

**OAK LODGE SANITARY DISTRICT
SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Summary of September 29, 2011, Regular Meeting**

The Oak Lodge Sanitary District Surface Water Management Program Citizens Advisory Committee met on Thursday September 29, 2011, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. in the Conference Room of the Administration Building, 14611 SE River Road, Oak Grove, Oregon 97267.

Committee members present: Jim Ferriss
Tom Civiletti
Lynn Fisher
Jerry Foy
Myron Martwick
Leonard Waldemar

Committee members absent: Matt Anderson
Eini Lowell
Tom Foeller
Carl Poston
Edith Coulter

Oak Lodge Sanitary District staff members present: Brett Arvidson PE, Manager of Planning and Engineering; J. Michael Read, General Manager; and Markus Mead, Administrative Services Specialist. Consultants in attendance were Libby Barg of Barney & Worth and Rolan Igloria and Donette Miranda of HDR Engineering.

Members of the Oak Lodge Sanitary District Board of Directors present:
Terry Gibson, Board Representative to the Committee
William Wild, Board President
Nikki West of North Clackamas Urban Watershed Council

Members of the public present: None

1. Introduction

Brett Arvidson, OLSD Manager of Planning and Engineering, welcomed the attendees to the meeting and asked that the attendees introduce themselves.

2. Streamside Stewards Program

Nikkie West, Citizen Advocate - North Clackamas Urban Watersheds Council provided a power point presentation about the Streamside Stewards Program results. WES funded this project and the Council developed this program. The program helps streamside property owners to understand their riparian area and manage their portion of the area. The goal is to

enhance riparian corridors within the Kellogg Creek– Mt. Scott watershed. It does this through outreach, site visits and print materials as well as providing native trees and shrubs and weed/invasive eradication. The goal is to enhance riparian corridors within the Kellogg Creek– Mt. Scott watershed. For sitework, the program created an agreement for continued work for future plant management. It realized a high response rate. The results were:

- established relationships with property owners
- located many high priority weed species
- located fish passage barriers.

A Committee member asked a question about eradication methods used. Ms. West responded that it depends on type of weed and property, but that generally, manual and chemical controls are used. The manual methods use a crew called Verde. Chemical controls are aquatic-approved herbicides.

A Committee member asked a question about coordination with Clackamas County. Ms. West responded that the Council is funded by and coordinating with WES.

A Committee member asked a question about invasive species recording. Ms. West responded that CCSWCD responds to these identifications.

A Committee member asked a question about the scope of the project; specifically about the program being applied to seasonal streams instead of tributaries. Ms. West answered that only the high priority streams were targeted for staff limitations and grant parameters.

A Committee member asked a question about financial target. Ms. West responded that she'd desire time to create a budget.

Mr. Arvidson stated that the District encompasses nearly 400 streamside properties. The type of restoration in this program is very cost effective. As the ordinance amendment process continues, he would like to incorporate these types of activities.

A Committee member asked a question about District participation. Mr. Arvidson responded that the long term arrangement with the property owner would be needed.

A Committee member asked a question about the Watershed Council's income stream. Ms. West responded that the program's model is not a fee for service. The committee member commented that if not, neglect of the restored area could create repeat measures.

A Committee member asked a question about the number of FTE equivalent the District has for SWM activities. Mr. Arvidson responded that there are two; both in the "operations". He added that this type of work is not in the District's current capacity. But that it would be valuable for the District to do by hiring contractors for site work and administer the program. He added that this type of work will be presented to the CAC in January for inclusion in the next FY operations.

3. Electronic Polling Results

Libby Barg, Barney & Worth described the polling results. The same poll that was presented last month. (ask Libby for handout with the results) Donette Miranda described th

stakeholder interview process. So far interviews were contacted with OLSD staff. CC DTD. CC WES, Developer, OLSD legal counsel, OLCC, JLCPO and others (ask libby)

4. Stakeholder Interviews to-date: Preliminary Summary.

Ms. Barg provided a summary of the interviews

- Protecting water quality is top priority.
- Most want stream code to be consistent with CC land use.
- Opportunity to clarify OLSD regulatory authority and process
- Additional regulation and enforcement is desired
- Property owner education will be key to success.

