

South Central Sound LIO  
Building Cities in the Rain  
Draft Meeting Summary  
7-30-13

Attendees: Heather Trim, Bill Moore, Erika Harris, Ian Munce, Jim Simmonds, Susan Saffery, Bruce Wulkan, De'Sean Quinn, Andy Rheume, Don Davidson, Anne Fritzel, Tim Gates, Heather Ballash

Ground rules agreed upon:

- One person talks at a time
- Respect each other
- No personal attacks
- Stay focused on task and agenda process
- Keep comments short (big ideas or concerns in 30 seconds)
- Everyone participates
- No side conversations
- All comments about the topic are valid
- Give everyone an opportunity to speak before others can speak again
- Tilt up card to speak – take down once facilitator calls upon you

Project context

- Regional Alliance is a technical assistance offer from Commerce funded through the National Estuary Program. South Central LIO proposed the topic of stormwater in infill areas to respond to Commerce as a result of focus by Puget Sound Regional Council's Growth Management Policy Board on stormwater management and infill development.

Problem statement and goals

- Comment: Smaller jurisdictions under Phase 2 permit requirements have less expensive stormwater requirements (e.g., there is an exemption for projects less than one-acre). A solution is single standards for everyone – small and large cities. *Ecology response:* This issue has been resolved. Stormwater requirements for sites and subdivisions for Phase 1 and 2 jurisdictions are identical (e.g., the one-acre threshold has been removed from Phase 2 permit). The requirement to adopt new site and subdivision codes is June 30, 2015 for Phase 1, and 12/31/2016. These dates are set in statute, Ecology cannot escalate the schedule. Small cities would have a hard time with things changing now. Caveat: both permits have been appealed, hearings scheduled for October 2013 and Feb 2014.
- The report should acknowledge urban area are more expenses to develop in general, it is not just stormwater treatment that is more costly. Another perspective is that larger cities have utilities to address stormwater, and there are more payers in urban areas to spread the costs. Small cities may not be able to afford these requirements because don't have as many payers.
- The intent of this project is to define land use barriers to implementing the Action Agenda, and use it for an opportunity for discussion. Do we want to quantify the problem, as opposed to considering anecdotal evidence? Commerce (or project partners) has some ability to look at

detailed projects, but not a lot of staff time on this project. Let's define the work program to see what is realistic.

- New problem statement was defined: Current regulatory and legal requirements, including stormwater management, for infill in urban centers are more expensive for developers than in less dense areas. The committee also discussed adding a study of whether this is undermining implementation of the Growth Management Act in certain areas. The committee steered away from including this in the problem statement.
- Committee thinks that the project goals are fine, but add:
  - Legislative/Regulatory fixes (should be approached with caution as this project is intended to address current context, not change regulation)
  - Consider whether this should be fed into the Action Agenda items in the update – in this section of the LIOs strategies.
  - Clarify GMA comprehensive plan updates in second goal statement.
  - Incentives for developers – e.g. green roof for more height.

#### Work plan

Overall strategy is fine.

Task 1 (not clear which of these went under Task 1 vs. 2):

- Committee likes what is already included in task 1, use task 2 as a way to draw more information out.
- Feasibility criteria for doing LID – map out where and how rules apply.
- Need information to articulate the problem – how much development is really going in to areas outside urban areas, where is it going, and why is it cheaper? (Possible resources - Commerce permit integration project, PSRC residential but not commercial, buildable lands)
- Also look at centers v. outside of centers.

Task 2:

- Actual examples/case studies of the problem – breadth of examples
- Other costs besides land value?
- Where are cities accomplishing success, and why not other cities?
- How capital facility plans address stormwater?

Task 3:

- Add policy makers to participants
- Venues with the sectors:
  - APWA stormwater managers group
  - Municipal stormwater managers – Jenny Gallis, Kirkland
  - APA conference in Bellevue(?)
  - County planning groups –
    - Pierce County Growth Management [Sept 26, Oct 24, Nov/Dec subject to change](#)
  - Master Builders Association
  - American Society of Civil Engineers
  - REALTORS

Task 4 (move ahead of 3 to inform the Task 3 discussion):

Some possible infill strategies:

- EPA estuary programs
- Enhance/fund TDR programs

Task 5:

- Add open space planning?
- What would be most useful in the report?
  - In addition to the report, for each key recommendation in a one or two pager for each recommendation that could be used with decision makers.
  - Carefully considered legislative changes to the GMA to inform PSP's legislative agenda.
  - Technical best practices information for implementation by planners.
  - Recommend for funding pilot projects, or other projects that demonstrate what we are trying to do with future NEP funding rounds
  - Pilot project - ability to replicate in other areas around the Sound
  - For PSRC – next meeting is October on this subject. Could brief them on this work at that point – work plan, etc. Recommendations would be presented when we have them in January or February.

Seattle problem project in South Lake Union – number one barrier was need to have the water go into the wastewater system to financially support the system.

Next Steps:

- Meet again in September to check on where we are
- South King County for next meeting – Renton City Hall?
- LIO web site is set up where the notes and other documents can be posted