

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

**DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

**TECHNICAL MEETING**

**March 16, 2001  
9:00 – 12:00**

These draft meeting notes have been prepared by Rachel McCrea, Floyd & Snider Inc. Please reply to Rachel at (206) 292-2078, fax (206) 682-7867, [rachelm@floyd-snyder.com](mailto:rachelm@floyd-snyder.com) with comments on the accuracy of these notes by 5pm, Thursday, 3/22/01.

**ATTENDEES**

John Drabek, Dept. of Ecology  
Ann Kenny, Dept. of Ecology  
Keith Smith, Port of Seattle  
Kelly Whiting, King County

Paul Fendt, Parametrix  
Tom Atkins, Parametrix  
Felix Kristanovich, Foster Wheeler  
Rachel McCrea, Floyd & Snider Inc.

**AGENDA**

1. Submit Deliverable 1 (scoped 3/14) to Ecology and King County (no discussion necessary).
2. Introduction of new participants:  
Tom Atkins (Parametrix) is responsible for putting together the SMP document and will attend the Technical Group meetings to assist the process.  
Felix Kristanovich (Foster Wheeler) has worked on the Des Moines and Miller Creek modeling. Felix and Joe will check each others modeling work.
3. Scope Checklist Group 4: Des Moines Creek (Deliverable 3).
4. Schedule additional meetings of the Technical Group.

**DELIVERABLE 3**

Deliverable 3 is based on Enclosure 2, Group 4 (Encl. 2 page 29). It is targeted for submittal to King County and Ecology on 3/28.

The Port and King County discussed the scope of each item included in the Group 4 checklist by reviewing the related detailed comments in Enclosure 2, primarily on pages 11 – 13.

The following is a short version of revisions to be done, organized by the numbering presented in Enclosure 2 pages 11 & 12:

1. Discrepancy will be fixed.
2. The Port will check this discrepancy and propose a solution for King County and Ecology review.
3. The Port will check this discrepancy and propose a solution for King County and Ecology review.

**NOTE:** KCR comments include a number of "Recommendations" that are not linked to SMP technical compliance with the King County Surface Water Design Manual. Recommendations will be discussed in this Technical Group setting and Ecology will determine if a change is needed based on King County's recommendation.

4. Ecology and the Port discussed this recommendation and decided to leave the conservative design assumption as submitted 12/00.

The Figure labeled "Des Moines Creek 2006 HSPF Schematic" located in Appendix B, part A will be updated to make it consistent with the model (e.g. SDS2 to Copy 4, SDS5 to Copy 41).

5. Port will verify facility performance based on the correct number (acres of wetlands).
6. This recommendation will be followed; FTAB 46 will be added back into the Pre-Project model.
7. Port will include Tye Pond in the Pre-Project conditions, Appendix A.

Ripple Effect Identified: This correction will cause a ripple effect to some numbers and tables appearing in the NRMP and the Biological Assessment (BA) Supplement. Ecology and the Port decided to note this effect and to not make the changes to the NRMP and BA Supplement at this time. Ecology will address the issue internally with their NRMP reviewer. The Management Group will discuss the issue of ripple effects to other documents in order to advise the Technical Group.

8. **SDS POCs**  
Port will provide POC 1 and POC 2 facility performance information clearly labeled either POC 1 or POC 2.

Flow duration graphs will be revised to show greater detail in the area of interest used to verify performance.

King County and the Port agreed to replace the entire Appendix A section entitled "Des Moines Creek Additional Point of Compliance Information."

#### **SDS7/SDS6 Vault**

The existing Appendix D will be augmented to include the memo previously completed by HNTB regarding the structural feasibility of proposed big vaults. An additional memo will be prepared and included which documents the structural feasibility of the SDS7/SDS6 vault and other above-ground vaults. A maintenance feasibility memo will be prepared and included that describes the maintenance feasibility for all vaults deeper

than 20 feet from grade to invert. The memos will include an overview table/matrix showing which vaults are evaluated.

**SASA**

Port will provide a conceptual design of the SASA facility in Appendix D.

Additional related items are briefly noted below, organized by Enclosure 2 page number and item numbers where applicable.

**General Comments, Page 1 item 1:** Clarification by King County: fill calibration parameters should be consistent across all basins with the exception of DEEPFR and AGWRC, which should both be basin specific and consistent within each basin.

**General Comments, Page 1 item 2:** Due to an intermittent HSPF software bug, all 0.000 entries will be changed to \*\*\*\*\*. This affects all basins and multiple deliverables, not just deliverable 3.

**SMP Comments Volume 1, Page 15 item 13** (also appears as item #8 on checklist Group 4): Table 4-3 Volume 1 will be amended to include an explanatory statement re: excess.

The Port will make the following clarifying statement in the SMP text wherever an IWS diversion is presented as an option for retrofit: "Performance will be evaluated prior to routing."

**NEXT SCHEDULED MEETINGS**

**Monday 3/26, 12:30 – 4:00:** KC feedback on Deliverable 1 (if necessary); Discuss Deliverable 2; Scope Group 5 checklist and Group 2 checklist.

**Wednesday 3/28, 9:00 – 12:00:** Present Deliverable 3; Scope Group 3 checklist.

**Monday 4/2, 1:00 – 4:00:** Agenda to be determined based on progress.