

Sea-Tac Airport Third Runway 401 Permit Negotiations

FINAL DRAFT MEETING NOTES

December 8, 2000

9:30 – 2:00

These draft meeting notes have been prepared by Kate Snider, Floyd & Snider Inc. Please reply to Kate at (206) 292-2078, fax (206) 682-7867, kates@floyd-snider.com with comments on the accuracy of these notes by 5pm, Monday, 12/18/00.

ATTENDEES

Ray Hellwig, Dept. of Ecology
Kevin Fitzpatrick, Dept. of Ecology
Ann Kenny, Dept. of Ecology
Dave Garland, Dept. of Ecology
Elizabeth Leavitt, Port of Seattle
Michael Cheyne, Port of Seattle
Keith Smith, Port of Seattle

Kelly Whiting, King County
Paul Fendt, Parametrix
Jim Dexter, Parametrix
Jim Kelley, Parametrix
Rick Schaefer, Earth Tech
Kate Snider, Floyd & Snider Inc.
Rachel McCrea, Floyd & Snider Inc.

MEETING AGENDA OVERVIEW

- Updates for:
 - Low Stream Flow (formerly referred to as Base Flow)
 - SDW1A
 - Des Moines Creek Flow Augmentation
 - Borrow Site #3 hydrology
 - NEPL
 - Temporary construction staging area within SASA footprint
 - SASA Facility Compliance with KC off-site flow criteria
- Schedule forward

DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN THESE NOTES

The purpose of these technical discussions is to clarify known issues and submittal requirements for documents adequate for Ecology and public review. Discussions of potential 401 condition language in these notes are subjective only. Language included in these notes does not in any way presuppose an Ecology decision regarding 401 issuance or preclude development of 401 requirements or conditions following review of the full record.

Resolution (general): The use of variations of the term "resolution" are for the purposes of these negotiations and refer only to the work of these technical negotiations between the Port of Seattle and the Department of Ecology. The terms are not intended to imply that, through these negotiations only, any issue has reached "final" resolution. Final resolution is subject to Ecology's receipt and approval of necessary documentation, subsequent public review and comment, evaluation of public comment and the final permit decision.

ECY00009662

Resolved: The term "resolved" is used in these notes to mean that subsequent discussion of the issue is not necessary in these negotiations. This term assumes that subsequent documentation submitted on these issues will be consistent with the meeting discussions, and be adequate for public review.

Resolution Pending Review of Additional Information: This phrase is used to indicate that a possible or likely solution to the issue was identified in the meeting. Additional information will be submitted for review, and further discussion in these meetings will determine whether the issue is "resolved".

Action Items Defined for Further Discussion: This phrase is used to indicate that the issue was discussed, and action items defined for the production of additional information or documentation. Following submittal of such additional information, the issue requires further discussion.

DOCUMENTATION OF NEGOTIATIONS: MASTER LIST OF ISSUES

Ecology and the Port have agreed to maintain a single "master list of issues" that is updated at each meeting during these negotiations. It has been agreed that individual participants in these negotiations will not maintain other lists of issues separate from this master list. The following summary table is used to document this master list of 401 Permit technical issues.

All issues are included on the list that have been identified by the Port or Ecology for resolution prior to issuance of the 401 permit. Resolution of these issues is the purpose of these technical negotiations. It is recognized that additional issues requiring resolution may be identified through public comment.

Definition of these issues and actions to resolve are included in meeting notes. Any comment on this master list of issues should be directed to Kate Snider at Floyd & Snider.

401 Technical Issues Requiring Resolution	RESOLVED	RESOLUTION PENDING REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	ACTION ITEMS DEFINED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION	NOT YET DISCUSSED
Administrative				
1. Documentation, master list of issues	✓			
2. Clarification of purpose of these discussions	✓			
1. Stormwater Master Plan - Detention Sizing				
Key Issues Discussed 10/2				
• Basin Acreage Discrepancies	✓			
• Use of different Target Flow Regimes for different basins	✓			
• Permeability assumptions of Airport fill material	✓			
• Infiltration evaluation of existing pond locations	✓			
• Project effect on Low Stream Flows (Base Flows)	✓			

AR 029088

401 Technical Issues Requiring Resolution	RESOLVED	RESOLUTION PENDING REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	ACTION ITEMS DEFINED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION	NOT YET DISCUSSED
• Use and documentation of HSPF and KCRTS models	✓			
• North Employees Parking Lot	✓			
• SDW2 land use conditions	✓			
• SASA facility volumes	✓			
• SASA facility compliance with KC off-site flow criteria	✓			
• SDS-7, SDS3-A, SDS-3, SDS-2, 5, 6 collection areas	✓			
• New information for Walker Creek calibration	✓			
• IWS model input consistency with SMP	✓			
• SDE-3 conditions	✓			
<u>Add'l Issues Discussed 10/6</u>				
• IWS Pump station overflow modeling	✓			
• IWS Pump station land use values	✓			
• IWS Pump station routing of water quality design storm	✓			
• IWS Lagoon capacities	✓			
• Modeling of potential IWS Lagoon overflow	✓			
• Filter Strip BMPs	✓			
• IWS treatment performance	✓			
• SDN1-OFF	✓			
• SDN-6 Cargo	✓			
• SDW1B impacts to Wetland 39B	✓			
• Des Moines Creek Basin Plan consistency	✓			
• All items in the 9/14/00 King County comment letter not specifically listed above	✓			
2. Flow augmentation for Des Moines Creek	✓			
3. Potential South Access Road impacts to Tyee Pond	✓			
4. Borrow Site #3 hydrology	✓			
5. HPA / 401 issuance relationship	✓			
<u>Add'l Issues Raised by Ecology on 10/10</u>				
• Potential impacts of SR 509 Interchange	✓			
• Potential aquitard breaches in Walker Creek basin	✓			

