

LID Community Workgroup Meeting #5

Notes

Tuesday, Nov. 24, 2015 – 1-3 PM
Thurston Regional Planning Council – 2424 Heritage Ct. SW, Suite A, Olympia, WA
Conference Room A (first floor)

Attending: *Mike Burnham, Veena Tabbutt and Paul Brewster -- TRPC; Allison Osterberg – Thurston County. Blair Prigge, Alex Smith, Donna Weaver, Steve Swan, Whitney Holm, Richard Davis, Art Castle, Mark Kitabayashi, Tom Holtz, Ben Alexander, Jeff Glander*

Brewster began with a greeting and review of the meeting agenda. He then asked workgroup members to introduce themselves. The workgroup welcomed Blair Prigge, who replaces Jeff Pantier as the workgroup's surveyor expert.

Burnham ensured workgroup members had collected handouts for their binders. Among the handouts were: Issue Paper 6—Hard & Impervious Surfaces, and Issue Paper 7—Streets & Roads.

Osterberg introduced Issue Paper 6 (Hard & Impervious Surfaces) and discussed the Ecology Toolkit questions, current Thurston County Code requirements and the County LID Workgroup's draft recommendations. She repeated the process for Issue Paper 7 (Streets & Roads)

Osterberg gave a brief PowerPoint presentation (See SharePoint folder for full presentation) relating to impervious surfaces and their stormwater impacts.

LID disconnects and reduces impervious surfaces to support on-site infiltration. A site's soil and topography, however, affect how well stormwater can infiltrate. Impacts can be seen with as little as 2 percent impervious surfaces; studies show that 10 percent impervious surface cover is an appropriate level for setting a limit.

The presentation then showed inconsistencies in the current Thurston County Code with regard to zoning types and impervious surfaces. She noted that the DDECM does not require rooftops to be modeled as impervious surfaces if downspouts drain to a gravel driveway and enable stormwater to infiltrate on site.

She showed a matrix of County zoning and the County LID Workgroup's suggested impervious surface limits for each zone. The recommendations are as follows:

- Use consistent definitions of “impervious surface” and “hard surface” across different areas of the code
- Develop consistent hard and impervious surface percentage limits for all zones
 - Square foot limit for smaller lots
 - Preexisting surfaces and structures can be replaced
 - Additional 5% allowed for farm and forestry buildings
 - Pervious surfaces calculated at 75% of total area
 - Hard surface limit can be increased with a special use permit
- Credits (residential & resource zones only)
 - Hard surface limits increased by 50%:
 - Soils on site allow for full dispersion of stormwater runoff
 - Landscape plan shows retention of existing native trees and vegetation on at least 20% of the site.
 - The development is a Planned Residential Development (PRD) or Planned Rural Residential Development (PRRD)
 - Hard surface limits increased by 100%:
 - Landscape plan shows retention of existing native trees and vegetation on at least 65% of the site.

Vegetation/ Restoration Credits

- Additional 1,000 square feet of hard surfaces above the limit if:
 - 6,500 square feet retention of native trees and vegetation that are outside of any designated critical areas or buffers.
 - 3,250 square feet retention of native trees and vegetation connecting designated critical areas or buffer
 - 3,250 square feet replanting of native trees and vegetation within a riparian or wetland buffer area.

Holtz and Alexander suggested that the proposed impervious surface limits are inadequate, given average site coverages and development types today; few developments are approaching their current limits today, they contended. Holtz suggest that the workgroup have a session on the NPDES requirements.

Osterberg will consider potential changes to address this concern. She added that the proposed impervious surface limits should simplify the code for developers. Holm said she likes this aspect.

Kitabayashi suggested that the code should set the minimum impervious surface limits and provide the development community credits as options.

Davis said, overall, he likes the proposed impervious surface limits and recommendations. Castle echoed Davis and said the recommendations do a good job of cleaning up the code.

Osterberg then gave a PowerPoint presentation about Streets & Roads and pointed the workgroup to the issue paper. (See SharePoint folder for full presentation)

She showed a table that compares existing road widths amongst Thurston County it its three largest cities:

	Arterial	Collector	Local Access	Private Road	Cul-de-sac
Thurston County	12 feet	11 feet	10 feet	8 feet	20 feet travel lane
Olympia	10 feet	10 feet	12 feet (one lane only)	-	47 feet radius
Lacey	11 feet	11 feet	10 feet	11 feet	45 feet radius
Tumwater	12 feet	10-11 feet	10-11 feet	10-11 feet	32 feet radius

She then showed the County LID Workgroup’s recommendations:

- No proposal to narrow most street widths at this time
- No proposal to use pervious surfaces for public roadways at this time
- Allow some designs that require variances currently to become a standard option
 - Two-track driveways
 - Standard surface 8-foot driveway with alternative surfaces in shoulders
 - Roads serving 6 or fewer homes can be 12-feet wide, with pullouts
 - Curb cuts to enable flow of stormwater into bioretention
- Allow for placement of bioretention facilities in the right-of-way

The workgroup signaled general support for the recommendations, which Osterberg explained were vetted by the Thurston County fire chiefs.

Davis suggested narrowing County road lanes to 11 feet. This would reduce impervious area but allow adequate room for vehicles. This could be problematic, however, because the lane width is needed to support vehicles traveling at higher speeds, as well as fire trucks and other large vehicles.

###