



MARION WATER QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, November 18, 2021 @ 5:30 pm
Virtual meeting via Zoom

PRESENT: Members: Zach Diehl, Brenda Sanchez

Zoom: Gary White, Mark Grenz, Rebecca McCoun

Staff: Matt Knudsen (Marion County Public Works), Alex Wade (Marion County Public Works), Ryan Crowther (Marion County Public Works Engineering), Max Hepburn (Marion County Public Works Engineering), Brian May (Marion County Public Works Environmental Services)

Guests: None

ABSENT: Rick Massey, Brent Stevenson

QUORUM: Yes

ADMINISTRATIVE (Information/Discussion/Action)

Zach called the meeting to order @ 5:33 p.m.

Member and Staff introductions: Done

Public Input: None

Marion County Engineering Standards Review

Matt stated the second draft Engineering Standards came back from their consultant and showed the document during the meeting.

Projected Timeline:

Matt shared an excel document detailing the timeline.

The timeline would be the second review of Engineering Standards with MWQAC, followed by taking recommendations from the Advisory Committee, and updates from the first draft to the Board of Commissioners at the end of November or early December. After meeting with the Board of Commissioners, feedback will be sent to Brown and Caldwell. Finally, in January, a final draft will be submitted to Marion County by Brown and Caldwell and a meeting with the Board of Commissioners will happen. This timeline may be pushed back.

Matt stated that there would be a year of implementation notice for the development and

construction industry for the new Engineering Standards.

Section 5: Downstream Analysis

The language is set for an acre or above and it matches with the detention requirement. It isn't a requirement for every project, it is a new requirement. It isn't required by the permit. When you are installing an impervious surface that is impacting the amount of water flowing downstream and are increasing the volume, the downstream analysis takes a look at what is impacted downstream. Marion County does not currently have this requirement for projects.

Mark Grenz asked for clarification on how far downstream would need to be looked at. Gary White and Matt Knudsen provided that it was approximately ¼ of a mile. Matt Knudsen stated that the County may require the downstream deficiency to be fixed.

Mark saw an issue with access through private properties. Max Hepburn suggested that clarifying language be added to “may require improvements in public infrastructure or where the county has applicable easements.”

Mark asked for examples of impacts that they were envisioning happening downstream to which Max replied, the Auburn culverts that were undersized as a known deficiency. Matt noted that the word ‘may’ is vague on the parameters for the known deficiencies and that needs to be clarified.

Alex noted the last paragraph on 5-2 states the parameters for public and private land. Gary White asked if the word “must” would be better than “may” within the paragraph stating the “applicant may elect to mitigate the storm drainage system concerns by either correcting the deficiencies”, when they can choose between two options. Matt stated that if there are any recommendations for changes in verbiage to send them to him.

Matt stated that the BOC asked staff to review what is required and not required within the standards; he stated that we are reviewing what is not required today.

Motion: Zach made a motion to support the inclusion of Section 5: Downstream Analysis within the Stormwater Engineering Standards. Gary seconded.

Discussion: None

Results: A voice vote is unanimous – motion passes.

Section 6.1: Drainage Submittal Package Requirements – Geotechnical Report

Matt noted that it states, “County may require a geotechnical report on sites with steep slopes or shallow groundwater, in order to evaluate the suitability of the proposed stormwater management facilities.”

Brenda asked for clarification on what steep slopes is; Matt noted that it is within the standards. Brenda also asked for some consideration on downslope risk within the standards; Mark commented that the purpose of the geotechnical report is to assess the potential risk for downslope properties.

Motion: Mark made a motion to support the inclusion of Section 6.1: Geotechnical Report Requirements within the Stormwater Engineering Standards. Brenda seconded.

Discussion: None

Results: A voice vote is unanimous – motion passes.

Section 6.3: Planting Requirements (Landscape Architect)

Matt read, “Landscape plans for all stormwater management facilities shall be prepared, signed, and stamped by a Landscape Architect registered in the State of Oregon.” Matt believes that the idea would be that a landscape architect would understand spacing of plants and what type of plants would do better in certain areas.

