

MARION WATER QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

September 8, 2015

Marion County Public Works in the North Santiam Room

5155 Silverton Rd. NE, Salem, Oregon

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Present: Rick Massey, Andrew Schmidt, Mark Grenz, Bryan Porter, Brent Stevenson

Absent: Zach Diehl, Douglas Krahmer, Richard Walker

Staff: Matt Knudsen, Kathy Lee

Public: None

CALL TO ORDER: 5:00 p.m.

INTRODUCTIONS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Dec 9, 2014):

Attendees introduced themselves for the record.

Rick made a motion to approve the Dec 9, 2014 meeting minutes as submitted. Mark seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

UPDATES:

Matt informed the committee that there will be back to back monthly meetings that will be held in September, October and November of 2015 to discuss the future credit system and how it is going to work.

Matt gave an update on the progress of the Stormwater Fee program. The program was approved by the Commissioners just as the Advisory Committee recommended to them in March of 2015. Then the East Salem Service District (ESSD) Advisory Committee members approved it. The fee will officially roll out to the non-profits and businesses on September 15, 2015 and it will be issued to the ESSD residential customers through their taxes in October of 2015. Outreach in the form of a letter was sent out twice to the residential customers and four times to the non-profits and businesses.

Andy commented that the ESSD customers have had ample time to state their concerns or opposition to the plan especially since the commissioners extended the date from the public hearing.

Matt relayed that we have had very little feedback regarding the Stormwater Fee Program but that we may receive more calls after the bills are received.

Matt commented that the funds that were already allocated from Environmental Services, the Roads fund, and ESSD funds for the Stormwater Fee Program are already being used for several projects. One

is on the culvert located on Center Street near the AMF bowling center. This culvert had deteriorated to the point where it needed to be addressed. This will be repaired by using a concrete casting in the culvert. The second project is the Sesame Street culvert. This culvert was collapsing. The only alternative to digging out the backyards would be to use a new product that is a cure in place plastic product. This product will basically put a tube of plastic inside the culvert. It will then cure it, which repairs the damage internally. This new product is supposed to be a 50 to 100 year fix, whereas the concrete casting is only a 25 year fix. Documentation will be done extensively on this product, not only for DEQ's requirements but for outreach so the ESSD customers will have information on what they are paying for.

Matt said is on the NPDES MS4 Phase II permit development committee. This committee involves developing the Phase 2 permit process. Matt will be attending a one day meeting in late September in Portland to further discuss the options.

STORMWATER FEE UPDATES:

Matt went over the handout "Illustrative Example for Stormwater Rate Credits" and explained the main point is that all commercial and non-profit customers will be offered this 2 year 25% credit. However, after the 2 year mark, we are working on getting a program in place to be able to offer a credit to those customers who will be qualified. Examples given were on a 90,000 square foot of impervious surface that re-directs the drainage to a detention pipe. How they would get a credit is dependent on the Quantity Credit (the portion of the impervious surface charge that supports the direct costs of stormwater quantity-related program) and on the Quality Credit (the portion of the impervious surface charge that supports the direct costs of the stormwater quality-related program). The total credit, using the stormwater rate of \$2 per month for each EDU would result in a credit of: $19,800 \text{ ft}^2$ or $19,800 \text{ ft}^2 \div 3,000 \text{ ft}^2 / \text{EDU} = 6.60 \text{ EDUs}$
 $6.60 \text{ EDU} \times \$2 / \text{EDU per month} = \$13.20 \text{ per month (or } \$153.46 / \text{year) rate reduction.}$

