



CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

For the Department of Environmental Services

Meeting Summary
Wednesday, August 6, 2014
6:30 PM – 8:30 PM
Public Service Center, 6th Floor Training Room
1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver

Members Present: Jim Carlson, Rob McKinney, David Meyer, Brian Peck, Susan Rasmussen, Dick Rylander, Gary Schaeffer, Virginia van Breemen, Melanie Wheeler

Members Absent: NA

Staff Present: Don Benton, Earl Rowell, Bobbi Trusty

Partner Agency Staff Present: None

Public Present: Thom McConathy, Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership; Jim Comrada, citizen

I ROLL CALL

The July 2, 2014 meeting summary was approved as submitted

II PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Comrada introduced himself and stated he was listening and learning about the commission.

Mr. McConathy wanted to inform the commission on the status of the Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership. The partnership is currently going through the process to figure out the future governance structure and is seeking more partners. The commission asked Mr. McConathy what are issues of the lake. He said it was too soon to tell what action might be needed and invited the commissioners to go to the website so they can learn more information about the lake and the partnership <http://sites.cityofvancouver.us/vancouverlake/>. The commissioners invited Mr. McConathy back to keep them informed and recommend how he thinks the commission can engage with the partnership.

III PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION/ACTION

Clean Water Commission Annual Report 2013

A mistake was made on the annual report in the section of Public Education and Outreach. In the last sentence it states “Unfortunately it was defunded and disbanded mid 2013” which is not accurate. Mr. Carlson recommended that the words “and disbanded” be removed.

Motion 2014-11

Mr. Schaffer made a motion to make the edit. It was seconded and approved. Motion passed.



proud past, promising future

CLEAN WATER COMMISSION For the Department of Environmental Services

Clean Water Program Fee Reduction to Schools

Mr. Benton informed the commission that there were only three school districts who appealed the assessed Clean Water Fees. The criteria established by the previous Board of County Commissioners and director stated that over a three year period the schools would complete Best Management Practices (BMP) training for custodial and ground staff, stormwater facilities must pass inspections and the Green Schools Water Module certification must be completed. After reviewing the appeal materials, Battle Ground School District's appeal was denied as they did not meet the requirements of the agreement, Evergreen School District received a fee reduction on two of their schools and Vancouver School District received a fee reduction on 10 of their schools that met the requirements. Mr. Benton also informed the schools that it is highly unlikely that there will be any fee reductions in the future and asked the schools to plan their budgets accordingly.

Mrs. Rasmussen brought up that part of the Commission's assigned tasks is outreach and education and the schools bring a vast assemblage. Each child has two to six interactions with adults over a given week and the commission cannot begin to match the network the schools have. The commissioners discussed what other opportunities there are to partner with the schools and keep the partnerships going because the relationships are challenged. A suggestion was made to do some public recognition to acknowledge the accomplishments the schools have made for stormwater in addition to the mandatory NPDES requirements.

Clean Water Program Fee Study: Stormwater Pollution

Mr. Benton reported Ordinance No. 2014-07-08 was approved by the Board of County Commissioners to raise the Clean Water Fee. The Board directed the department to prepare a study and report back within one year to examine a polluter fee. Mr. Benton asked the commission to gather ideas and provide input on items they would like to see in the study, how they think the study might be conducted, and what areas should be looked at. He asked the commission to prepare a report and recommendations, and then provide feedback to the department.

Commissioners discussed reviewing research that has already been completed (i.e.: Exhibit E from 1999 and a California litter study) and asked for the core pollutants found in the county's local urban and rural stormwater facilities. Mr. Meyer agreed to provide some initial framework and ideas. Time will be placed on the September agenda for discussion.

Debrief of the Clean Water Commission Work Session with the Board of County Commissioners

Mr. Benton reviewed a memorialization of the work session that Mr. Rowell had completed. The commissioners asked to be provided a copy.

Ms. Rasmussen asked what the Board meant by being involved in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Benton said that the interaction with the planning department will help to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan includes NPDES requirements.

Mr. Rylander heard that the Board wants things that are actionable to have defined timeframes and materials that are useful to have results. Commissioners discussed the need to start identifying the one or two items they think they can accomplish in a year, reengage education and outreach by getting out to neighborhood meetings and complete some press releases on the good work being



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

CLEAN WATER COMMISSION For the Department of Environmental Services

accomplished in the community. Mr. Carlson also brought up the need to identify the barriers that prevent good partnerships (i.e. efficient and cost effective methods)) from being created within the Clean Water Program. The *Public and Private Regional Stormwater Association Multi-use Projects* (SWAMP) concept has the potential to bring together groups of people to implement this effort.

IV PUBLIC COMMENT – feedback

Mr. McConathy stated that the most powerful impact this commission can have is to advise the policy makers, create white papers and tackle issues they are passionate about.

Mr. Comrada said: 1) While working on mitigation designs, he has noticed that when a buffer (e.g., the area that separated wetland and ponds from developed land) is closely mowed, it becomes an impervious surface that allows runoff into an adjacent water body; 2) In regard to the fee for newspapers, newspapers are a “baby boomer” pollutant with a diminishing return. This issue will likely go away in the future as younger generations read about the news using SMART phones; and 3) Some facilities are seasonally quite wet, the sedges and rushes create a waxy coating which helps them become technically fire proof. These types of facilities can be mowed less frequently and reduce the cost of maintenance.

V ADJOURN – 08:39 PM

Summary provided by: Bobbi Trusty / 360-397-2121 x 5268

For audio file, previous meeting summaries or presentations please visit:

<http://www.clark.wa.gov/environment/stormwater/management/commission.html>