Zach stated that he would like to hear from the consultant as why they included this in the standards, because if there isn’t a reason to need it, it’s overly restrictive.

Matt asked Ryan if the County has a landscape architect that they utilize; Ryan stated that they have a very detailed planting list based on the different zones that they based the plan on.

Alex said that he doesn’t believe that there is a certain credential that demonstrates every aspect of the planning process and would be in favor of removing the landscape architect.

Rebecca McCoun suggested that only native plants were used; Matt stated that a set plant list was already established and included in the standards.

Motion: Mark made a motion to support the inclusion of Planting Requirements (Landscape Architect) within the Stormwater Engineering Standards, with the removal of the requirement for a Landscape Architect. Zach seconded.

Discussion: None

Results: A voice vote is unanimous – motion passes.

Appendix B.3: Infiltration Testing

Matt stated that the standards say, “there will be one every 100 feet in the areas that will be used for infiltration.” The standards read, “At least one infiltration test is required for any potential location where a public or private stormwater management facility will be sited.”

Ryan stated that this is significantly more than what would be done for the County’s Capital Projects; the County doesn’t do a test at each location but does enough tests to show that we don’t have the ability to take advantage of infiltration. Matt stated that infiltration tests at every facility would be for inconsistent water tables or disturbing landscape cases.

Mark and Gary stated that it made more sense to remove the specific requirements stating to have an infiltration test every 100 feet and to have the amount of testing left up to the Geotechnical Engineer. Gary suggested that it read as “the County may require additional infiltration tests”.

Motion: Gary made a motion to support the inclusion of Infiltration Tests within the Stormwater Engineering Standards, with the removal of the requirements for infiltration tests and the addition of the County may require additional infiltration tests. Zach seconded.

Discussion: None

Results: A voice vote is unanimous – motion passes.

Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance

Matt would like to have a meeting in the future for discussion on these. County staff is working on combining all the permits into one permit to streamline the application process; this would combine the high-risk tier, regular permit tier and large permit tier into one style of permit. The only increase requirement would be for the County to review the smaller lot plans as required by the DEQ.

Alex wanted to clarify that this is for construction erosion and sediment control during development and not post-construction; Matt confirmed.

Zach asked for clarification on what large lots and small lots were; Matt said that the way DEQ has it is it's based on the disturbed area. A plan is required for a quarter of an acre, but review of the plan is required for one full acre. Matt stated that they are setting it up as the high-risk tier goes away and a quarter of an acre and above will need to submit a plan and have it reviewed through the process.

Matt said that the committee will see the ordinances in December.

Motion: Zach made a motion to support the inclusion of standardized permitting within the Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. Brenda seconded.

Discussion: None

Results: A voice vote is unanimous – motion passes.

Section 7.4: Two-Year Maintenance Warranty

Max stated that the warranty protects for two years; it protects the County against situations such as bad plants. Max stated that the County currently has a one-year warranty period such things as failures, construction disturbance, etc. We only require that it be replanted before the one-year warranty with new plants, leading to poorly established plants. The new update for the maintenance warranty would require the water quality treatment facilities to maintain the plants for two consecutive years to ensure established plants. Matt said that this also relies on maintenance of the plants.

Motion: Zach made a motion to support the inclusion of the two-year Maintenance Warranty. Gary seconded.

Discussion: Gary noted that it makes sense to require maintenance of it.

Results: A voice vote is unanimous – motion passes.

FUTURE TOPICS / EMERGING ISSUES / OTHER BUSINESS

Other comments: Matt noted that if the Committee had any comments about the Standards, he would like them as soon as possible.

Zach asked if there were any recommendations from the first draft; Matt said there weren't any major changes.

Matt would like to bring the Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance before the advisory committee for review in the future, probably in December.

Matt thanked the committee for their time, review of and comments on the standards.

Adjourn: Zach adjourned the meeting at 7:16 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: TBD via Doodle poll