

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

Date: July 20, 2011
Time: 3:00 pm- 5:30 pm
Place: Whatcom County Public Works, Civic Building, Garden Room

AGENDA

1.	Intro and review of agenda
2.	Low Impact Development
3.	Incentives
4.	Alternative Mitigation Program

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Darcy Jones – Jones Engineers	Nathan Row – APC Consultants
Wendy Harris - Citizen	Peter Gill – Whatcom County PDS
Colleen Mitchell – 2020 Engineering	Michael Kershner – Whatcom County PDS
Tim Kennedy - BIAWC	Adam Merrill - ESA
Keturah Witter - ReSources	Analiese Burns – NW Ecological
Keats Garman – BBWARM Advisory Board	

DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED

MEETING CONTENTS

- 1. Should Birch Bay LID code be kept together (as an overlay), or spread throughout the entire WCC?**
 - Yes, it should be kept together
 - No, it should be spread throughout. Need to differentiate between structural (e.g., stormwater infrastructure) and non-structural (e.g., preserving open space) LID practices.
 - There might be too many overlays already, which gets confusing
 - LID is a result, not necessarily a practice.
 - Keeping it all together will emphasize its importance. Too many cross-references is confusing
 - Make an “LID” section that’s not specific to Birch Bay. Treat as a pilot project.
- 2. Point System**
 - Ran some development examples—point system may discourage participation on small lots/commercial areas. Preserving forest and land set asides is hard to do on smaller lots. No incentive to use LID manual, except for the stormwater management stuff.

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

- Need to take redevelopment of existing developed parcels into account.
- Maybe we need to just “write off” some areas of the watershed that are already highly impacted, in exchange for protecting other areas
- Need defensible point system
- Point system is a good idea
- Need a simple checklist sheet to show the planning commission. Make it easy to understand
- County should make planning documents and regulations easy to find on website, linked to a parcel map.

3. Guidebook options

- Worried about homeowners putting in rain gardens in unsuitable areas, without an engineering review.
- May want to split guidebook into 2 versions, one for single-home developments and one for larger developments
- Should have requirements specific to the different sub-basins
- Make a flow charts, pointing people in the right direction for appropriate practices, depending on development types, site conditions, ect...
- We should advise people to get professional advice

4. Should we pilot the approach?

- Yes, should set a date for reviewing the program
- First thing we should look at in the future: are people actually using the program
- Will need to evaluate incentives in the future—are they working?
- How does this program figure in to other LID planning efforts within the County?
- Need to “sell” the public/land owners about the LID plan
- Test water quality in the bay and at different sites, to determine a baseline of water quality. Then, compare the baseline to post-development measurements
- Should do fish and wildlife monitoring and surveys. Get colleges/schools involved

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

5. Maintenance of LID stormwater facilities

- Most jurisdictions don't want to take over maintenance of private stormwater facilities.
- Maintain is critical; education and enforcement is a major issue
- For BBWARM fee reduction, have property owners submit an annual monitoring report

6. Incentives

- BBWARM does not want to reduce fees. Should focus on overall cost savings resulting from LID development, as opposed to conventional development
- Should LID suffice for avoidance and minimization criteria in the "development" subwatersheds as described in the Watershed Pilot Study.
- Emphasize overall cost savings.

7. Incentives

- Need to factor in no net loss and indirect impacts