



CLARK COUNTY
PUBLIC WORKS

Clean Water Program



Clark County Clean Water Commission 2007 Annual Report

to the
Board of Clark County Commissioners



Clark County Clean Water Commission Members

Mr. Bill Owen, P.E., Chair
(Chair, 2007)
12713 NW 21st Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98685

Ms. Patty Page, Vice Chair
12807 NW 20th Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98685

Mr. Robert Even
14300 NE 20th Avenue, D102
Vancouver, WA 98686

Mr. Carl Keller
12802 NE 182nd Avenue
Brush Prairie, WA 98606

Mr. Don Moe, P.E.
withheld
Vancouver, WA

Mr. David Morgan
33112 NW Lancaster Road
Ridgefield, WA 98642

Mrs. Susan Rasmussen
30101 NE 58th Avenue
La Center, WA 98629

Mr. Art Stubbs
6804 NE 86th Court
Vancouver, WA 98662

Ms. Virginia van Breemen
P.O. Box 559
4106 NE Stoughton Road
La Center, WA 98629

Former 2007 CWC Members

Mr. Ronald Wilson
3305 NE 116th Street
Vancouver, WA 98686

Mr. Tim Crawford
PO Box 1766
Battle Ground, WA 98604

On behalf of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, I approve the 2007 Annual Report to the Board of Clark County Commissioners.



Clean Water Commission Chair

June 20, 2008



For other formats

Clark County ADA Office, Voice (360) 397-2000
Relay (800) 833-6384, E-mail ADA@clark.wa.gov

Executive Summary

This report provides the Board of Clark County Commissioners (BOCC) an overview of work efforts performed by the Clark County Clean Water Commission (CWC) in 2007. The report focuses on the role of the Clean Water Commission, its accomplishments, observations, and activities it plans to undertake in 2008. This document also includes information regarding the county's 2007 expenditures for the Clean Water Program (CWP) and its overall effectiveness. The report concludes with a short list of recommendations to the BOCC.

The Clean Water Commission 2007 Action Plan resulted in continued work on several activities, and addressing new items. These include the following:

1. *Septic Tanks*: The BOCC agreed with the CWC recommendation to modify local code;
2. *Low Impact Development*: Staff has identified a number of projects to implement low impact development techniques;
3. *Education/Public Relations/Coordination*: The CWC is continuing in this effort;
4. *Incentives*: The CWC conducted an informal survey of incentives of other NPDES Phase 1 permittees in Washington, along with selected other jurisdictions.

The CWC opted to use a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) as its evaluation tool of the Clean Water Program's 2007 activities. Overall, the CWC believes:

- County staff knowledge and capability is program strength;
- Insufficient staff to properly complete work is a weakness;
- New permit requirements are an opportunity to lobby for an expanded program and funding
- Threats include loss of revenue due to potential annexation and the permit term, "minimum requirements".

The Clean Water Commission will focus on a variety of topics in 2008 including low impact development, education, Clean Water fees, and the 2008 Stormwater Capital Improvement Program Involvement Team (SCIPIT). Given this information, the Clark County Clean Water Commission makes the following recommendations for your consideration during the 2008 calendar year:

- To move aggressively in implementing the storm water ordinance code revisions as outlined in the new NPDES permit.
- Prepare new fee schedule to include incentive for all Clean Water Fee ratepayers in unincorporated Clark County.
- Schedule a meeting the Clean Water Commission for the first Quarter of 2009 to review our 2008 Annual Report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	I
INTRODUCTION AND 2007 ACCOMPLISHMENTS	1
PURPOSE & OVERVIEW.....	1
ROLE OF CLARK COUNTY CLEAN WATER COMMISSION	1
2007 CWC ACCOMPLISHMENTS	2
STATUS OF INCENTIVE PROGRAM	4
CWC OBSERVATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5
EVALUATION OF CLEAN WATER PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.....	5
SUMMARY OF CLEAN WATER PROGRAM EXPENDITURES	6
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	7
2008 ACTION PLAN	9
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS	9
APPENDIX A.....	10
CWC SURVEY OF STORMWATER DISCOUNT PROGRAMS	10
APPENDIX B.....	13
CWC EVALUATION OF 2007 CLEAN WATER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	13
APPENDIX C.....	18
SUMMARY OF 2007 CLEAN WATER PROGRAM EXPENDITURES.....	18
APPENDIX D.....	21
LOG OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AT 2007 CWC MEETINGS.....	21

Introduction and 2007 Accomplishments

Purpose & Overview

This report provides the Board of Clark County Commissioners (BOCC) an overview of work efforts performed by the Clark County Clean Water Commission (CWC) in 2007. The report focuses on the role of the Clean Water Commission, its accomplishments, observations, and activities it plans to undertake in 2008. This document also includes information regarding the county's 2007 expenditures for the Clean Water Program (CWP) and its overall effectiveness. The report concludes with a short list of recommendations to the BOCC.

Role of Clark County Clean Water Commission

The role of the nine-member Clean Water Commission is to serve as an advisory board to the Board of Clark County Commissioners on matters relating to improving the quality of stormwater runoff.

The CWC meets on the first Wednesday evening of each month. All of the meetings are open to the public. An important aspect of the CWC is that it provides the chance for the community to have a voice in managing one of our most precious resources, water. During each meeting an agenda is followed whereby the public, Clark County staff and the CWC listen to matters of importance regarding stormwater runoff. After information is presented to the group, participants at the meetings are allowed to discuss and give input.

The CWC's task is to listen to all information presented, ask questions of the presenters, listen to the public input and then make recommendations to the BOCC as necessary. These recommendations would most likely relate to the following subjects:

- Educating the public in stormwater matters
- County policy on stormwater issues
- Budget, revenue and stormwater fees
- Capital improvement projects
- Stormwater and facility maintenance
- NPDES compliance issues

Our responsibility is to serve as a link between the Clean Water Program staff, the public and the BOCC. All of us listening, learning, and working together can help to ensure that our stormwater runoff is clean as possible, enabling Clark County to be the most livable community it can be!

2007 CWC Accomplishments

The Clean Water Commission 2007 Action Plan resulted in continued work on several activities, and addressing new items. These include the following:

1. *Septic Tanks*: Continue to investigate the impact of septic tanks.

ACTION: The CWC met with the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) in a work session to discuss proposals presented by the CWC.

RESULT: The BOCC agreed with the CWC recommendation to modify local code to enhance inspections of these septic tanks and require their design drawings to be provided to the County as a matter of record. The BOCC also provided staff direction to determine the pollution occurring within the Salmon Creek Watershed, coordinating with lending institutions to improve compliance with ensuring septic systems perform properly, and focusing attention on older parcels more likely to having problems with septic systems.

2. *Low Impact Development*: Continue to promote stormwater low impact development, including studying how stormwater low impact development could improve water quality in Clark County. Also, work to identify a developer/partner that is willing to build a model project using some of the techniques.