A Committee member asked a question about how developers answered in contrast to Committee. Ms. Barg responded that their request was to be consistent in regulations, that rules are acceptable, but to be associated with a purpose and not be arbitrary. Most of the developers comments are on the permit processing procedures, which is also the bulk of comments from Clackamas County Staff.

Mr. Arvidson responded that the District's desire is that through the code review process, the County and WES will be more familiar with OLSD purview and process.

5. Stream Code Update:

6. Draft Ordinance Update to "Group A" sections

Ronan described Draft Group A.

Ronan Igloria described the code review schedule. The process is currently at step 2: SWM CAC. Next steps are to engage the highly interested stakeholders including property owners, developers and ratepayers. Libby will send notice to stakeholders to their email lists for code review to send directly to their contact lists. The Group B will receive direct mailings.

Comment, key ingredient is communiatin and exposure.

Comment: most important thing would be th changes to exisni ordinance. E.g. property rights. Clackamas County did this with the highlighted changes. Thi could expedite some of th open house.

Comment: request to review the entire draft document at a meeting. Libby asked the group, like to go through document at a meeting? Manager Read stated that if that's the group's desire, it should be done at a specific meeting dedicated to it. Ronan will have a summary of changes. Those are part of his workplan. We can then have conversation about that. Concern is that many committee members haven't read the code.

Libby reviewed the internet site steamcodeupdate.com which has the code review room which contains areas for input. This mechanism puts all the comments into one location.

Idea for the comment form to have an email for recontact. A box that says please contact me.

Idea for more structure than just by article. However, there would be many articles and subsections. Idea for including line numbers such as a legal document, but the lines will be changing, so the reference will be changing. Idea for a link within the PDF to click on the document to automatically link or reference the section. It would pull the information into other comment boxes.

Quetins, is there a subgroup that would like a code review subcommittee? Brett will set up a meeting. For people that want to attend. The agenda item should be for folks who have specific comments.

Ronan provided a brief overview of the code.

Declaration of Policy. Much is the same. Difference in applicability with HIGAs. Definitions in 1.3 are essentially the same as existing ordinance. Questions about defining MS4. The shorthand note should be listed (MS4) 1200Z should be added.

Chapter 2. Administration is quite similar to existing ordinance.

Article 3 has been changed the most. Question about why the District doesn't control disturbance activities over one acre in size. It's based on federal law. Discussion ensued about parameters and purview and permit process and communication with County and WES.

Permit procedure is more explicit. The coordination should be described more explicitly with authority.

Comment: define "construct inactivity"

7. Project Website Demonstration

OLSD is partnering with NCUWC, Johnson Creek WC, and WES to hold a watershed event held in Spring of 2012 at Rex Putnam. The event will describe watersheds, urbanization effects.

A comment was raised that the SWM line item fee description should also change to better reflect the District's work.

Residents formerly believed the District's work is to remove stormwater from property (volume) but its charge is water quality. Stormwater is the largest threat to poor water quality. The District's charge is to mitigate effects to water quality.

Alternate name proposals (with vote results)

Include the word "rainwater".

- "Watershed Quality"; discussion of possible confusion with NCUWC (5).
- Surface Water Quality Committee (5)

Due to split decision, it will be sent via email and voting with other ideas encouraged.

Discussion around next meeting to include a presentation by Nicole of the NCUWC.

8. Next Steps

Ronan state that they are workin on OLSD staff on SDC feasiblity
Gro uB Updates. Will also schedule worksess non Grou pA1s.

Discharge regualtin ans SWM standards next articles covered.

Publi comments on Group A

9. Public Comment

William wild advised to invite Erine Platt
Suggestion fro additional civil engineer in this process.

10. Adjournment 7:24pm