



STORMWATER ADVISORY GROUP

MEETING NOTES – June 24, 2024

City of Salem, Public Works Traffic Control Room (#325) & Via Zoom

MEMBERS PRESENT

Natalie Janney, Multi-Tech Engineering
Rick Massey, Richard Massey Construction
Josh Wells, Westech Engineering
Gene Bolante, Studio 3 Architecture
Ken Bierly, Glenn-Gibson Watershed
Councilor Linda Nishioka

STAFF/CONSULTANT SUPPORT PRESENT

Robert Chandler, City of Salem
Dwayne Barnes, City of Salem
Nitin Joshi, City of Salem
Fred Wilson, City of Salem
Anita Panko, City of Salem
Laurel Christian, City of Salem
Helena Najar, City of Salem
Kyle Cochran, City of Salem
Tyler Roth, AKS
Rose Horton, Otak
Angela Wieland, Brown & Caldwell
Jessica Christofferson, Brown & Caldwell

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Meeting #4 Recap & Follow-Up Questions
3. Review Proposed Stormwater Code Amendments and Timeline
3. Review Reorganized Stormwater Design Standards and Timeline
4. Future Sub-Group Meetings for Stormwater Design Standards
5. Closing Comments

1. Welcome & Introductions

Staff, consultants, and Stormwater Advisory Group participants introduced themselves for the record.

2. Meeting #4 Recap & Follow Up Questions

Angela Wieland walked the group through the PowerPoint presentation, covering the following:

- Appendix 4A and Site Assessment Checklist
- Simplified Sizing Form
- SRC Revised Definitions

Appendix 4A:

- Clarified Infiltration Infeasibility Criteria is based on vertical separation between the stormwater facility bottom and seasonal high groundwater.
- Checklist didn't reflect infeasibility criteria including depth of groundwater. This has been corrected.
- Reflects use of Area Set Aside (10%) in cases where infiltration testing has not been completed.
- Clarified submittal requirements based on Simplified, Engineered or Area Set Aside method.
 - Area Set Aside does not require an assumed infiltration rate to check footprint area.
 - As a conservative assumption, the designer could check facility footprint based on a design infiltration rate.

- 0.5"/hr requires full infiltration of the water quality storm (assumed largest GSI footprint required unless GSI is also being used to meet flow control performance standard)
- Flow control facility may be above or below ground.

Simplified Sizing Form:

- Adjusted project category definition for RES and Large projects to align with threshold designations and project definitions.
- Clarified Infiltration Infeasibility Criteria is based on vertical separation between the stormwater facility bottom and seasonal high groundwater. Clarifying notes added for sections references.
- Reflects use of Area Set Aside (10%) in cases where infiltration testing has not been completed.
- Clarified submittal requirements based on Simplified, Engineered or Area Set Aside method.
 - Area Set Aside does not require an assumed infiltration rate to check footprint area.
 - As a conservative assumption, the designer could check facility footprint based on a design infiltration rate.
 - 0.5"/hr requires full infiltration of the water quality storm (assumed largest GSI footprint required unless GSI is also being used to meet flow control performance standard)
 - Flow control facility may be above or below ground.

SRC Revised Definitions:

- **New impervious surface** means any impervious surface resulting from a project that 1) is placed over a previously pervious surface; 2) is placed over a surface that was in a predeveloped state; or 3) is placed over an existing impervious surface that does not have a stormwater system.
- **Replaced impervious surface** means the removal of an existing impervious surface and replacement with new impervious surface. Replaced impervious surface does not include repair or maintenance activities on structures, paved surfaces, or stormwater facilities taken to prevent decline, lapse, or cessation in the use of the existing impervious surfaces as long as no additional hydrologic impact results from the repair or maintenance activity. By way of illustration but not limitation, hydrologic impacts can include changes in the routing of drainage water flows, changes in drainage water flow rates, changes in the duration of drainage water flows, or changes in drainage water flow volumes.
- Note: Definitions have been updated based on feedback from the stakeholders. A stakeholder asked about taking a gravel parking lot and paving it – the stakeholder doesn't think it should trigger stormwater standards.

3. Review Proposed Stormwater Code Amendments:

Angela Wieland continued to walk the group through the PowerPoint presentation, covering the following:

Proposed Amendments SRC 70 - Definitions

- **Cross-reference.** Cross-reference one definition with another in SRC 70/Other SRC chapter.

- Examples: Construction activity, Contaminant, Development, Earth material, Erosion, and Single-family residential project.
- **Alignment. Align the City's definition with the Municipal Stormwater Permit.**
- Examples: Green stormwater infrastructure, Impervious surface, Numeric stormwater retention requirements, Pollutant, and Water quality design storm.
- **Compliance. Amend to comply with Municipal Stormwater Permit.**
- Examples: Large project, Maximum extent feasible, Replaced impervious surface.
- **Addition. New definitions to clarify and better codify existing practice.**
- Examples: Flow control exemption area, new impervious surface, Pervious pavement, pervious surface, Residential project.
 - **NOTE:** SRC is 10 years old, and this group is the only ones who have had an advanced reading of the code.
 - **Question:** Why is the single residential projects definition change?