ACTION: The CWC developed a Proposal to Encourage Low Impact Development in Clark County in November 2006, and presented its findings and proposal to the BOCC on January 24, 2007.

RESULT: Staff has identified a number of projects to implement low impact development techniques that can be monitored by the County, and used to demonstrate the application of these techniques. In addition, members of the CWC participated on the Stakeholder Advisory Committee to change the current stormwater ordinance to meet the requirements of the NPDES Permit. This ordinance revision encourages the use of low impact development techniques, and the County has developed a manual to assist in their design and construction.

There is a growing interest in the development community to use low impact development techniques. The ability to do so has been difficult under the current stormwater ordinance, even though staff is supportive of their use. The new stormwater ordinance will provide for the implementation of low impact development, and help reduce the impact of new requirements of the stormwater ordinance necessary to comply with the NPDES Permit.

3. Education/Public Relations/Coordination: Explore ways to provide water quality education to the community, public relations opportunities to promote the Clean Water Program, and coordinate resources available for each of the above.

ACTION: Clean Water Commissioners previously formed an education subcommittee to provide feedback regarding on-going activities of the Program's Education & Outreach staff. The CWC also heard presentations by staff, and participated on the Stakeholder Advisory Committee in the revision to the County stormwater ordinance. The CWC held an open house late in 2007 to update the public on the need and progress of the ordinance revision.

RESULT: The CWC is continuing in this effort, and is exploring opportunities to educate homeowners and the business community. These include changing the method of billing the fee, including information with the bill, and offering incentives to reduce the fee.

The Program continued with numerous education efforts, including River Heroes/Living Streams, the annual Watershed Festival, Watershed Stewards, a booth at the County fair, a rain barrel workshop, non-toxic cleaning workshops, a Wells and Septic workshop, Living on the Land workshop, and model farms.

4. Incentives: Form a committee to discuss options for providing incentives for reducing water quality impacts, particularly when an individual or business may not be required to do so for any other reason.

ACTION: The CWC conducted an informal survey of incentives of other NPDES Phase 1 permittees in Washington, along with selected other jurisdictions. Appendix A contains details of the survey results.

RESULT: Observations from this survey work include:

- Incentive programs are primarily targeted to commercial and industrial properties.
- Most incentives require engineer-approved structural facility (e.g. detention ponds).
- Examples of non-traditional incentives include a fee discount for an approved farm management programs (Pierce County), development bonus for ecoroofs (City of Portland), and a fee discount for large continuous areas of non-impervious surfaces (City of Seattle).
- While many incentives are available, many property owners do not take advantage of them due, in part, to the incentives' marginal economic benefit (e.g. City of Vancouver, City of Gresham, and City of Tacoma, Washington County).
- Several Washington NPDES Phase 1 jurisdictions are currently re-evaluating their incentives program with the new permit release.

Status of Incentive Program

The CWC has no recommendations for the BOCC regarding incentives at this time. However, if the County chooses to review the Clean Water Fee structure this year, this information regarding incentives could be included as a topic of conversation. Given the right conditions, incentives to stormwater fees can entice average homeowners to become more aware or actively involved in water quality issues. Incentives could also encourage business owners, who typically pay a substantially larger fee than residential property owners, to re-consider how they manage stormwater on their property.

CWC Observations & Recommendations

Evaluation of Clean Water Program Effectiveness

The CWC opted to use a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) as its evaluation tool of the Clean Water Program’s 2007 activities. This technique was applied to top three areas of interest for CWC members: capital program, education & technical assistance, and maintenance & operations. The table below provides a summary of this evaluation. Appendix B contains a full version of this evaluation, along with comments on other Clean Water Program functional areas.

	Capital Program	Education & Tech. Assistance	Maintenance & Operations	Applicable to entire CWP
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Formal process to prioritize stormwater capital projects ▪ Willingness to use consultants to supplement design staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of children reached ▪ Using partnerships for general education & outreach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visibility ▪ Streets are clean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff knowledge & capability
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intradepartmental communication ▪ Inability to use capital budget for several years makes it difficult to increase fee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Connect cause & effect ▪ Reach out more to non-profit organizations to help promote clean water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Condition assessment records of facilities could use improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient staff to properly complete work
Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local interest in green building, including Low Impact Development ▪ Expand list of potential capital projects to other watersheds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase educational info on web ▪ Educate homeowners on purpose, use & upkeep of their SW facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review frequency of maintenance cycles to reallocate budget ▪ Publicize amount of work done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New permit requirements are an opportunity to lobby for an expanded program and funding
Threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget limits program scope & imagination ▪ Lack of funding for future capital projects if fee not adjusted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hard to justify dollars when you can’t see a clear and measurable outcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increasing number of public & private BMPs are expensive to maintain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loss of revenue due to potential annexation ▪ Permit term “Minimum Requirements”

Summary of Clean Water Program Expenditures

One of our Commission's responsibilities is to review the CWP's budget periodically. Appendix C contains a copy of the County's Clean Water Program budget status as of December 31, 2007. The CWC makes the following observations based on our review of this information:

- The budget shows that over 53% of the total amount budgeted for the biennium falls into three categories: Intergovernmental Services (4%), Outside Services (18.6%), and Service by County Agencies/Departments (31%). And with 50% of the period expended, 62% of the funds expended fall into those same three categories. These figures raise several concerns.
- While we recognize the efficiencies to be gained by cooperative efforts and by "farming out" work to experts and other entities, we have a general uneasiness that so much of the Clean Water fees are spent outside the direct supervision of Clean Water Program staff. More specifically, we are disturbed that the program element that our evaluation found most wanting, Regulation and Enforcement, is 100% expended in Services by County Agencies.
- The figures in the Administration and Coordination program element related to billing handling and the work of public relations seem excessive (as do the projected costs for including the Clean Water fee into the unified billing to be implemented in 2009). It is our impression that the Clean Water Program bears these and other costs, whether truly and fairly proportional, without recourse.
- Another concern we have is that certain amounts may be budgeted, but authorization to expend the funds is withheld. Where there is a clear need, accompanied by a clear benefit, withholding such authorization is clearly detrimental to the Program.
- It does not seem appropriate that Clean Water Fees be used to support the Clark County Endangered Species Act Program. The County collects this service charge from residents for the sole purpose of providing "regulation of and protection from stormwater runoff in the unincorporated areas of the county" (CCC Chapter 13.30AS.010). Thus, these dollars should not be used to fund any activities that are not associated with the NPDES permit.
- Finally, it seems totally inappropriate to the Clean Water Commissioners that Clean Water fees – intended to improve water quality in Clark County – should be used to contest NPDES requirements.

NOTE: This report deals with information up to 12/31/2007. Changes have been made in 2008 that promise to address some of these concerns.

