



Clark County Environmental Services

2013-2018 NPDES Stormwater Permit STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 8, 2014, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Elections Building - 1408 Franklin St., Conference Room

Attendees (invited):	Don Benton, Ron Wierenga, Rod Swanson, Jane Tesner Kleiner, Chris Clifford, Earl Rowell	Clark County - DES
	Heath Henderson, Greg Shafer, Sue Stepan	Clark County – Public Works
	Holly Gaya	Clark County - PIO
	Jon Dunaway	Clark County – Fire Marshal
	Doug Ballou	NACCC
	Jeff Breckel	Lower Columbia Fish Recovery
	Barry Cain / Matt Grady	Gramor Development
	Jim Carlson / Gary Schaeffer / Dick Rylander	Clean Water Commission
	Maury Harris	Salmon Creek Watershed Council
	Michele Holen	Clark County Association of Realtors
	Lehman Holder	Sierra Club
	Todd Horenstein / Jennifer Halleck	Vancouver Public Schools
	Jamie Howsley	BIA of Clark County
	Ryan Jeynes	City of Battle Ground, ASCE SW Branch
	Lance Killian	Killian Pacific
	James Martin II	Washington State University
	Mike Bomar / Bonnie Moore / Elizabeth Scott	Columbia River Economic Devel. Council
	Jeff Deringer	Nutter Corporation
	Kenneth Opp	Real Property Management Services
	Sydney Reisbick	Friends of Clark County
Kali Robson	Nothing But NW Natives	
Ginger Schmidt	Hazel Dell/Salmon Creek Business Assoc.	
Gretchen Starke	Vancouver Audubon Society	
Dave Cone	Evergreen School District	
Kevin Tapani	Tapani Underground	
Kevin Wann	Pacific Lifestyle Homes	
Terry Wollam	Re/Max Equity Group	

Agenda Topics:

4:00	1. Welcome	All
4:05	2. Feedback from last meeting	All
± 4:20	3. Design Manual and Code update changes • Discuss "Review Draft" of stormwater manual	All
5:55	5. Next steps – Public outreach process – May	Jane Tesner Kleiner
Guests: Kelly Uhacz (Battle Ground)		



Meeting Summary:

Welcome and introductions

Overview of the project –To create a new and improved manual (stand-alone document, usable, flexible), to meet permit requirements (equivalent), and is user-friendly (staff and applicants).

Schedule – this meeting is a step in the process to get to adopted code and manual in July 2015. We need to submit our “Final Draft” to Department of Ecology in June 2014. They will have three months to review and provide feedback. We will then have time to make adjustments and update processes.

- Timing of starting new projects and which rules apply? Need to submit application by June 30, 2015.

Public comments – We have received over 286 comments (internal and external stakeholders) on the “Review Draft” of the manual. We are currently reviewing comments for applicability and feasibility. Some may require policy level review and decisions.

- Current direction is to comply with the state requirements – What is a future growth plan for development that protects water quality? We are required to meet the permit requirements by the BOCC and the permit requires water quality treatment and flow control to minimize impacts to streams and tributaries. This allows for new development to provide better runoff quality. The hole is then the older developments that do not have treatment features. The County identifies projects to address outdated facilities (i.e. roadway runoff, etc.). Inadequacies in our runoff is required to be addressed (that requirement is currently not in place for the cities). *[The County’s Comprehensive Plan update is the county’s long term vision and includes some language related to environmental policies and goals]*
- For redevelopment projects (like adding an addition to a building) new and replaced hard surface are required to meet the new standards. For example, if you replace a 10,000 square foot parking area and add a little more, you have to account for the full 10,000 sf and the addition (treatment and flow control).
- The LID performance standard is meant to address the smaller storms typical to our area (such as the light rains with minimal runoff that can be captured by LID BMPs).
- There is interest in posting the public comments with the County responses to the comment. There is a website dedicated to the project to post: www.clark.wa.gov/stormwater. Once the county reviews and creates feedback, the comments will be posted on the link provided as suggested by SAC members.

Maintenance standards – the main changes are to add the low impact development thresholds.

- Is there any change to the timing to inspections and cleanout of facilities? (i.e. timing for cleaning out swales). We added more narrative sections to help clarify the timing and level of inspections and maintenance. Review information in Book 4 and let us know if there is additional information that would be helpful to the user.
- Our inspection staff is willing to work with owners to coordinate on timing of maintenance and repairs once an issue has been identified.
- Training for school districts – BMP maintenance for schools (training was in Evergreen PS in April, Vancouver PS is looking at June for their training)
- HOAs are working with the County on repairs in the Ridgefield area. They are working with Cary Armstrong, our business technical assistance lead.
- What can we do (County) to make the manual more user friendly, such as checklists and tear-away sheets? Small projects development manual is a tool that we may develop in the next 6 months.

County ownership of residential subdivisions – there are pros and cons to the county owning those facilities. For example, private developments would need an HOA or similar entity to oversee on-going maintenance. There are many examples of sites where the HOAs dissipate over time and the facility falls into disrepair. The county would be required to then find monies to provide repairs.

- What is the long term plan for future development of stormwater infrastructure? Other than the county’s comprehensive plan, the Clean Water Program is looking at addressing current needs, including existing facility repair (asset management). Similar to roads, there needs to be a fund to preserve and

maintain existing assets. Stormwater has a minimal fund to repair. There are needs for routine and preventative maintenance, as well as the infrequent major repair needs. In the County, we have a detailed GIS inventory of all of our facilities.

- It is critical to have a long term strategic plan and goals to guide decisions. It would include policies to guide how to address the various scenarios, such as the HOAs that disappear.
- Are there options to look at fees associated with each facility to collect the required needs for that facility? The assessor and treasurer manage the billings for parcels, therefore are there tools to direct which property drains to a specific facility? The GIS does not have that level of information in it per each facility.
- The county is ultimately responsible for the stormwater system properly functioning and meeting standards. Therefore they need to be responsible.
- In general, the stormwater facilities are approximately 50% privately owned and 50% are publicly owned.
- Other examples are publicly owned facilities, such as bridges and roads, there are impact fees and state/federal funds available based on priority need.
- It is better to plan ahead for the fees necessary to maintain the facilities to allow people to plan for those costs.
- The costs of doing business should reflect the actual cost to service and maintain. Can the house price reflect the need to cover those maintenance costs?
- Tree preservation, to the extent feasible, is a requirement in the new requirements.
- There are some HOAs that have a good history of maintaining their sites. Some property owners would rather care for their property to their level of expectations while meeting the county requirements. They have bylaws and charters to address the maintenance. These are typically the larger HOAs. In the past four years, the county has met with HOAs in the county's jurisdiction to get them up to speed with the requirements.
- One of the concerns is when the typical annual costs of a few thousand dollars needs to increase for a site that has a significant failure (that could run in the tens of thousands of dollars). The county has had an example of a public facility failure that has cost over \$200,000 to repair.
- We currently don't have a formal process to allow the county to take over the facility. Sometimes there are legal settlements that allow the county to take over the ownership of the facility.
- Our current proposal is to carry the same language from the previous stormwater manual forward in the new manual. That the county will not take over residential subdivision stormwater facilities.

End of Summary