



Clark County Environmental Services

## 2013-2018 NPDES Stormwater Permit TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE #6

Wednesday, January 22, 2014

3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Public Service Center, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin St.

<b>Attendees:</b>	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 Gruffy	City of Vancouver
	Tim Kraft (consultant for manual update)	OTAK
Guests: Trista Kobluskie, Sean Darcy, Lisa Cox, Virginia VanBreemen, Susan Rasmussen		

### Agenda Topics:

3:00	<b>1. Welcome</b>	Clark County staff
3:05	<b>2. Feedback from last meeting – any follow-up</b>	All
3:15	<b>3. Design Manual Update Project</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realignment of Book 1</li> <li>• Review Chapter 1</li> <li>• Review Hydrologic Computation chapter (new 2)</li> <li>• Review Infiltration for Flow Control / Treatment (new 4)</li> <li>• Review Traditional Flow Control (new 5)</li> </ul>	Tim and all
4:50	<b>5. Next steps: Meeting #7 – March 5<sup>th</sup>, PSC Training Room</b>	Jane Tesner Kleiner

## **MEETING SUMMARY:**

**Welcome** – all (introduce new CWC member Jim Carlson)

### **Feedback from last meeting** – all –

- ***Geotechnical engineer subcommittee meeting*** – Was hosted this week to review the details of infiltration testing methods and procedures. No major changes proposed. On-site infiltration BMPs are a major issue therefore it seemed prudent to discuss this work with other geotechnical professionals. Otak has prepared meeting notes.
- ***Meeting with Dept. of Ecology*** – County staff reviewed updates to our manual, formatting, infeasibility mapping techniques (for small projects), etc. Our goal is to create tools to help small projects save costs by minimizing need for expertise such as engineers for non-engineered features. While it appears that mapping may assist customers with understanding their site constraints, the available datasets are typically too coarse and not site-specific enough to eliminate the need for a site and soils assessment on-site.
- ***Meeting with DEAB on January 2, 2014*** – County staff prepared a short presentation of the code and manual update project. There was good discussion and a few key concerns noted (e.g. “preserve vegetation to the extent feasible”).

### **Review of the Revised Table of Contents**

- All chapters are written and we are now fine tuning the flow, adding graphics/tables/checklists, etc. This work will continue into February.

**Review of Book 1 Chapter 1 – *Minimum Requirements and Submittal Requirements.*** We have previously sent out submittal requirements for the TAC to review.

- TAC members requested information on how chapters were put together, where the information was pulled together and what significant changes are included – this would help TAC members review the information faster.
- Submission of Stormwater Pollution Prevention plan (SWPPP – certified erosion and sediment control lead (CESCL) may not be required in the plan preparations but are typically used for on-site inspection and maintenance. Engineers stamp the plans and TIR.
- It doesn't make sense to submit SWPPP with the final engineering plans. Ideally, it would be later. In current process, SWPPP is part of the final TIR and is required in the counter complete review. Timing has been an issue for submittal. If it could be submitted with the mylars it might contain an appropriate level of detail where minimal changes are required. County inspectors typically will review the information for technical details. The TIR is the “booklet” with all of the details and the SWPPP is on the plans, although the SWPPP also requires a narrative that is contained in the “booklet”. The SWPPP is meant to be living documents on site for the contractor to continue to use and update. The TIR may be updated between preliminary and final engineering (such as the means and methods). So typically, earlier submissions include boilerplate language rather than useful information reflecting the actual erosion control techniques to be used on the site. Dictating means and methods becomes a liability if determined by the engineer as opposed to the allowing the contractor to determine how to control the site. What if section 1.5.5 becomes the SWPP(Plan). Would waiting until pre-construction be a more appropriate timeline? It may be a hurdle to get a project moving when everything else is ready to go. Information needs to be concise for contractors to use the

information effectively. Contractors are on the hook to look at phasing of SESC. Our current system is not working well (information in the SWPPP may be outdated during construction, information not submitted, etc.). Review MR2 and the list of elements to be submitted. There was also some discussion about whether the county NPDES permit required review of the SWPPP and how this would be managed in the timing of submittals and the pre-con meeting.

- Direct Discharge section (p. 19) – Discharging to a large water body, the easiest way is to match existing flow and spread the water at the floodplain. The various sections don't work well together and may create a condition in which it is not possible to meet both MR#8 and MR#7. It is requested that this section is reviewed. This language is from the DOE manual and it is difficult to create equivalent language. The main intent is to avoid impacting the hydro-period of the floodplain wetland and the downstream conditions are not a factor. County staff is looking at how to meet MR#8, as conditions depend on the type of wetland (i.e. riparian wetlands). Eric G. may wish to submit scenario to staff to review, discuss and pose questions to Ecology.

#### **Review of Book 1 Chapter 2 – Hydrologic Computation**

- Language came from both the DOE (standards, models, types of continuous flow models, etc.) and the current Clark County manual.
- Closed depression analysis – is new information. Feel free to review and submit comments to County staff. Look at definition of “closed depression” to confirm the intent (King Co. definition was referenced – due to 100-year you get 5,000 sf of surface area).
- Some information will be in the appendix for modeling data.

#### **Review of Book 1 Chapter 4 – Infiltration for Flow Control and Treatment**

- The chapter is previous language; no original new text was added. The existing DOE language can be considered confusing, so this chapter attempts to reorganize and simplify. The geotechnical subcommittee is also reviewing for details.
- 4.1.1 (page 2) – “evaluate the suitability of soil for treatment” would be helpful to add.
- Page 3 – clarify 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph
- Page 3 – 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph – soil suitability for treatment for fish-bearing streams. Criteria can be confusing as to when certain criteria apply (i.e. enhanced treatment with overflows).
- Clear definition for final stabilization – difficult to understand for on-site inspectors and contractors in the field.
- 4.1.1.1 (page 3) – clarify first bullet as to intent of this section (it is a repeat from earlier sections), same as 4.1.1.2.
- Page 6 – Regarding CARA, need to add “residential areas are exempt” for CARA II.
- Page 7 – simplified approach – reference the sections that apply.
- Page 8 – 3(b) – You don't know your trench length until you do your testing, therefore is one enough? Do we add the clause from the DOE language? Review the previous Clark County language. Staff will continue to discuss and review with DOE.
- Safety factors – traditional is different from LID information. Staff will clarify and make articulate so that staff can review appropriately.
- Well data – need to clarify location (how far away) and how old is the data?
- Chapter 3 (LID) and 4 are very different process so it is important to understand the differences.
- Groundwater depth data from county mapping (page 8) last bullet changed to 30' below bottom of facility.

- Page 18 – common systems on property lines – we discussed at the last meeting – this section will be updated.

#### **Review of Book 1 Chapter 5 – *Traditional Flow Control***

- Language comes out from the Clark County manual as well as the DOE manual. This is tied to the BMP sheets in Book 2. Nothing new is in this chapter. Most important sections are the access roads, fencing, private/public facilities, etc.
- Review 5.2.3.3 – don't know if this is a current practice and may want to consider removing (this is from DOE manual).
- Splitters between treatment – leave it up to the designer to decide when to use splitters.

#### **Next Steps:**

1. Next meeting – **March 5<sup>th</sup>, 3-5:00 pm, same location**
2. What we anticipate to cover at the next meeting – The March meeting is the last before we have a full “Review Draft” that will go out for public review in April. Staff may email certain sections out to TAC members for review and comment. For example, the list of standard detail revisions.
3. Upcoming SAC meeting set for late February for general overview.

*End of Summary*