Summary of Public Comments

This section summarizes citizen-initiated contacts to County staff and public comments during Clean Water Commission meetings held in 2007. Sources of public comments include those made at CWC meetings and those received by the County's Clean Water Program.

Comments Made at 2007 Clean Water Commission Meetings

Appendix D includes a log of the public comments received during the CWC monthly meetings in 2007. In these comments, concerns were expressed related to the following:

- Specific instances of illicit discharges into the stormwater system,
- Lack of proper erosion control on specific development sites,
- Inadequate response to reports of problems,
- Lack of a comprehensive Groundwater Management Plan, and
- The perceived need for more Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) designations.

Citizens urged the members of the Clean Water Commission and the Clean Water Program staff to put into place mechanisms or strategies to ensure that Clark County complies fully and whole-heartedly with the new NPDES permit.

Citizen-initiated Contacts to County Staff

Table 2 summarizes the citizen-initiated contacts received by the County's Clean Water Program during 2007. For the eagle-eyed, the numbers for prior years have been adjusted from the 2006 report to reflect calls taken in the current year that were related to prior years' billings. Address and Billing errors have dropped significantly, though issues related to the calculation criteria have risen slightly. This implies a need to:

- 1) Carefully structure any fee increases for understandability,
- 2) Educate the public with clarity on the increases, and
- 3) Ensure that, when the unified billing system is implemented in 2009, it is well tested and reviewed for accuracy where the Clean Water Fee is concerned.

Questions about the Clean Water Program itself have decreased. We surmise that this is due to heightened public awareness about environmental matters in general, and to the effectiveness of the CWP Education and Outreach efforts.

Statistics on mode of contact have not been included here, however they are maintained by the Clean Water Program, and show that even with total calls decreasing, and all other modes of contact decreasing (written, voice mail, phone calls), email contacts have increased very slightly.

Table 2. Clean Water Program Citizen-Initiated Contacts

<i>Issue Type</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>Marked Trend</i>
Address, addressee error	8	8	5	↓
Billing math error	23	16	3	↓
Billing math question resolved	100	36	15	↓
Calculation criteria error	11	11	11	
Calculation criteria question resolved	0	5	11	↑
CWP questions	52	14	6	↓
Comments only	2	0	2	
Drainage issues	4	4	2	
General complaint	52	11	3	↓
Request appeal*	3	5	1	↓
Request Hardship/Senior exemption	3	5	0	
Request for info*	6	4	14	
Fee structure, rate, tax	0	0	8	
Other	20	4	3	
Subtotal – all issues	284	123	84	↓
Additional uncategorized calls	75	250	143	↓
Total public-initiated contacts	359	373	227	↓

* *These issues are recapped under “Actions Taken” below*

Uncategorized calls: Issues resolved on the first contact are often not categorized.
 Categorized calls: Calls are assigned to a single issue. If more than one issue is raised, the call is assigned to the most important issue. Requests for appeal form trump all other issues.

For reference, a summary of the results of the calls received is shown in Table 3.

Summary of Citizen-initiated Contacts

The overall decrease in citizen-initiated contacts regarding Clean Water fee billings suggests growing acceptance of the Clean Water Program as a valid county government function. As staff fine-tunes the tracking of these contacts, the data is becoming more and more dependable.

Table 3. Actions Taken

	2005	2006	2007	Trend
Information requested/sent	15	9	14	
Site visits	5	4	1	
Contacts escalated to Dispute Tracker		1	5	
Appeal Forms requested	11	4	1	↓
Appeals submitted*	6	6	0	
Appeals approved	1	1	0	
Appeals denied	4	5	0	

** Some appeal forms are requested but not submitted; occasionally an appeal is submitted on fee payer's own form. Appeals are approved or denied by the Director of Public Works.*

2008 Action Plan

The Clean Water Commission will focus on topics in 2008 that continue from previous years, along with a couple of new items:

- Promoting low impact development opportunities in Clark County;
- CWC Education Subcommittee to explore ways to provide water quality education to the community, public relations opportunities to promote the Clean Water Program;
- Initiating a discussion on the Clean Water Fees as they relate to projected costs of compliance with the new NPDES (stormwater) permit;
- Participate in the 2008 Stormwater Capital Improvement Program Involvement Team (SCIPIT) to prioritize future CWP capital projects.

Recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners

Given this information, the Clark County Clean Water Commission makes the following recommendations for your consideration during the 2008 calendar year:

- To move aggressively in implementing the storm water ordinance code revisions as outlined in the new NPDES permit.
- Review Clean Water Fee, Fee structure, and potential incentives for all ratepayers in unincorporated Clark County.
- Schedule a meeting the Clean Water Commission for the first Quarter of 2009 to review our 2008 Annual Report.