AR 029089

401 Technical Issues Requiring Resolution	RESOLVED	RESOLUTION PENDING REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	ACTION ITEMS DEFINED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION	NOT YET DISCUSSED
• Runway De-icing / Dissolved Oxygen study	✓			
• Compliance with Kludt settlement	✓			
• Contaminated soil stockpile facility	✓			
• Structural feasibility of proposed big vaults	✓			
• NEPA /SEPA revision timing	✓			
Natural Resources Mitigation Plan (Issues raised by Ecology on 10/10, discussed 10/13)				
• NRMP consistency with SMP	✓			
• Maintenance of wetland 18, 37, 39B hydrology	✓			
• NRMP incorporation of technical responses to previously identified issues	✓			
• S. Access Road/Tyee Pond Impacts	✓			
• Vacca Farm floodplain habitat design elements	✓			
• Stormwater pond cross sections	✓			
• Performance standards	✓			
• Documentation of indirect impacts	✓			
• Wetland delineations	✓			
• Documentation of Miller Creek buffer	✓			
• Fencing/signage for buffers/mitigation areas	✓			
• Restrictive Covenant for Auburn mitigation site	✓			
• Buffer planting in area of potential RDF	✓			
• Wetland impact analysis of IWS expansion	✓			
• Source of irrigation water for mitigation areas	✓			
• Mitigation Fund	✓			
NPDES Major Modification	✓			
Add'l Issues Raised by Ecology on 10/20				
• Timing of Corps public notice	✓			
• Temp. const. staging area w/in SASA footprint	✓			
• Water quality BMPs (401/402)	✓			
• Lagoon #3 potential direct impacts	✓			

AR 029090

401 Technical Issues Requiring Resolution	RESOLVED	RESOLUTION PENDING REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	ACTION ITEMS DEFINED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION	NOT YET DISCUSSED
• Add'l wetlands on Auburn site	✓			
• 401 relationship to A.O./Gov. Cert. for MTCA GW study	✓			
• Potentially contaminated properties in S. Runway Protection Zone	✓			
• Soil Quality at Borrow Sites	✓			
• Potential confirmation of groundwater quality w/in embankment	✓			
• Construction stormwater management	✓			
• Clean Air and CZM	✓			
• Compatibility of potential RDF and Tyee mitigation	✓			
Add'l SMP Issues Identified on 10/27				
• SDW1A facility sizing	✓			
• SMP Clarification regarding water quality BMPs	✓			

Issue Update: Project Effect on Low Stream Flows (formerly known as Base Flows)

RESOLVED: As discussed in previous meetings, a technical memorandum regarding project effect on low stream flows will be part of the package that is released for public comment. The technical memorandum will be referenced by both the SMP and the NRMP. The memo will describe combined project effect on low stream flows based on HSPF results, embankment discharge evaluation and cultural (non-hydrological) effects. The HSPF results for critical low stream flows will now include effects of the designed infiltration facilities at SDW1A and SDW1B.

For areas where it is determined that the project will have negative impacts on critical low stream flows, stormwater storage in excess of detention requirements will be reserved specifically for low-flow augmentation purposes. There will not be a separate Flow Augmentation Plan produced for any of the basins. The SMP and Low-Flow Stream Flow memo will show no overall low-flow impacts due to a combination of detention, infiltration and stormwater retained specifically for low-flow release.

Documents produced for public comment will include proposed flow augmentation facilities, with accompanying monitoring and operational description.

Issue Update: SDW1A

RESOLVED: The proposed infiltration system for SDW1A and SDW1B was presented, and will be included in documents released for public comment. King County requested that the

AR 029091

designers make sure rainfall is not double-counted in the modeling, and maintenance of the pumped system is addressed.

Issue Update: Flow Augmentation for Des Moines Creek

RESOLVED: For the Des Moines Creek basin, the critical low stream flow impact evaluation will address consistency with the Des Moines Creek Basin Plan approach regarding total critical low flows, and the effect that Port actions under these documents will have on total stream low flows.

Issue Update: Borrow Site #3 hydrology

RESOLVED: The documents produced for public comment will include the mitigation as proposed. Ecology has selected Shannon and Wilson to provide wetland expertise. They will review the Borrow Site #3 proposal concurrent with the public comment period.

Issue Update: NEPL

RESOLVED: The Port will propose an additional 13.9-ac/ft vault to retrofit the NEPL facility. This proposal uses the Miller Creek parameters and takes the constructed site back to the target flow regime (75, 15, 10), consistent with the approach to retrofit other constructed facilities. King County noted that the downstream regional facility assists with the rationale to retrofit NEPL as a constructed facility.

Issue Update: Temporary Construction Staging Area within the SASA footprint

RESOLVED: This facility complies with storm water management requirements for temporary facilities. The change in the proposed approach for flow augmentation also supports this issue's resolution. Additional information regarding the facility's operation was provided to Ecology.

Issue Update: SASA facility compliance with King County off-site flow criteria

RESOLVED: The SMP includes an in-stream detention facility at this location. King County has reviewed information submitted to date and has concluded the in-stream facility is acceptable, but requires a waiver of King County off-site flow criteria. King County will review new information and discuss the waiver proposal with Ecology, concurrent with public comment.

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The Port will proceed with preparing the documents for an anticipated public notice prior to the end of December 2000.

No further meetings of this group are scheduled.

ECY00009667