



## Sanitary and Stormwater Rules and Standards Update Task Force Meeting #2 - Thursday, October 25, 2018 Meeting Notes

### Participants

- Bruce Goldson, Theta
- Ben Austin, HHPR
- Cedimir Jasic, Cardno
- Kathleen Freeman, 3J Consulting
- Rand Waltz, AKS Engineering
- Ray Moore, All County Surveyors
- Josh Wheeler, City of Oregon City
- Justin Poyser, City of Gladstone
- Amy Pepper, City of West Linn
- Sally Curran, City of Happy Valley
- Deana Mulder, Clackamas County
- Jason Rice, Oak Lodge Water Services

### Staff and Consultant Team

- Greg Geist, WES Director
- Ron Wierenga, WES Environmental Services Manager
- Don Kemp, WES Development Review Supervisor
- Leah Johanson, WES Senior Civil Engineer
- Alissa Maxwell, Brown and Caldwell
- Libby Barg, Barney & Worth, Inc.
- Kimi Sloop, Barney & Worth, Inc.

### Agenda Items

**Stormwater Performance Standards:** Alissa Maxell, Brown and Caldwell gave an overview of the current CCSD #1 stormwater performance standards and NPDES permit requirements and provided technical background on hydromodification and why volume control matters. Alissa also gave a comparison of other local agency standards, including Portland, CWS, Salem, Oregon City, Lake Oswego and Clark County. She then presented the WES proposal for updated stormwater performance standards which includes:

- Site planning: Development applications would be required to allocate a percentage of the site to LID facilities or other green stormwater approaches OR demonstrate that WQ and flow control standards are met through GSI facilities. The required area for site planning would be measured as a percentage of the impervious surface.
- Water quality: Capture and treat 80% of average annual runoff volume, which can be met by sizing facilities for the 1" 24-hour storm.
- Flow control: Match flow durations to immediate pre-development conditions (range of flows still TBD). Infiltration can be used to meet the flow control performance standard. Flow control exemptions would be provided for direct discharge to major water bodies

A group discussion of the performance standards followed. Key takeaways:

- There should be different standards for different sized projects (i.e., lot of record vs. multi-lot partition). A tiered approach would be more equitable for developers. It should be based on the footprint of the new development, not total development.
- Matching flow durations is difficult when a site does not infiltrate.
- The proposal to imbed infiltration in flow control standards is a good idea.
- The idea of simplifying the standards was well received, with the caution that flexibility is still needed.
- A sizing tool is useful but the current BMP tool does not offer flexibility as the background assumptions cannot be changed. It was noted that sizing tools that do not allow assumptions to be changed are a concern for engineers who are required to stamp the drawings – they have no basis to verify the outputs. There was agreement that the tool could be improved if the engineers understood the assumptions behind the outputs better.
- May be challenging to meet the site planning performance standard for public right of way projects.
- Stormwater standards need to consider that homes are being built to lot lines now.
- The hierarchy for standards makes sense – applicants should meet the standard or have the option to pay a fee in lieu. The question then is – what is the fee in lieu? Ideally, the cost would be based on actual project costs for the watershed being impacted.

**Stormwater Facility Sizing Tool Exercise:** Task members completed an exercise to identify the ease of use and familiarity with a variety of stormwater sizing tools, including BMP Sizing Tool, Tualatin River Urban Stormwater Tool, Western Washington Hydrology Model, MGS Flood, EPA National Stormwater Calculator and the Portland PAC Tool. In the conversation that followed, task force members noted that the Portland PAC tool and the WES BMP sizing tool were the two tools the group was most familiar with. The Santa Barbara Urban Hydrograph method was mentioned as an easy to use tool. It was generally noted that having options as to which tool to use is a good thing. There was also recognition that having choices about what sizing tool to use may be an issue for WES when it comes to reviewing plans.

Key features noted as desirable in a tool include:

- Ability to make adjustments to the assumptions. Example - Portland PAC calculator allows more changes to the calculator.
- Ability to share the work/inputs among staff. Example - Portland PAC calculator requires a log in to use the tool which makes it cumbersome for multiple staff members to share the work.
- Better understanding of the underlying assumptions.
- A standard that could be used for smaller projects that does not involve using a sizing tool.
- For small projects, sizing tools may identify an orifice that is too small and will be difficult to maintain.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

The PowerPoint slides from the meeting are attached.