Appendix A

CWC Survey of Stormwater Discount Programs

**Stormwater User Fees and Discount Programs
A Survey of Selected Municipal Utilities**

Jurisdiction	Rate Structure	Qualifications	Inspections	Incentives / Discount Structure Other Requirements	Limits	Cost to Administer Incentives' Program	What happens to \$\$ when discount not used?	Source
City of Bellevue, Washington	Base Rate (\$3.29/bimonthly) plus sliding scale based on intensity of development (\$0 for wetlands to \$9.87 for 70% impervious). Charge for lightly developed (20% impervious) and moderately developed (40% impervious) areas are \$3.96 and \$4.95 respectively. Rates effective for the year 2008.	Credit for on-site detention.	Regular inspections conducted by the utility.	Facilities must be reviewed and permitted by the utility.	Reduces effective rate to next lowest rate class.			http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Utilities/2008_Utility_Rates.pdf
Clackamas County, Oregon	Equivalent Service Unit (ESU) based on 2500 square feet of impervious area. ESU set at \$6.00 per month (Effective 7/1/2007).	Credits are based on extent of on-site controls for water quality and quantity as set forth in established policy manual.	Ratepayer files annual maintenance certification. Inspections authorized via application.	Professional certification required for all technical information provided in support of applications other than those for single family residences.	Maximum credit of 33% for water quality and 33% for water quantity. Full credits linked based on control of 100-year storm event.			http://www.co.clackamas.or.us/sites/about.htm
City of Gresham, Oregon	Drainage Residential Unit (DRU) based on 2500 square feet of impervious area and set at \$7.65 per month (as of November, 2007). SFR built prior to July 1, 1994 equals 1 DRU. All other SFR based on 130% of actual building footprint plus 650 square feet.	Quick Credit requires full on-site retention, and some water quality and source controls. Prorated Credits are allowed for partial on-site retention. Additional credit is allowed for facilities that exceed City design requirements.	No follow-up inspections except for large commercial facilities.	Application & photo documentation required to get fee reduction	Quick Credit limited to 27% of monthly charge.			Conversation with Steve Fancher/Watershed Mgt Manager plus following web site: http://www.ci.gresham.or.us/departments/fms/fmservice/utilitybilling/fees.asp
King County, Washington	Fixed for Single Family Residential (SFR) lots: \$111 per year. All others based on sliding scales linked to % of impervious cover. Includes charges on open spaces.	Flow control and water quality treatment for at least 50% of parcel. Standards set by stormwater manual.	Pre and post assessments. Inspections authorized via application	Source Control BMPs for non-residential ratepayers. Applicant must submit detailed technical information of facilities installed prior to stormwater manual. Information must be stamped by a licensed engineer.	50% for SFR. "Light" Non-Residential reduced to SFR rate. All others reduced by one rate class.			http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wmf/surface-water-mgt-fees/
Pierce County, Washington	SFR annual rates range from \$26 to \$119, depending watershed and CIP level of service and river maintenance. Rates for other properties include a minimum charge (same as above) plus a per-foot rate for impervious area (\$0.0088 to \$0.0470).	Any ratepayer that has an engineered-designed facility to control runoff can apply. Farms can also receive a discount with an approved NRCS farm management plan.	Professionally Inspected annually for the 1st 5 years then once every 5 years thereafter - all at the property owner's expense.	1) Submit credit application; 2) Submit approved/stamped plans; 3) Certify that the system is constructed and functioning as designed; 4) Perform the required maintenance.	Participation in the credit program can reduce SWM Utility fees by as much as 85%. To obtain this discount, one must control 100-year storm. Control of smaller storms receive a prorated discount. The ceiling for farm discounts is 25%.	< 0.5 FTE (includes time for engineer and financial specialists)	Not applicable. The dollar amount for any credit approved is very small compared to the entire program budget.	Pierce County Code 11.02. Conversation with Harold Smelt/Water Program Mgr plus following web site: http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/pz/services/home/enviro/zwa/alter/cip/credflapp.htm
City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services, Oregon	Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) based on 2400 square feet of impervious area. SFR is \$17.33 per month (\$11.26 off-site + \$6.07 on-site charges). Effective July 1, 2007	4 Program Exist: (1) Clean River Rewards, (2) Downspout Disconnection Program, (3) EcoRoof Bonus, (4) Community Watershed Stewardship Grants	Under development	See City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services web site for details: http://www.portlandonline.com/bes/index.cfm?c=37487	(1) 100% credit for on-site stormwater charge; (2) \$83 per disconnection; (3) Sliding scale up to 1 square foot of ecoroof equals three square feet of additional floor area; (4) \$5,000 limit awarded per project (average 12 project per year receive grants)	(1) Initial year was \$1.5 million budget or 15.5 staff in first year; budget & # of staff will go down sharply in future years. (2) \$500,000/year or 3 staff + Americorps volunteers; (3) N/A; (4) 1.5 staff to administer program	Money is returned to the rate stabilization fund to reduce rate increases in future years	Conversation with Dan Vrzini/BES plus following web site: http://www.portlandonline.com/bes/index.cfm?c=31019&a=121563

Stormwater User Fees and Discount Programs A Survey of Selected Municipal Utilities

Jurisdiction	Incentives / Discount Structure					Source	
	Rate Structure	Qualifications	Inspections	Other Requirements	Limits		Cost to Administer Incentives' Program
City of Seattle/Seattle Public Utilities, Washington	SFR annual rates range from \$91.38 to \$213.00 based on total square feet up to 10,000 square feet. All other properties are charged an annual rate based on the percentage of impervious area on their lot. Those annual rates range from \$9.09 (0-15% imp.) to \$50.53 (86-100% imp.) per 1,000 square feet of impervious surface. Rates effective January 1, 2008.	Low income customers; Low impact rates available for properties with less than 65% impervious area that also include a continuous area of at least one-half an acre	Inspected when application received. Inspected every 5-years thereafter. Suppose to be a 2-year frequency but shortage of staff increases this frequency.	Detention facility must meet code requirements.	50% reduction for low income customers; Low impact rates range from approx. 10-20% discount depending on rate category		Web site: http://www.seattle.gov/util/Services/Drainage_&_Sewer/Rates/DrainageRates/index.htm
Snohomish County, Washington	ERU based on 1/4 acre (10,890 square feet) of impervious area. SFR ranges from \$33.10 to \$65.00 per year depending on whether one lives within the urban growth boundary. COM & IND annual rates range from \$9.90 to \$194.98 per 1/4 acre of imp. Area. Farm rates have a ceiling of 1-acre. Original fee established 1987. Rates above effective January 1, 2008.	Discounts available for commercial properties with a detention facility			Discount is a on-category rate reduction. This is equivalent to an annual reduction of \$19.81 to \$88.81 per 1/4 acre of impervious surface.	1.5 FTEs to administer entire fee plus incentives. Does not include time for inspections.	No designated program within the Surface Water Management Program receives this money; redistributed in its program budget.
City of Tacoma, Washington	Fixed fee of \$4.43 per month plus a unit charge per 500 square feet of developed property. Unit charges range from \$0.164 to \$1.3113 per 500 square feet. A typical 7,000 sqft SFR lot pays \$13.87 per month. Rates effective as of January 1, 2008.	Property owners that use and maintain low-impact development (LID) practices. Residents who qualify as low-income elderly or low-income disabled.	LID facility undergoes an initial inspection and ongoing source control inspections similar to stormwater facilities.	LID facility has to meet all permit requirements for City (e.g. design standards, stamped plans, etc.)	Businesses using LID can qualify for a one-category rate reduction. Residents who qualify as low-income elderly or low-income disabled may be eligible for rates reduced by 25 percent		Conversation with Shauna Hansen/Public Works plus City web site: http://www.cityoftacoma.org/Page.aspx?hid=2092
City of Vancouver, Washington	ERU based on 2500 square feet of impervious area. SFR is \$6.38 per month. COM & IND are \$6.38 per 2500 sq. ft. impervious surface per month (\$6.38 minimum). Rates effective January 1, 2008.	50% discount available to commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential properties	No regular inspections; under development. Will make site visits on an as-needed basis	Current on one's utility bill & are a stormwater ratepayer	Maximum credit of 50% of fee	Not available	Phone conversation with Annett Griffy/Public Works plus following web site: http://www.cityofvancouver.us/MunicipalCode.aspx?menuid=10462&submenuid=10478&title=title_14&chapter=09&VMC=060.html
Washington County, Oregon (Clean Water Services)	Equivalent Service Unit (ESU) based on 2640 square feet of impervious area. ESU set at \$4.00 per month. Single Family Residential (SFR) property equals 1 ESU. Effective July 1, 2007.	Set by Clean Water Services. Full exemption for 100% stormwater retention. No credits for partial controls.	Inspection prior to approval of exemption request. Fee for review and inspections. Utility Application must include a maintenance plan.	Facilities must be certified by a licensed engineer, and reviewed and permitted by the utility.	Full exemption if applicant retains 100% of volume for all storm events.		http://www.cleanwaterservices.org/CustomService/YourBill/Rates.aspx

NOTE: Washington Department of Transportation is a NPDES Phase I permittee. However, they do not charge stormwater rates nor have a incentive/discount system

Appendix B

CWC Evaluation of 2007 Clean Water Program Activities

(Note: The following are excerpts from the March 5 and April 2, 2008 meeting notes.)

