

**BIRCH BAY WATERSHED ACTION PLAN
AD HOC STAKEHOLDER MEETING (LID SUBGROUP)
MEETING SUMMARY**

Date: July 27, 2011

Time: 9:00 am- 11:30 am

Place: Whatcom County Public Works, Civic Building, Garden Room

1.	Intro and review of agenda
2.	Low Impact Development Qualification Code
3.	Examples
4.	Technical Specifications

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Roger McCarthy – WC Public Works	Nathan Row – APC Consultants
David Galbraith – PSE Engineering	Peter Gill – Whatcom County PDS
Colleen Mitchell – 2020 Engineering	Michael Kershner – Whatcom County PDS
Tim Kennedy - BIAWC	Dustin Atchison – CH2M Hill
Ken Bell – WC Planning Commission	

DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED

- Revised Stormwater Design code 20.50.700
- LID Scoring Checklist
- Draft State LID Requirements On-site Stormwater Management

MEETING CONTENTS

1. Review Agenda

There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

2. Low Impact Development Qualification Code

The intention of this code is to remove barriers to LID and define minimum requirements to qualify as an LID project. We are not providing technical standards on how to build stormwater facilities; this is left up to WC development Standards Section 221 and State LID Technical Manual for Puget Sound.

A hybrid point system that simplifies the seven proposed point categories was reduced down to five. This was accomplished by removing the Open Space points, and requiring clustering according to the particular zone. Clustering provisions are already part of Title 20 so no changes are needed. The other section that was removed was the critical area protection credits. This category was confusing to some. A one page checklist was distributed that includes all the point categories.

Action Item: Continue to simplify point system and checklist.

**BIRCH BAY WATERSHED ACTION PLAN
AD HOC STAKEHOLDER MEETING (LID SUBGROUP)
MEETING SUMMARY**

3. Examples (Existing Sites that have been built)

The revised point system discussed in previous agenda item was applied to several projects that went above and beyond the existing requirements to manage stormwater, minimize impacts to habitat, and provide open space.

- Tides at Birch Bay (Cottages and condos) 42 points out of 74 possible
- Millworks, Bellingham (Single family Residential) 55 points out of 74 possible
- Indian Point, Port Townsend (Commercial Mixed use, Shoreline) 45 points out of 74

During the discussion costs to implement these projects vs. conventional was brought up as the most effective way to make the case. It was suggested that a handout that compares costs should be created as a handout to perspective builders/developers. Even with useful incentives, developers will not go down this road unless it benefits their bottom line.

Mr. Bell noted that developers will be more interested in this approach if it makes their development more marketable, but noted that the general public is not “there” yet. Aesthetics of conventional stormwater ponds and systems versus LID systems were discussed. Forested trails, landscaping, and rain gardens were mentioned as benefits to most people when looking for a place to live.

A LID tour was discussed as a way to reach more of the market and decision makers. This tour should be put on by a neutral group that does not already have a “green” following.

Discussion of the point system included concern over giving points for tree retention for lots that start without trees. This was discussed as a way to encourage infill. A number of people noted that there is nothing to stop someone from cutting down trees and then two years later getting points under this program for retaining “existing” tree cover. Questions included, how were the points calibrated, and are they weighted. The highest potential points are for revegetation, which includes reveg for CAO buffers not associated with mitigation.

Action Item: Look into organizing a LID tour of existing facilities. Evaluate how to improve the point system for tree retention. Create handout comparing economics of LID vs. Conventional stormwater on existing projects.

4. Technical Specifications

Concern over what counts as impervious surface as it relates to small or large project thresholds was discussed. Since both small and large projects will require flow control, detention, and water quality the main difference is whether engineering is required for the stormwater system design. Sounds like different jurisdictions administer the State code differently in terms of meeting thresholds. Smaller road profiles and lot dimensions are part of the incentives for doing LID. We will work to secure letters from other departments that show

**BIRCH BAY WATERSHED ACTION PLAN
AD HOC STAKEHOLDER MEETING (LID SUBGROUP)
MEETING SUMMARY**

understanding of the program and commit to the alternative standards, Fire Marshall for example. Other benefits of LID include buffer reduction without reasonable use provision or mitigation per the CAO.

For technical specifications of how to build LID BMPs we refer to existing County specs in Section 221 or the LID Technical Manual for Puget Sound.

The need to improve the point system to encourage redevelopment was discussed. Better stormwater management from redevelopment could improve the flooding problems, so encouraging infill should be the priority. There is a provision to give full points to a project that results in less impervious than currently onsite, is not enough, we should go further.

Matching up to State performance standards is important if Birch Bay is to ever become a NPDES permitted area. The proposed State LID minimum requirement #5 was distributed. They have very specific requirements for impervious pavement, etc. We do not need to match these as long as we meet their performance measure for stormwater quality, detention, and flow control.

Use of the average annual runoff thresholds as a performance measure of stormwater design was discussed. This seemed to be an acceptable way to afford points, given it is a measurement engineers are accustomed to. It was mentioned that we should add additional emphasis that LID measures (structural or site design) are required to manage a minimum of 91% of the stormwater.

Action Item: Define stormwater “management.” Define what are considered LID BMPs and what surfaces count toward the Large Project/Small project threshold. Reverify that we meet State performance standards with our prerequisite.