The other example was if a customer constructed a vegetated bioswale in series with the detention pond, then they would be eligible for additional credits because of the combine treatment and flow control benefits. The performance value for the combined facilities is 50 percent for detention pipe + 25 percent for the bioswale or 75 percent for the quantity. For quantity, the performance values are zero percent for the detention pipe + 50 percent for the bioswale or 50 percent. The stormwater rate credit for the series would be: $90,000 \text{ ft}^2$ of impervious surface $\times$ 75% performance value $\times$ 44% direct costs which equals $29,700 \text{ ft}^2$. For the quality credit, the $90,000 \text{ ft}^2$ of impervious surface $\times$ the 50 % performance value $\times$ 29% of the direct costs would equal $13,050 \text{ ft}^2$. So, the total credit would be using the stormwater rate of \$2 per month for each EDU, the resulting rate credit would be: $29,700 \text{ ft}^2 + 13,050 \text{ ft}^2 = 42,750$, or $42,750 \text{ ft}^2 \div 3,000 \text{ ft}^2 / \text{EDU} = 14.25 \text{ EDU}$
 $14.25 \text{ EDU} \times \$2 / \text{EDU per month} = \$28.50 \text{ per month or } \$342 \text{ per year rate reduction.}$

The City of Salem is offering a 50% credit but their impervious service is almost double to what the ESSD area is now and they have a base rate of \$10 where the ESSD rate is only at \$2.

Matt gave an example of how this would benefit a customer like Chemeketa. If they were paying \$24,000 a year, using a 50% credit rate reduction they could get a credit of \$12,000 per year.

Matt clarified that although the City of Salem did their own research, he will be doing his own research for the performance value each treatment system. He then went over the handout regarding Stormwater Facility Performance Values. This talked about the performance value that had been assigned to different stormwater facilities based on an assessment of the ability of the facility to remove pollutants and/or lower peak stormwater discharge rates. The performance values are based on best professional judgment using information drawn from published literature and stormwater rate reduction programs used by other jurisdictions. The actual effectiveness of a facility depends on many factors, including targeted performance standards, design and construction standards, status of ongoing maintenance, size of the storm event, and influent pollutant concentrations during the event.

The table on the handout explained the type of facility to the stormwater quantity and quality.

Matt opened up the discussion to the Advisory Committee members.

Brent asked if the percentage is based on current construction or will this apply to new construction? Matt clarified that if the customer is reducing the quantity and improving the quality of the flow, they would receive the credit. However, if they were to put in their own basin without a permit or they were to have a dry well without a permit, they would not qualify for the credit.

Mark asked if this is intended to be a good account from the county since we could not incentivize it enough to offset the cost of putting in their own basin? Matt said the credit is more for the accounting aspect of it instead of creating an incentive because the cost to construct a basin and maintain it will always be more than what a fee credit could provide. Unless the fee was considerably higher.

Rick asked if this is going to require maintenance logging. Matt said that to keep up the program it will be necessary to do periodic site visits to important infrastructure.

Mark commented that the property owners all have costs to maintain their own properties but the incentive to receive a credit is there. He gave the example of Chemeketa already having their own catch basin but there still is work to be done on those basins. Mark also commented that to get a permit for a dry well, it is necessary to register with DEQ and any treatments to basins would need to get the approval from DEQ.

Matt commented that to get a permit from DEQ for a dry well near drinking water, there is a requirement that there needs to be a 500 foot setback and that can become very costly.

Brent asked if there has been any thought to businesses such as Chemeketa coming up with the state of the art basins that perform above and beyond the requirements? This was discussed at a previous meeting when Chemeketa talked about creating a credit for education. Another example of this would be if a new school had a grant to create a state of the art basin that would add zero percent runoff.

Matt explained that even if the new school would meet DEQ and our requirements, they would still need to be paying for the base rate costs for sweeping, etc.

Rick commented that if you are dumping anything in the Willamette, then it is considered to be part of the impervious area.

Matt explained that we don't foresee a justification for this in our area because the ground in the ESSD area is not the right material to just infiltrate all the runoff.

Andy stated that the City of Keizer does not accept any credits since the roads are considered impervious service.

Matt said that he is going to try and recruit Chemeketa for the October meeting and also he will invite the Realtors Association. Matt asked who else we should invite to the meeting and Rick suggested we invite Keizer school district to the meeting.

CLOSING REMARKS:

None

Dan Goffin e-mailed Matt Knudsen to inform him of no longer being interested in participating on the MWQAC.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:57 p.m.

NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting will be held on October 13, 2015.