

**401 Permit Decision-Making
Sea-Tac International Airport, Third Runway**

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

TECHNICAL MEETING

March 14, 2001

9:00 – 12:00

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, 3/19/01.

ATTENDEES

John Drabek, Dept. of Ecology
Kevin Fitzpatrick, Dept. of Ecology
Ann Kenny, Dept. of Ecology
Keith Smith, Port of Seattle
Paul Fendt, Parametrix

Kelly Whiting, King County
Joe Brascher, AquaTerra
Kate Snider, Floyd & Snider Inc.
Rachel McCrea, Floyd & Snider Inc.

OVERVIEW AND RULES GOVERNING PROCESS

The purpose of these Technical Meetings is to coordinate Port responses to Stormwater Master Plan (SMP) information requests and comments defined in enclosures to the letter from King County dated February 22, 2001. Completion of work items defined in the above referenced document is required to allow King County to determine whether the SMP is in compliance with the technical requirements of the 1998 King County Surface Water Design Manual. The ground rules for technical meetings as developed by the management group on 3/9/01 were reviewed.

The focus of these technical discussions will be on Enclosure 2 of the King County comments. The grouped checklists located in the back of Enclosure 2 recap all the "big ticket" items in the Enclosure 2 comments. Additional applicable comments are included in the body of Enclosure 2. To ensure that nothing is overlooked, the Port will review all Enclosure 2 comments and King County will identify work items that are raised in the body of Enclosure 2, or in other enclosures, but do not appear in the checklists.

Each Technical Meeting will:

- Clarify (scope) specific work to be done, appropriate page substitutions, and delivery timing expectations for upcoming deliverables.
- Provide an overview/explanation of materials submitted in the previous or current deliverable(s).

AR 029135

DRAFT

C:\Temp\Technical Mtg 031401
draft.doc - projects\POS-ACQ3rd Runway\401 Permit
Negotiations\Decision Meetings\Technical Mtg 031401
draft.doc
rm 04/13/0103/45/04

Page 1 of 6

ECY00007549

- Receive feedback from King County and Ecology on previously submitted and reviewed deliverable(s).
- Result in published notes documenting the work to be done, as agreed to by the technical group.

Logistics for Deliverable Submittals

Deliverables should not be 3-hole punched. Text changes will be redlined until after the review and technical group process is completed. There will be no electronic exchange of files except for model input files as may be requested.

A footer (on text pages) or a stamp (on figures and model output) will be included on all substitute pages. The footer/stamp will read:

**<date deliverable submitted> - Revision # (color) D#
Agency Review Draft Only**

Each time a page is revised to address a different KCR comment, the Revision # will change. For example, if page 7-8 were revised to address a KCR comment in Group 1, it would be labeled "Revision 1." If that same page 7-8 were revised later to address a different KCR comment in Group 3 (for example), it would be labeled Revision 2 and would show both the first and the second revisions.

A color scheme, as follows, has been selected to track the review process. Deliverables should be printed on lightly colored paper and should include the color name in the footer/stamp.

Pink – first draft revision
Yellow – second draft revision
Green – third draft revision (if necessary)

Deliverables will be submitted for review in logical, agreed-to groups. "D#" (as appears in the footer/stamp) will refer to the Deliverable Number.

Deliverables will be submitted simultaneously to King County Reviewer (one copy) and to Ecology's Ann Kenny (3 copies).

A transmittal will accompany each deliverable. The transmittal will list the items/pages included in the deliverable and will reference the Technical Meeting where this deliverable was scoped.

Deliverables will be maintained in packets as submitted and revised until the SMP review and technical group process is completed. Only then will page substitutions actually be made in the document binders. If corrections/revisions result in multiple pages that need to replace a single page, the pages will be numbered a, b, c, etc. For example, page 7-8a, 7-8b, 7-8c.

If public comment or other Ecology comment results in further changes to the SMP, King County will be provided with a copy of all final pages to review in order to confirm that the revision would not effect King County's concurrence that the SMP meets King County's technical requirements.

Interim Communications

Regarding communication between technical group members between meetings, the following rules apply:

- If a change in scope of deliverable is needed, communication must include John Drabek of Ecology and must be documented in an email sent to John D., Ann K. and Rachel M.
- All email interim communication must copy Ann Kenny and John Drabek.

DELIVERABLE 1

Deliverable 1 is based on Enclosure 2, Group 1A (Encl. 2 page 25).

Draft responses to Group 1A were provided by the Port, however, since the paper did not follow the format and labeling as determined during the first part of this meeting, the materials were discussed only and will be resubmitted formally in conformance with the guidelines. Resubmittal will occur as soon as possible.

The Port and King County discussed the scope of each item included in the Group 1A checklist and how the Port will respond.

It was agreed that the pages to be substituted will include a replacement appendix and text changes to 2 specific pages in the SMP.

Each Group 1A item on the checklist (1-8) was discussed. The following is a short version of revisions to be done:

1. New table MC-7A/ASR will be added to the appendix in question. Input files will be changes accordingly. The table's footnote #3 will include a phrase such as "...with adjustment to gravel areas at 50%."
2. Soils information will be included in the appendix which shows that the area is not feasible for infiltration.
3. The Appendix Exhibit A2 will include the basin boundary on the drawing. After confirmation, the Appendix narrative will include a statement such as "The conveyance systems for this site are not collecting off-site flows, such as roadway runoff." The Port will confirm for King County that Miller Creek runoff files (and not regional runoff files) were used.
4. A model rerun will be done.
5. Fencing on slopes steeper than 3:1 is a safety issue in the King County Manual. However, because the facility in question is within Port property, the entire ASR area will be fenced off from public access. King County and Ecology will discuss this issue and notify the Port of their decision whether or not this fencing solution is acceptable.
6. Text changes will be made to address this item.

7. To back up the definition of this area as "non pollution-generating surfaces", the Port will confirm the frequency of visits to the ASR facility based on visits to the existing similar facility, and will report the answer to King County and Ecology.
8. The Port will include details of pollution prevention measures related to this fuel tank in the SMP text in Section 7.1.2.5.

DELIVERABLE 2

Deliverable 2 will consist of responses to the Appendix B2 checklist items on page 25 of Encl. 2.

It was agreed that Deliverable 2 will consist of a replacement Appendix B2 and replacement of a figure that is used throughout the document under different names. Deliverable 2 will be submitted to King County and Ecology on Thursday, March 22, 2001.

The following list is a simplified explanation of revisions to be done. The numbers do not directly relate to the numbers in the Enclosure 2, Appendix B2 checklist.

1. Calibration report text will be redlined.
2. All tables for the Walker Creek calibration will be revised.
3. All figures for the Walker Creek calibration will be revised. Figure B2-3B will be changed to show gauge 42C. Watershed maps will be changed to show only the existing sub-basins used for the calibration.
4. The basin maps of Miller, Walker and Des Moines throughout the SMP will be revised to show a red dot at gauge 42C (for example Figure B2-1).
5. Enclosure 2, page 3, #4 comments will be addressed on a number discrepancy in MC-16. Also review Encl. 2, pages 8-10 for additional explanation.
6. Results of the calibration will be provided for Gauge 42C.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Friday 3/16, 9:00 – 12:00: Scope Group 4 and part of Group 5.

Monday 3/26, 1:00 – 4:00: Scope Group 2, discuss Deliverable 1 and Deliverable 2.

Additional meetings will be scheduled on 3/16. The process and meeting dates will not be limited by King County Reviewer or other resource availability.