Mr. Gladson is the Public Works Public Information & Community Relations Manager. He will facilitate the evaluation. The evaluation will be a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats). The group will select three of the five program areas. The notes will inform the report in a narrative form as opposed to the previous matrix.

Mr. Gladson briefly reviewed the primary components of each program element. He asked for the top three from the CWC. Mr. Keller thought only choosing three program elements would fail to supply a complete evaluation of the program. Each element may be important. Mr. Gladson: with time limitations, selecting the most important three seemed the best way to evaluate in-depth. Mr. Owen: we have struggled with good ways to evaluate the program. This is our experiment for this year. Mr. Rowell noted that the 2008 Work Plan has specific targets, which should make next year's evaluation easier.

After a discussion, the group chose Capital, Education, and Operations & Maintenance. Mr. Gladson suggested a short section at the next meeting or e-mail communication to talk about other aspects of the program.

Capital

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Formal process to prioritize stormwater capital projects ▪ Partnering with other agencies and private enterprise – WSDOT, county roads ▪ Willingness to use consultants to supplement design staff ▪ Staff capability ▪ The Curtin Creek project was started 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of choices on types of filtering facilities and retention facilities ▪ Intradepartmental communication. (Land was sold by one section of Public Works without informing CWP, killing one potential project.) ▪ Not using up capital budget for several years makes it difficult to ask for more money ▪ Insufficient staff ▪ Set of available projects is geographically limited, mostly to Whipple Creek
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use LID to add treatment to developed areas that are currently untreated without incurring huge land costs ▪ Local interest in green building, including LID ▪ Expand list of potential capital projects to other watersheds ▪ New requirements are an opportunity to lobby for an expanded program and funding 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loss of facilities and revenue to annexation ▪ Lack of funding for capital projects if fee not adjusted ▪ Budget limitations limit program scope (imagination) ▪ Term “Minimum Requirements” ▪ New requirements increase size of stormwater facilities, consequently are more expensive and may hogtie economic growth and opportunity

Discussion

Mr. Rowell noted that the capital budget is now going to be spent. Mr. Stubbs stated that the capital budget was not spent previously because of staffing shortages.

Mr. Owen pointed out that some comments were relevant to the entire program, not just to the capital component, such as loss of revenue to annexation, insufficient staff, and new requirements providing an opportunity to expand program.

Ms. Page noted that limiting economic growth and development is not intrinsically bad.

Mr. Keller wondered if the county had been receptive to Clean Water Commission recommendations. Mr. Stubbs: they have not refused CWC requests. Mr. Owen: neither side has been very proactive. Ms. Page: that's not an evaluation of the Clean Water Program, but of the Clean Water Commission. Mr. Gladson: are those separate? Ms. Page thought so.

Outreach & Education / Technical Assistance

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completed public survey ▪ Billboard contest and interest in it ▪ Number of children reached ▪ Watershed Stewards program & coordination ▪ Recognizing and using partnerships for general education & outreach (e.g. Regional Coalition) ▪ Number & participation of volunteers ▪ Staff capabilities ▪ Good source control outreach given limited staff 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey delayed by lack of support from BOCC ▪ Programs lack measures of effectiveness ▪ Amount of educational info on web ▪ Connect cause & effect ▪ Could reach out more to non-profits to supplement their work or to promote clean water (e.g. watershed councils, 4-H) ▪ Schools getting free ride ▪ Insufficient staff for source control goals
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase educational info on web ▪ Billboard art contest ▪ Expand volunteer commitment ▪ Offer education program / demonstrations to each of 34 neighborhood association (e.g. rain garden) ▪ Educate homeowners on purpose, use and upkeep of their stormwater facilities ▪ Placemats ▪ People will become more aware of program and water quality issues when discussing possible fee increase ▪ Institute a fee incentive program ▪ Rainwater art 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hard to justify dollars when you can't see a clear and measurable outcome

Discussion

Ms. Page disputed the value of the billboard art contest.

Maintenance and Operations

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visibility ▪ Staff capabilities ▪ Streets are clean 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient staff ▪ Condition assessment records of facilities could use improvement
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review frequency of sweeping & cleaning cycles and potentially reallocate budget ▪ Publicize amount of work done 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The increasing number of proprietary BMPs that are expensive to maintain ▪ Increasing number of public facilities and public roads will increase maintenance costs

Discussion

Mr. Stubbs stated that underground filter vaults should be prohibited.

Mr. Stubbs asked if the program had been audited recently. Mr. Rowell replied that one “audit” would be by Department of Ecology to determine if the county is meeting its permit requirement. Another type of audit would be a performance audit. The last one was in 2003.

Monitoring

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • staff quality • # of monitoring stations • Volunteer monitoring program 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ time-consuming ▪ lack of staff
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • empower volunteer monitors to work independently 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • diverse interests could diffuse monitoring data collection

Discussion

Mr. McConathy contended that volunteer monitors frequently do not go out independently of staff; therefore their efforts do not magnify staff efforts. Mr. Owen wondered if the volunteer monitors themselves are not stepping up to the plate for that kind of responsibility.

Regulation & Enforcement

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clarity of the program requirements • staff knowledge of local builders and their practices • improved construction site practices are evident 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no effort to improve compliance • cannot report violations after hours • building inspectors reluctant to enforce water quality because they're "not familiar with the regulations" • lack of staff
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how effective is it to share bodies between one functional area and another? • push the envelope to achieve compliance • better coordination with DOE on construction NPDES permit 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATVs & other destructive public infringement on construction sites

Discussion

Mr. McConathy contended that building inspectors are reluctant to enforce water quality because they're "not familiar with the regulations," yet they've received training again and again. He stated that some staff that are sharing NPDES duties with other duties may be expending less effort on NPDES than reported or paid for. He reported that some contractors continue to practice very poor or non-existent erosion control.

Administration & Coordination

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledgeable staff • better coordination between monitoring & capital through the SNAP • provide prompt and good responses to CWC 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of staff • more coordination between education, source control, regulations, maintenance through the SNAP
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • programmatic coordination with neighboring cities 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Discussion

Mr. McConathy requested more coordination with Public Health on septic issues, particularly in Burnt Bridge Creek and Salmon Creek. Mr. Rowell responded that the CWC looked extensively at the topic in 2006, and Public Health was identified as the lead entity on septic issues. Public Health recently submitted a grant application to the state to help subsidize septic repairs for low-income property owners; the Clean Water Commission and the Clean Water Program each submitted letters of support for the grant application.

