

adoption of the engineering standards by the end of January 2022. The timeline is fluid for possible adjustments, but the first work session with the Board of Commissioners is tentatively scheduled for Sept 23, 2021.

The Department of Environmental Quality's (DEQ) deadline for the engineering standards is February of 2023, which will allow Marion County to share the final draft with the community a year before implementation is required.

The draft is a combination of what Marion County had initially and includes the new DEQ requirements. Matt wants the committee to look at the draft from a stakeholder position. Is it a positive or negative impact? The staff of Marion County may not be able to see the draft due to the county's own inward perspective. Matt thinks that the document is good, as it does not over complicate the rules.

Definitions:

Some of the definitions that need to be addressed:

- Urban (logic circle?)
- Rehabilitation
- Streams

There are eight sections:

Section 1: Introduction

This section answers the question about where we are with the regulation.

The map, for engineering standards, will need to be replaced as it will be out of date once the census is updated.

The group discussed the applicability of thresholds, and the objectives and how the county will use it internally, though development will use it externally.

Section 2: Site Assessment and Infiltration Assessment

This section is looking for basic information like contact information, property descriptions, etc. Matt wants to hear from the stakeholders regarding the infiltration assessment especially when counting the number of facilities on a site. Please look at the downstream analysis as well.

The table shows site development considerations and is set up for low impact development techniques.

The section on impervious pavements called out a few brands, which may or may not be helpful. Rebecca suggested that the list of brands could go into the appendix.

Matt does not think that Marion County currently has any green roofs.

Section 3: Stormwater Quality

For section 3.5 Treatment Performance Standards, if 3.3 standard cannot be met, then the consumer should try to meet standard 3.4. If they cannot meet 3.4 (retention performance) then they should try to meet 3.5 (treatment performance). If the consumer is not able to meet

any of these then offsite mitigation efforts, then they may meet the standards based on the permission of the director.

3.6 Management Facility Design Standards

This is a prioritized list of systems moving from retention to treatment implementation.

Max thought that the language was clear and very specific but maybe too restrictive. This is expected with this kind of document.

Brent asked if a property owner's plan for retention cannot meet the full standard, would the approach would be part retention/ part treatment, or does it go straight to treatment standards. Matt said that retention is preferred. Max said that the permit does not specify that you have to do it one way.

Alex said that we could allow for an exception of the retention requirements in instances where full compliance with the requirements cannot be achieved based on factors of technical infeasibility. Alex said that he interpreted it as having some flexibility.

Richard asked if Marion County had thought about doing a case study of current projects/designs in relation to the new DEQ requirements. Matt agreed that doing a case study was a good idea for both private and public scenarios. Ryan said that they have experience with the public side.

3.6.1, General Facility Design Requirements

This section provides the information what the plan for a facility with specific plans. Matt thought there would be a problem when there is a requirement for 2" thick of soil amendment over the soil, which may cause problems when there is a lot of water.

In reference to the O&M considerations for the operation of maintenance.

This is not a consideration for what a commercial facility but it is also a consideration for what the county is going to maintain.

What is an approved conveyance system and discharge point? Max said that when you apply for the permit for the construction of the system it depends on who owns the infrastructure. The county cannot issue a permit on property that is not within the jurisdiction of Marion County. We can issue a permit if there is authorization from the entity that owns the property. Other cities will allow a permit for an activity but is not focused on the jurisdiction. It is up to the landowner or the committee to make sure that they have permission, but that is getting into 1200Z.

3.6.3 Treatment Facilities Design Requirements

You can see the facilities that are acceptable and then each facility shows the specific standards

for soil amendment, planting and landscaping requirements. Included in this section are seed lists, treatment planter boxes, and treatment rain gardens. This is a simplified method for folks who want to design the landscape for themselves.

Marion County may have only two propriety devices.

3.7 Special Pollutant Sources

Matt thought about taking this section out because of the wastewater pretreatment aspect, but after discussion thought it should stay in for the stormwater aspect.

Rebecca asked about looking at this section on a smaller scale, like garage. She has seen examples of pollutants on a smaller scale which should not be allowed.

Someone mentioned that this section should stay in the standards to say that these are okay not to be connected to stormwater.

3.8 Detention Applications for Stormwater

We are not focusing on the detention standards. We do not have the ability to be able to turn over a new detention standard. Matt hoped to continue the conversation about detention and operation of maintenance that had previously been brought up before by Rick.

Max said that the document include wording that says 'see most recent document.'

Matt said that it will likely be a MS4 document.

Section 4: Hydrologic analysis

4.2 Rational Method is referring to the detention requirement as it is being included in section 5.

Matt will look into it why this section is here; it could just be because it was in MC standards before.

Section 5: Downstream Analysis

Please look at qualitative and quantitative analysis as well as upstream impacts.

There are references in 5.1.1 or 5.1.2 to 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 which do not exist.

Section 6: Drainage Submittals

6.3 Landscape plan requirements – it is a new requirement that we did not ask for this.

He believes that there is a suggestion within the draft standards for all facilities. Matt assumed

that for proprietary systems, you would not need a landscape plan.

There was discussion that a landscape architect is not necessary when you already have a landscape plan with guidelines, or threshold.

Zach did not know if the City of Salem required a landscape architect.

Section 7 Operation and Maintenance

There are options for public and private maintenance. The county is responsible for both public and private maintenance with the county making sure that the private maintenance is done.

Section 8: Warranty Periods

Section 8 is separate from the rest of the document, which focusses on erosion and sediment and control just during the construction phase of the site.

References and Appendices: Please look at them.

Matt will update the group if the Board of Commissioners Work Session set for September 21 would move forward.

FUTURE TOPICS / EMERGING ISSUES / OTHER BUSINESS

Other comments: None

Adjourn: Zach adjourned the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: TBD via Doodle poll