

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

REVISED DRAFT MEETING NOTES

TECHNICAL MEETING

April 9, 2001

1:00 – 4:30

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, with comments on the accuracy of these notes by 5pm, Friday, 4/13/01.

ATTENDEES

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

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

AGENDA

1. Deliverable 1 (yellow) King County Feedback
2. Finish Scoping Volume I Comments – Deliverable 8 (Checklist Group 5, Item #4)
3. Upcoming meetings: schedule and agenda

DELIVERABLE 1 KING COUNTY FEEDBACK

King County reviewed the yellow draft materials for the ASR site (Deliverable 1) submitted 4/4/01. No additional revisions are necessary.

DELIVERABLE 8 SCOPING PART II

Deliverable 8 is based on checklist Group 5, Item #4 "Volume I Comments" which are detailed on pages 14 – 19 of Enclosure 2. Items 1 – 6 were scoped at the 4/2/01 Technical Meeting.

7. This is not a KCSWDM compliance issue. The Wildlife Hazard Management Plan contains related details and is referenced in the SMP. No action is necessary.
8. See item #7, above.

9. A footnote will be added to Table 4-1 describing that the purpose of the table is to compare pervious areas and that it is a supporting data table that is not used for modeling purposes.
- A new table and map will be created to show the sum of the subbasin areas and annual flows in order to compare 1994 existing and 2006 conditions. This material will be added to Appendix A or as a new appendix to the SMP. This material is not related to KCSWDM compliance. ←
10. No new discharges are proposed in this basin. Ecology concurs that no retrofit is required for this area, unless new projects are proposed in the future.
11. Ecology and the Port note King County's comments. Comments are not pertinent to current decision-making.
12. See item #11, above.
13. Table 4-3 was previously scoped in Deliverable 3 "Des Moines Creek." A column will be added to Table 4-3 showing which stations would have discharges to stream and which would not. The revised table will remain a component of D3.
14. Clarification was provided to King County. Footnotes to Table 4-5 will be added explaining which projects shown on the table will be removed during the master plan update process, and that the South 160th Remote Parking in Gilliam basin will not be changed.
15. This item was scoped in Deliverable 4 "Walker Creek."
16. The Port will evaluate where the performance goal originated and a corresponding text correction will be made.
17. King County defers to the Industrial Waste Permit for the facility.
18. The Port will correct the intent of Figure 4-2 or, if appropriate, revise the reference to refer to Figure 4-3. The Port will also refer to the new table and map that will be included in Appendix A or a new appendix (see item #9).
19. See item #18, above. Ecology notes the comment.
20. This comment is related to above-ground vaults, which was scoped for Deliverable 5. The structural feasibility memo will include information regarding vaults constructed in fill soils.
21. Ecology notes the comments regarding final design approvals and alternate flow scenarios.
22. Page 6-2 text will be revised to say "The area of pond expansion..."
23. See item #21, above. The Port's stormwater management standards are included in Section 2. A reference to that section will be added to page 6-3. Section 2.1.4 also includes standards to be used for alternate flow scenarios.

24. The Port will delete "...and evaluated in 6.2.2." (in the last sentence of section 6.2.2).
25. Comments are related to Table A-3, which was scoped as a component of Deliverable 5. Comments are deferred to the D5 effort.
26. See item #25, above.
27. Ecology notes the comment related to alternate flow scenarios.
28. Deferred to the next meeting.
29. Clarification provided to King County. Due to the complexity of plumbing, existing roof runoff goes to IWS. Efforts are underway to plumb the rooftops to the storm system. No related revision to the SMP is necessary.
30. The Port will verify the correct number and will reflect necessary changes in the equation. The value in Table 7-8 will be updated accordingly. The equation typo will be corrected. The Port notes the comment regarding Appendix D.
31. King County corrected their comment; it should read "...one column to the left." The Port will make the changes.
32. Ecology notes the comment and will research the history of the testing procedures.
33. This item was scoped in Deliverable 5.

Enclosure 2, item number 3 (page 2) – A new Section 3.2 will be added to the SMP, bumping former section 3.2 to 3.3. The new section will include information regarding dam safety, including the applicable criteria and which facilities may need to be subject to permitting by Ecology's Dam Safety office.

REVIEW OF DRAWINGS

Meeting participants reviewed the drawings (sheets) provided in Appendix D. Drawing revisions will be made to be consistent with modeling revisions. Revised drawings will be submitted as ripple edits associated with each basin deliverable.

The following revisions will be submitted as a component of Deliverable 7 (Miller Creek):

- The Port will clarify how outfalls are designed on SDN3A
- The Port will provide a mechanism for overflows from SDN3A vaults to SDN3A pond (e.g. a flow splitter; see SDW1A).
- The overflow depth on SDN3A pond will be adjusted.

AR 029150

SCHEDULE PROGRESS

As documented in these notes, King County has completed reviewing the yellow materials for D1 and D2, and no further action is necessary. The Port is targeting submittal of D5 and D6 to King County and Ecology on 4/12/01. No schedule targets for submitting pink D3, D4, D7 and D8 (scoped today) have been provided. King County currently has nothing to review.

The participants agreed that because scoping is complete, and there are no deliverables on which to provide feedback during a 4/12 meeting, the meeting previously scheduled for 4/12 will not take place.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Monday 4/16, 1:00 – 4:00: Complete a matrix for scheduling deliverable processes. Deliverable Progress Reports as necessary. Potential KC feedback on pink D5 and D6.

Monday 4/23, 1:00 – 4:00: Agenda to be defined based on deliverable progress.

ECY00013747