Mr. McConathy stated that the NPDES permit requires inter-local agreements and none are forthcoming. Mr. Moe suggested that as Phase II permittees come online, that could force the issue. The group discussed diking districts, the port district, and others that may be eligible.

Appendix C

Summary of 2007 Clean Water Program Expenditures

**2007-08 Clean Water Program Budget
as of December 31, 2007**

(period expended = 50.0%)

Object Code	Program Element	Budget	% of Total Budget	Expenditures	% Spent	Budget Remaining	Comments
Capital Improvements		\$4,437,030	29.04%	\$1,102,747	24.85%	\$3,334,283	
100s	Salaries	\$168,052	1.10%	\$109,147	64.95%	\$58,905	
200s	Benefits	\$58,865	0.39%	\$30,702	52.16%	\$28,163	
300s	Supplies	\$1,700	0.01%	\$9,994	587.88%	-\$8,294	
400s	Outside Services	\$322,600	2.11%	\$17,306	5.36%	\$305,294	A
600s	Capital Outlay	\$3,870,000	25.33%	\$916,552	23.68%	\$2,953,448	A
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$15,813	0.10%	\$19,046	120.45%	-\$3,233	A
Non-Capital Improvements		\$1,104,594		\$433,887	39.28%	\$670,707	B
100s	Salaries	\$401,583	2.63%	\$202,967	50.54%	\$198,616	
200s	Benefits	\$145,684	0.95%	\$56,750	38.95%	\$88,934	
300s	Supplies	\$35,425	0.23%	\$3,193	9.01%	\$32,232	
400s	Outside Services	\$139,126	0.91%	\$36,780	26.44%	\$102,346	C
600s	Capital Outlay	\$0	0.00%	\$252		-\$252	
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$382,776	2.51%	\$133,945	34.99%	\$248,831	
Monitoring		\$2,296,952	15.03%	\$612,010	26.64%	\$1,684,942	
100s	Salaries	\$497,615	3.26%	\$241,468	48.53%	256,147	
200s	Benefits	\$188,170	1.23%	\$67,348	35.79%	120,822	
300s	Supplies	\$219,100	1.43%	\$16,557	7.56%	202,543	
400s	Outside Services	\$1,225,200	8.02%	\$197,441	16.12%	1,027,759	C
600s	Capital Outlay	\$0	0.00%	\$169		-169	
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$166,867	1.09%	\$89,027	53.35%	77,840	
Public Education and Outreach		\$2,062,414	13.50%	\$438,156	21.24%	\$1,624,258	
100s	Salaries	\$520,454	3.41%	\$166,407	31.97%	\$354,047	
200s	Benefits	\$158,560	1.04%	\$45,703	28.82%	\$112,857	
300s	Supplies	\$12,400	0.08%	\$1,998	16.11%	\$10,402	
400s	Outside Services	\$927,057	6.07%	\$93,392	10.07%	\$833,665	D
500s	Inter-Governmental Services	\$363,784	2.38%	\$89,869	24.70%	\$273,915	D
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$80,159	0.52%	\$40,787	50.88%	\$39,372	D
Regulation and Enforcement		1,177,747	7.71%	479,618	40.72%	698,129	
100s	Salaries		0.00%	48,128		-48,128	
200s	Benefits		0.00%	15,539		-15,539	
400s	Outside Services	2,500	0.02%	\$135,087		-132,587	
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	1,175,247	7.69%	\$280,864	23.90%	894,383	E
Operations and Maintenance		\$2,396,060	15.68%	\$951,767	39.72%	\$1,444,293	
100s	Salaries	\$0	0.00%	\$8,258		-8,258	
200s	Benefits	\$0	0.00%	\$2,142		-2,142	
400s	Outside Services	\$0	0.00%	\$2,819		-2,819	
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$2,396,060	15.68%	\$938,548	39.17%	1,457,512	F
Administration & Coordination		\$1,803,866	11.81%	\$347,761	19.28%	\$1,456,105	
100s	Salaries	\$409,729	2.68%	\$13,962	3.41%	\$395,767	
200s	Benefits	\$127,002	0.83%	\$32,330	25.46%	\$94,672	
300s	Supplies	\$12,000	0.08%	\$3,082	25.68%	\$8,918	
400s	Outside Services	\$233,470	1.53%	\$39,716	17.01%	\$193,754	G
550s	Support to Clark County Endangered Species Act Program	\$210,000	1.37%	\$95,000	45.24%	\$115,000	H
551	Interfund Subsidy	\$282,950	1.85%	\$0.00	0.00%	\$282,950	I
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$528,715	3.46%	\$163,671	30.96%	\$365,044	J
Total		\$15,278,663	100.00%	\$4,365,946	28.58%	\$10,912,717	

>>Turn page to see comments>>

**2007-08 Clean Water Program Budget
as of December 31, 2007**

(period expended = 50.0%)

Comments: The activates listed below represent two years of work.	
A.	<i>Dollars for additional capital improvements, such as construction of the Curtin Creek Enhancement Project (~\$3.2 Million); design of several stormwater facilities at NE 152nd/NE 20th Avenue, grade control at NE 179th Street/I-5; implementation of low impact development pilot projects near Jorgenson Park and behind the Clark County Public Service Center, etc.</i>
B.	<i>This is for scoping stormwater capital improvements, such as retrofitting defective stormwater facilities, low impact development projects, general stormwater engineering support, stormwater inventory tracking, etc.</i>
C.	<i>The Stormwater Needs Assessment Program needs outside services to perform riparian, physical habitat, geomorphology, hydrology and hydraulic assessment, etc. This will cost an estimated \$600,000 (\$350,000 from 4420...245 and \$250,000 from 4420...203).</i>
D	<i>Living Streams: Teach grade school level kids about health watersheds (\$20,000) ; Post Contests: Allow elementary through high school students to participate submit a poster about environmental protection (\$50,000); Contract with the City of Vancouver water quality monitoring program to teach students and teachers about water quality protection at specific streams in unincorporated Clark County; in partnering with WSU Extension and Clark Conservation District, the Clean Water Program through Watershed Stewards, allows interested citizens to learn about watershed protection (learn how to improve the watershed in which they live, use rain water wisely, learn about using nontoxic products in daily activities, etc)(\$182,500); The Clean Water Program in partnership with WSU Extension and Conservation District also manage the Small Acreage Landholders Outreach that teaches rural land owners how to manage their land and livestock to minimize water quality pollution(\$111,200); The Clean Water Program in partnership with the school districts, and city of Vancouver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Public Works Solid Waste Program, etc., students (K-16) learn about environmental protect while at the Columbia Spring facility and they take at information back to their respective schools where they continue to study environmental protection issues.</i>
E	<i>The Department of Community Development is implementing enforcement of county stormwater, erosion control, and water quality protection codes.</i>
F	<i>Public Works Operations implements maintenance and operations of the county stormwater infrastructure.</i>
G	<i>\$27,000 for professional services to facilities public meetings to address NPDES permit issues; \$12,000 cost for printing the flyer (or insert) explaining the fee and accompanying the CWP fee statement; \$27,000 for mailing the Clean Water Program Service fee; \$25,000 for temporary services to assist in answering CWP fee calls; Washington Department of Ecology will receive about \$76,000 to administer the Phase I NPDES Permit; ~\$6,000 for legal services in Hearing Examiner cases, etc.; and about \$10,000 to appeal NPDES permit Special Conditions 4, 7, and 8 as requested by the BOCC, etc.</i>
H	<i>Transfer of dollars to the ESA program: a) ESA staff assigned to writing SNAP subbasin reports, b) assist with Stormwater Management Program Plan and Stormwater Code development and implementation, c) finish Water Resources Inventory Area planning and implementation process as required by Ecology and NOAA Fisheries.</i>
I	<i>Refund Clark County Fairground \$20,000 for over payment of Clean Water Program Service Fee; due to a processing error, the remaining \$262,950 is to be removed from the budget in 2008.</i>
J	<i>~\$377,000 for the Treasurer's Office to collect and process the CWP fee; \$34,000 in county indirect; \$43,000 in GIS support for the fee; \$36,000 in county land and Building rental cost; \$14,200 in computers and supplies, etc.</i>

