



CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

For the Department of Environmental Services

Meeting Summary

Wednesday, October 7, 2015

6:30 PM – 8:30 PM

**Public Service Center, 6th Floor Training Room
1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver**

Members Present: Marie La Manna, David McDevitt, David Meyer, Dick Rylander, Gary Schaeffer, Kate Schoof, Mark Schneider

Members Absent: Jim Carlson, Susan Rasmussen

Staff Present: Dean Boening, Bobbi Trusty

Partner Agency Staff Present: None

Public Present: Deirdre Schneider

I ROLL CALL

The September 2, 2015 meeting summary was approved as submitted.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (2:15)

None

III. PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION

Discussion/Review of the Preliminary Draft Clean Water Fee Study (2:37)

Mr. Meyer opened the discussion by thanking staff for forwarding the study and giving the commission the opportunity to review and comment, both from a technical and organizational perspective, on the study.

Commissioners' comments:

- Study as written has numerous grammatical and formatting errors
- Study has no conclusion – the reason for this study is not clear and fee equations are too complicated
- The clean water fee should be thought of this as a business plan, outcomes needs to be clearly identified:
 - Stay in compliance, no more lawsuits
 - meet increasing cost for NPDES compliance
 - proactive measures to improve watersheds and the environment for future generations
 - plan for future facility maintenance and county growth as identified in the 20 year growth plan
- Where do the Clean Water expenditures go and how much revenue is generated by the fees
- How much would the system development fee generate, would it be fair since developers already pay large impact fees. Would there be support by Development and Engineering Advisory Board?



proud past, promising future

CLEAN WATER COMMISSION For the Department of Environmental Services

- A rate study should be done. A table should be created on the various methodologies of raising revenue (fees) and how feasible each method would be or not be; how much revenue would be needed to raise from that method to get to a total bottom line number, and have that total number tied to an index
- Can best practices be learned from around the world? How are other densely populated countries treating and dealing with stormwater
- Is this study what the County Councilors asked the department for? The study gives good history and filler but does not seem to come to a conclusion
- The study has too much filler; background information is good but dominates the report. Change it to a page or two describing what stormwater is, what type of stormwater system Clark County has, who the fee applies to, why a fee is charged and how the fee is calculated.
- Section two gives good options but then they are abandoned in section three
- The study needs to be fact based, with citations for everything; need more detailed information in order to give to the public
- Newspaper fee feels politicized. The information needs to be factual based and supported with accurate citations and backup
- PCB issues do not have a place in the report – caused confusion and deflects – remove that section as the issue is bigger than Clark County. State and Federal agencies are reviewing the PCB issues.
- Should be user based approach instead of a polluter based – while they can pollute, a vehicle or newspaper does not generate stormwater or use the stormwater control system
- Section three has the most valuable info in this report but it needs additional background, citations, references and technical data.
- How are other Washington counties handling increasing NPDES compliance issues and rate increases
- An example was given that the burden already shows roads are paying almost half the Clean Water fee revenue so the county is just taking money from one pocket and putting it into another, WSDOT is limited to only pay 70% of the amount charged, the next largest burden falls on the single family residence and commercial only pays a very small component of the fee.
- Should an automobile fee algorithm be considered? New car vs old car, various options could be looked at.
- Each option should pass feasibility or a risk based approach: complexity, revenue generated and cost to administer, fair, equitable and be defensible.
- How involved will the commission be in this process now and going forward – talking about polluter pays option, participate in the further development of this report, vetting the options to meet current requirements. Commissioners want to be involved in the process and feel value added
- Is there a time constraint to get a new fee in place? Are the councilors asking for a resolution at any particular timeframe? Commissioners would like to schedule their work plan

Commissioner Discussion time (1:18:33)

None

V PUBLIC COMMENT (1:18:35)



CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

For the Department of Environmental Services

None

VII ADJOURN – 07:50 PM

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

For more detailed information, an audio recording for this meeting is available through the county website at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/environment/stormwater/management/commission.html>