Proposed Amendments SRC 71

- **SRC 71.025 (Fee-in-lieu of construction).**
Provides for opportunity of using a fee-in-lieu to not only construct new but to also retrofit an existing stormwater facility.
- **SRC 71.055 (Permissible Discharges).**
Aligns the set of permissible discharges in code with those of the Municipal Stormwater Permit.
- **SRC 71.080 (Requirements for land divisions).**
Clarifies that land divisions must be provided with both flow control and treatment facilities. Establishes the date at which the new requirements will apply to land divisions.
- **SRC 71.085 (Requirements for residential projects).**
- Accounts for recent changes in zoning and development codes to incorporate middle housing.
- **SRC 71.087 (Requirements for City projects).**
- Establish the date beyond which the new provisions apply to City projects.
- **SRC 71.090 (Requirements for large projects).**
Incorporates requirement in Municipal Stormwater Permit specific to provide stormwater treatment using GSI to the maximum extent feasible.
- **SRC 71.095 (Flow control facilities).**
Add to “applicability” an exemption for projects discharging directly into a “flow control exemption area” as newly defined in SRC 70.005. Clarifies the flow control performance standards.
- **SRC 71.100 (Treatment facilities).**
As required by the Municipal Stormwater Permit, states that the water quality design storm must be retained.

Timeline for Amending SRC 70 & 71

- Jun 18 Staff Report “In Approval Tracking” in Legistar for 1st Reading
- Jul 08 City Council meeting – First Reading and refer to Planning Commission

- Jul 15 35-day DLCD Notice (for Aug 20 public hearing)
- Jul 31 20-day Measure 56/SRC 300.1110 Notice (for Aug 20 public hearing)
- Aug 20 Planning Commission meeting – Public Hearing
- Sep 4 Staff Report “In Approval Tracking” in Legistar for 2nd Reading
- Sept 23 City Council meeting – Second Reading (Start of land use appeal period)
- Oct 28 30-day appeal period ends on Code Amendments
- Nov 01 SRC Chapter 70, SRC Chapter 71, PWDS Effective

Robert requested feedback on the SRC changes. July 8 is the City Council meeting that is open for public comment (3 minutes).

4. Review Reorganized Stormwater Design Standards and Timeline

Goal: Finalize PWDS Design Standards (Admin Rules) for notice by 8/19

- Design Standards Update are with the City for internal review.
- Revised Definition: Drainage Water, Filtration Facility (does not promote infiltrate, may be lined), Flow Control Facility, Infiltration Facility (no liner, fully infiltrate), Partial Infiltration Facility (without a liner, but with an underdrain for treatment). Generally trying to simply and be consistent with terminology used in the both the SRC and Design Standards.
- Organization and New Sections
 - Summary of changes, and source information is shared on the annotated outline.
 - There are still outstanding policy decisions and questions to be addressed in the Design Standards.
 - 25% steep slopes – not allowed to infiltrate (infiltration infeasibility). Consistent with WES, Marion County, etc. 25% was based on the geotechnical engineer’s recommendation. Some agencies allow 20% but could need to be supported by the Geotechnical Engineer. A stakeholder asked if we could decrease 20%. Plus 15% slopes require a geotechnical engineer to determine setbacks from the toe of slope. Conclusion: Change to 20% steep slopes are not allowed to infiltrate (similar to Gresham and Portland). This decision is finalized.
 - Thresholds – Robert gave a brief history of the thresholds. DEQ is now requiring a decrease in the thresholds.
 - Should use of Green Roofs (also referred to as Ecoroofs) be allowed credit for flow control sizing? Maintenance is a really important component of Green Roof functionality. Conclusion: The removal of the 50% credit for Green Roofs in the design standards need to be discussed and confirmed by the City internally.
 - Section 4.4: Shifting to prioritizing infiltration, instead of a GSI to the MEF.
 - Added a section on design exceptions and fee-in-lieu to reflect submittal of Appendix 4E equivalent.
 - Section 4.5: Add design storm table.
 - Clarify water quality (with NSRR) and flow control performance standards.
 - Consolidate sizing methods into one section.
 - Simplified Method can be used for under 10,000 sq ft.
 - Engineered Sizing Calculations include volume-based sizing and hydrograph-based sizing.

- Section 4.6: provide description and detail reference for facilities upfront.
 - Organized by GSI facilities, filtration facilities, and flow control facilities.
 - Incorporate applicable design criteria for standard details.
- Where are the clarification needs related to Sizing Calculations (approved tools, methods, etc.)?
 - Stakeholder: Prohibition of walls on ponds – not allowed in the Design Standards but are still used. Safety is an issue with walls. City may prefer a berm. There are internal discussions about how to address this.
- Should Simplified Method be used for public facilities?
 - Stakeholder comment: It just makes the facilities bigger. Not efficient use of taxpayer dollars.
 - The decision to allow the simplified method to be used for public facilities needs to be discussed internally.
- Appendix 4B – Landscaping.
 - The comments received have not yet been reviewed internally. Eugene is going through an update of their landscape requirements. There is value in having regional consistency. Eugene allows trees in GSI facilities. Eugene is going to maintain a separate planting lists independent of the Design Standards.
 - Stakeholder: Keizer keeps their street trees lists independent of Design Standards.
- The stakeholders expressed concerns about access road requirements for stormwater facility O&M activities. This should be reviewed in the Standards Update.

Timeline for Amending Admin Rule

- Aug 19 Finalize PWDS Admin Rule for Notice
- Aug 20 Planning Commission meeting – Public Hearing
- Aug 27 Issue Notice of Rulemaking (15-day minimum notification)
- Sept 10 End of Notification Period for Rulemaking (Compile Comments)
- Sept 23 City Council meeting – Second Reading (Start of land use appeal period)
- Sept 25 Info Staff Report on Rulemaking “In Approval Tracking” in Legistar
- Oct 14 City Council meeting – Information Staff Report on Rulemaking
- Nov 01 SRC Chapter 70, SRC Chapter 71, PWDS Effective

5. Future Sub-Group Meetings for Stormwater Design Standards

- Robert will send an email out to solicit interest in participating in this group.
- The schedule for this group to meet is still in development.

6. Closing Comment

- Robert needs all comments by 5pm today on the SRC.

The meeting adjourned just before 1 p.m.

Next Meeting:

TBD