Appendix D

Log of Public Comments at 2007 CWC Meetings

January 3, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy said that he attended the recent Vancouver Lake Partnership Steering Committee meeting, where he learned that Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) is determining Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) allocations. He urged the Commission to consider contacting Ecology to support a TMDL on Burnt Bridge Creek.

Mr. McConathy discussed the existence of native freshwater mussel species in the Columbia River basin. Previous efforts to clean up Vancouver Lake have resulted in the destruction of large numbers of these animals. He stated that several species are highly dependent on groundwater emergence in streams.

Mr. McConathy urged the Commission to prepare a set of recommendations to Ecology for the Salmon Creek TMDL review, which should occur in 2011. He stated that the existing TMDL lacked a meaningful public input process and fails to require corrections of four pollutant parameters that are problematic in Salmon Creek. He stated that he has never seen Clark County's implementation plan for the TMDL.

Mr. Owen asked if the county is the lead on the implementation plan. Mr. Rowell replied that Ecology writes TMDL implementation plans after conducting a survey of public and jurisdictional capabilities to correct water quality. He gave the TMDL on Gibbons Creek as an example of how the county can participate in an implementation plan. In that instance, the county provided coordination of volunteer monitors and water quality monitoring equipment. The city of Washougal provided analytical services.

Mr. Owen asked if there will be an implementation plan for Gibbons Creek. Mr. Rowell: yes. Mr. Owen asked where Salmon Creek is in the TMDL process. Mr. Rowell replied that Clark County is doing the implementation of the Stormwater Management Plan.

[Factual Note: Ecology has written Detailed Implementation Plans (DIP) for both Gibbons Creek (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0510078.html>) and Salmon Creek (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0510037.html>).]

February 7, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy said that he attended a work session with Public Health and the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) regarding new septic tank inspection and maintenance rules from the state that must be adopted by the county by July 1, 2007. Public Health identified the Clean Water Program as a possible source of funding and expertise for their new programs. [Factual Note: The Board of County Commissioners mentioned using the Clean Water fee to fix some failing septic systems.]

Mr. McConathy stated that BOCC members listed some innovative ideas for facilitating conversion to sewer, including loans payable upon the sale of the property, and using the capital improvement fund as a bank for priority properties.

Mr. McConathy asked the group to recommend that the BOCC develop and implement and groundwater plan for Clark County. A number of major municipal wells have been forced to relocate because of groundwater quality issues.

Ms. Page asked if the NPDES permit regulates septic systems. Mr. McConathy: only tangentially, where they impinge upon surface water directly. Mr. Swanson: our NPDES permit essentially regulates only “stuff” that comes out of one of our outfalls, so if a septic system leaks effluent into our drainage and conveyance system, then it would be covered in the permit.

Mr. Owen stated that TMDL work needs to continue. Mr. Swanson replied that none of the TMDLs in Clark County have the kind of requirements that mandate specific actions. If the county is implementing the Stormwater Management Program under the permit, then it is complying with the TMDL.

Mr. Owen added groundwater as a topic for the next meeting. Mr. Rowell: a 1992 guidance document identifies areas of concern and the wellhead protection program information might be useful. This past year, the sole source aquifer designation was put in place.

Ms. Page asked about the Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARA) in the county GIS; which designation is more critical? Mr. Rowell: level 1 is more critical. Mr. Swanson: a level 1 represents a 1-year contributing area, and almost everything else in Clark County is a level 2, which primarily means land underlain by sedimentary rock aquifer.

March 7, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy announced a meeting on March 27, 2007 from 7-9 p.m. at the Three Creeks Library to study tasks to meet the new NPDES permit. He invited Commissioners to attend.

Mr. McConathy expressed disappointment that the meeting agenda does not include the Groundwater Management Plan topic that he requested. Mr. Owen: I will try to fit it on the April or May agenda.

Mr. McConathy stated that he is disappointed in Clark County. After reading the meeting notes from the February 28, 2007 NPDES Permit Review work session, he feels the county is arrogant and placing itself among the worst counties in Washington. He declared that the permit standard is much higher than the county appears to be planning as noted on page three of the work session notes regarding S5.C.

Mr. Owen asked Mr. McConathy for an example of adequate public involvement. Mr. McConathy replied that the public must be involved in the drafting and development of the documents. Mr. Owen asked for a specific example. Mr. McConathy responded that

the permit requires the public to be involved in the development of initial wording, and at every level.

Mr. McConathy asked Mr. Swanson to present a list of tasks and timetables for the new NPDES permit. Mr. Rowell: Mr. Swanson is working on the task list.

Mr. McConathy urged the Commission to read the permit themselves, particularly S5.C.4, and to talk to Ecology staff to discover exactly what kind of public involvement is required.

April 4, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy complained that the county web site lacks a calendar of Clean Water Commission meetings and is not updated in a timely manner with meeting notes. He requested meeting notes to be posted in draft form. Ms. Kobluskie stated that there is a schedule, and she will send the link to Mr. McConathy. [see http://www.clark.wa.gov/water-resources/commission/meeting_schedule.html]

Mr. McConathy stated that he is glad to see that groundwater is on the agenda.

