual. One TAC member has his colleagues applying the manual to a project as a test for applicability. He will send comments to Otak.
- The overall intent of the update is to simplify and move sections to logical order without duplication. In some instances, there are places where information could be duplicated to assist the user (especially if new to manual). Need to add more references to direct new users as to where to find information (i.e. bioretention, permeable pavement, etc.).
- The introductory chapter is really helpful for the new user. May want to look at how information (such as the Lists) is laid out in the County's NPDES permit. Some of the other permit information may be helpful to the new / average user.
- Include references to the treatment and on-site to show what BMPs are applicable. Don't need to repeat Repeat from Chapter 6 to 5 (and perhaps vice versa as well).
- Need to confirm infiltration basins are listed (they are listed in detention in the DOE manual). Would it be helpful to include an index to reference the BMPs? They are listed in one location our draft manual and a different section for DOE. Look at text in the SWMMWW for text Volume 5, page 7-2.
- Simplified vs. detailed approach to testing for Infiltration – Book 1, page 124. This has been reviewed a great deal but what is the most commonly used approach? Or should the County eliminate these methods and just use the ASCE approach? What would DOE's approach for equivalency? DOE has stated that the ASCE approach is acceptable. Perhaps put the ASCE approach in the body of work and list the other methods in an appendix.
- Off-site analysis (our currently language is broadly worded from the 2005 DOE manual). Perhaps we will add a paragraph to identify some examples to help clarify when additional analysis is necessary. It may be helpful to get feedback from this group to help clarify applicability. Noted on Chapter 1, page 54. There appears to be discrepancy on thresholds of when to apply. List on page 244 for potential impacts. Applicants want more clarity on what exactly is required to provide while the county wants flexibility to get more information as needed to ensure the approach has been thoroughly reviewed to minimize impacts. Section 3, Page 3-8 of DOE manual has good verbiage on this topic and may be considered for this draft. There is a typo of "pervious" vs. "impervious" in the current language. For MR 1-9, it is suggested off site for all projects which is similar to the 2009 manual.
- Capacity question including analysis of the conveyance system. If the current system is not sized for the 100-year flow, what conditions does the applicant need to meet? At what rate? For MR 7 flow control exemption, does this language need to be updated? There needs to be some language that addresses that you are discharging to a flow control exempted water body but addresses an undersized conveyance system. This topic is not currently covered in the manual. Example, how do you maintain hydrology to wetland and excess flow is discharged at forested rate in an undersized conveyance system without impacting the wetland (i.e. flow splitter)? What is the opinion from DOE on this topic? This will need to be determined on a "project by project" basis. Go back to the intent of the requirement – protecting the stream base flow and try to develop language that addresses the intent. Trying to protect the hydroperiod of the wetland.
- County funded transportation projects will use the WSDOT manual for linear projects. What is the applicability of accepting other acceptable DOE BMPs? Will need further discussion by the County.
- What is the ability to match industrial / business complexes to the allow vesting of parcels within the site similar to residential subdivisions. What is the length of time that those parcels can use the approved

engineering plans? Time frame is listed in the permit. The county will need to review with the prosecuting attorney's office.

- Regional facility definition (in the proposed 40.386) needs to be updated to correlate to the manual (A-37).
- Eliminate "Puget Sound Basin" from the glossary. Do we need definition of the "Columbia River Basin?" No. There are areas that may be included in the backwater therefore clarity would be helpful. As an example, there is tidal influence on the Salmon Creek up to the Cougar Creek. There are some areas on the Burnt Bridge Creek as well but are not comparable situations.
- "Should" vs. "shall" throughout the manual may cause some confusion as to exactly what is required vs. guidance for the designer. We don't want to change all should to shall as it then makes the manual more restrictive. Review the manual to change language to "shall" where it is a hard requirement. Do we need to define "should" to help clarify the requirements?
- The perspectives of the city represented (Vancouver and Battle Ground) – reviewing from the perspective of a Phase II permittee. Are there some things in our manual that would be a more restrictive requirement for a city? Modelling is different as well as some of the thresholds. Need to look at compliance for the city. Battle Ground will most likely adopt the 2012 manual but update their code.
- Graphics need to be updated and will be completed before the final adopted manual. They will not be updated for the "Final Draft" submitted in June. There are sufficient graphics to meet the intent in the manual for this round but the final version would benefit from consistent / updated graphics.
- Safety factor – We need to update language to 75% to match the 2009 SWMMWW manual language.

End of summary