Mr. McConathy advocated that the Clean Water Commission receive an overview of the county's new wetland banking system. He stated that mitigation in a different drainage than the project can be bad for water quality Ms. van Breemen agreed; it bothers her to see wetlands put where water does not naturally drain. The group discussed documented failures of mitigations in the Midwest and Skagit County.

Mr. McConathy asked for the Clean Water Commission to receive as soon as possible from staff the list of tasks for implementing the new NPDES permit. He worried that the Commission would not have much oversight of some tasks that must be complete by August.

May 2, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy explained that a recent article in The Columbian states that fresh water mussels are illegal to collect in the state of Washington and also have high levels of PCBs.

Mr. McConathy protested the inclusion of "factual notes" from staff in the 2006 Annual Report's Public Comments appendix. The term is disrespectful. He requested a record of dialog at meetings without comments. Mr. Stubbs apologized. "Point of Information" is the correct term.

Mr. McConathy asked the Commission to make a motion to ask the BOCC to reconsider implementing a groundwater program. The topic did not result in action at the last meeting.

Mr. McConathy stated that the list of potential capital projects in the 2007-2012 Stormwater Capital Improvement Program is unfairly focused on the Whipple Creek area. He complained that there is no systematic basin planning effort by the County.

Mr. McConathy asked once again for staff to produce a list of tasks for meeting requirements of the new NPDES permit. Some components must be in place by August 2007.

June 6, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy asked the Commission to advise the BOCC to develop a plan to reduce the pollution and nutrient load into Vancouver Lake. The Vancouver Lake Partnership has discovered past federal requirements to clean up Vancouver Lake and Salmon Creek, which were never met.

Mr. McConathy thanked the Commission for including the groundwater topic on the agenda. He hoped the Commission would advise the BOCC to develop a groundwater program.

Ms. Page stated that a formal request from the Vancouver Lake Partnership would be a better method. Mr. McConathy replied that most of the partnership is agency staff, and unwilling to request other agencies to act. Mr. Owen noted that he would be reluctant to advise the BOCC to pursue something so significant without a formal proposal.

Mr. McConathy urged the Commission to remain supportive of Public Health in implementing new codes for on-site septic systems.

Mr. Bourlet advised property owners to fully understand the total ramifications of selling a conservation easement or covenant for mitigation purposes.

July 11, 2007 Meeting:

None.

August 1, 2007 Meeting:

None.

September 5, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy said he hopes that Clark County will adopt a fish friendly solution to the Highway 99 Bridge replacement over Salmon Creek.

Mr. McConathy stated that he tested the Erosion Control hotline and found that the employee answering the phone did not have adequate training to answer questions. The employee did take his name and phone number and he did receive a return call, but he still felt it did not satisfy the NPDES requirement.

Mr. McConathy urged the Commission to review the current agreement between Clark Public Utilities, Clark County and the Department of Ecology in regard to the management of Salmon Creek to ensure that NPDES requirements are reflected in the next revision.

Mr. McConathy criticized the composition of the Stakeholders Advisory Group. At the August meeting, there were no representatives from Parks and Recreation, Watershed Councils or Environmental Groups.

Mr. Rowell shared the desire to see more representation from these groups. He added that two CWC members and Doug Stienbarger from WSU Cooperative Extension attended, representing rural property owners. John DiVittorio from Fish First has agreed to attend future meetings.

The group discussed the role of the CWC in the Kline Bridge project. Mr. Wilson shared his concern about ongoing conflict between the state and county on the details of the repair and possible winter bridge closures. Mr. Owen asserted that the Commission would need more information to take a position; he encouraged the group to learn more about it.

October 3, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy stated that the program to detect illicit discharges to the storm sewer is not sufficient. Originally, the program researched illicit discharges in all basins each year. More recently the program has been abandoned and fails to meet NPDES requirements. Also, reports from previous years have been removed from the Web site.

Mr. Schnabel replied that the illicit discharge detection program was conducted county-wide from 2000-2002. From 2003-2005, it was complaint-driven only due to insufficient staff. In 2006, systematic screening was reinstated, and the current implementation exceeds Ecology's requirements. Mr. McConathy said that significant narratives of problems in the early reports are not followed-up in later reports.

Mr. McConathy requested better response to complaints from enforcement. He called the hotline about erosion control problems on the 99th St. C-Tran project. Staff replied that the inspector on the project was one of the best. Mr. McConathy pointed out that mud went onto Hazel Dell Ave. and to Hwy 99, and the site lacked BMPs. The gravel was small, instead of the spall required by code. He said also that the stormwater facility at the Arco station was compromised.

Mr. Owen asked how Mr. McConathy dealt with the lack of enforcement. Mr. McConathy turned the issue over to Ecology. Things improved, but it was not sustained.

Mr. McConathy stated that Ecology will do a TMDL on Burnt Bridge Creek. Some citizens want the Alcoa Superfund site re-designated. There is a PCB issue. Vancouver Lake is identified as having some of the highest PCB levels in Washington. This could threaten future water costs for all of Clark County.

November 7, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy shared that at the recent Vancouver Lake Partnership a representative from DOE asked for other TMDL candidates in Clark County. She is looking for small ones and would like suggestions forwarded to her at DOE. Those being considered are White Salmon, Lacamas Lake tributaries and Washougal River. Mr. Moe asked about the Lewis River and Mr. McConathy stated the session should have taken place last June, but did not.

Mr. McConathy stated that DOE is conducting monitoring studies and suggested that Clark County contact them to discuss participation and the application process.

Mr. McConathy shared that the Vancouver Lake Partnership in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will perform preliminary work and research of juvenile and adult fish use of the lake. Ideas discussed included enlarging the size of the pipes leading into the lake, more flushing actions, purging the lake, pumping ground water into it and possibly making the lake smaller.

Mr. Swanson stated that the Clean Water Program has discussed the monitoring studies with the employee who is planning them. An original intent of Ecology was to conduct side by site monitoring of our volunteers for the Gibbons Creek bacteria monitoring project. However, this is no longer needed because that project is complete.

December 5, 2007 Meeting:

Mr. McConathy requested that the Clean Water Commission invite Code Enforcement to another meeting to ask staff specifically about certain projects that have received unsatisfactory attention after he has complained. He claimed that major projects in Hazel Dell have no erosion control in place and no BMPs on the site. Mr. Rowell asked for a list of the sites.

Mr. McConathy requested that the Commission ask staff to prepare a report showing which areas flood. He advised against locating facilities in flood-prone areas. Mr. Owen asked if there are design standards for treatment facilities in a floodplain. Mr. Krause: a water quality facility cannot be flooded during a water quality storm – 67% of the 2-year storm. The recent storm was probably a 10 to 15 year storm. Mr. McConathy argued that they're not to be located within natural drainage-ways. Mr. Krause argued that that may or may not include the floodway. Mr. Owen: SCIPIT will reconvene next year and keep Mr. McConathy's thoughts in mind.