

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

**FINAL DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

**TECHNICAL MEETING**

**May 14, 2001  
1:00 – 4:00**

These draft meeting notes have been prepared by Kathryn Snider, Floyd & Snider Inc. Please reply to Kathryn Snider at [khshome@seanet.com](mailto:khshome@seanet.com) or call (206) 292-2078 with comments on the accuracy of these notes by 5pm, 5/25/01.

**ATTENDEES**

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

Tom Atkins, Parametrix  
Alan Black, HNTB  
Kate Snider, Floyd & Snider Inc.

**AGENDA**

1. King County Feedback on Deliverable 3 (green) "Des Moines Creek"
2. King County Feedback on Deliverable 4B (pink) "Infiltration Feasibility"
3. King County Feedback on Deliverable 4A (pink) "Walker Creek"
4. King County Feedback on Deliverable 5 (yellow) "General"
5. King County Feedback on Deliverable 7B (pink) "154<sup>th</sup> Street"
6. King County Feedback on Deliverable 8 (pink) "Volume 1"
7. Schedule update and future meeting agendas

**DELIVERABLE 3 (GREEN) KING COUNTY FEEDBACK**

No additional revisions to Deliverable 3 "Des Moines Creek" are required.

**DELIVERABLE 4B (PINK) KING COUNTY FEEDBACK**

The Hart Crowser report regarding infiltration feasibility at SDW-2 in the Walker Creek basin concluded that infiltration is not feasible at the Pond F location. King County concurs with this determination.

King County requested two revisions that will be submitted as yellow Deliverable 4B.

1. New site map and boring logs referenced in the last paragraph should be submitted as yellow in final submittal.
2. Add note to Sheet C-132, SDW2 Pond F (similar to SDW1A, 1B, 3A etc.) that states "groundwater elevation is approximate..."

#### DELIVERABLE 4A (PINK) KING COUNTY FEEDBACK

King County stated that facility performance data seems to show pond is appropriately sized. King County requested the Port make the following changes to Deliverable 4A "Walker Creek", for final yellow submittal.

1. Table A-8
  - SDW2 numbers need to be changed to match numbers labeled "Walker Creek @ So. 12<sup>th</sup> St."
2. Figure A-10 Flow Duration Graph
  - need more log cycles on percent time exceeded so can determine that flow durations match up to 50 year or maximum simulated.

Note: as wrap-up item following final SMP completion, King County and Ecology request HSPF input and WDM files for all basins, for their files.

3. MC-9 has a PERLND of  $\emptyset$  - should be deleted or "starred out" consistent with others.
4. Would be most clear if M-21 was adjusted to have 100 percent acres accounted for (not 33 percent or 133 percent). This change would be applicable to pre-, post- and calibration runs.  
[T. Atkins noted revised numbers that would accomplish this].  
  
(change only would affect project facilities, but would increase the usability of files from this SMP for future downstream applications).
5. F-Table 20 was changed in calibration report. It needs to be changed accordingly in pre-development and post development.
6. Check and revise future condition Land Use numbers for SDW2? Based in review of post development acreages on the 5<sup>th</sup> from last page of the table, they look like they have been changed unnecessarily.
7. Attachment C to Appendix A – Walker CK SDW2 Flow Duration Graph – needs additional log cycles – same comment as comment #2 above.

AR 029175

Drawings:

8. Discrepancy of CB labeling – changes made on C-113 not made on C-131 (numbers need to be updated to the new locations).

Note: reserve vault shown on drawing may be affected by results of low flow evaluation.

## DELIVERABLE 5 (YELLOW) KING COUNTY FEEDBACK

The following revisions will be made to Deliverable 5 "General" and provided to Ecology and King County in a green submittal.

1. Table A-3

- Regarding the column header "Permanent Stormwater Detention Required," change "Required" to "Provided".
- RW 34 R Safety Fill: inconsistent...if "retrofit" than wouldn't detention be provided? (Isn't this in a retrofit basin with a facility provided?).
- 154<sup>th</sup>/156<sup>th</sup> facility note revision: Keep "no new net impervious"; and add "detention provided in regional facility" (strike "retrofit existing conditions").
- 154<sup>th</sup>/156<sup>th</sup> facility: Delete "retrofit", use "- -". Stormwater detention provided should be "yes" with footnote 'C'.
- Borrow Site Activity – why limited to just Borrow Sites 3 A and 4?
- Does footnote G apply to others – where "no stormwater detention provided"-? Don't understand logic of where footnote G used – include on Borrow Site.
- 518 Interchange needs footnote G.
- 509 needs footnote G.
- Relocation of Airborne cargo, ATCT: see general comment below

General comment: Wherever "just retrofitting exist conditions" does this mean "no net new impervious" proposed.

- ASR – strike footnote E.
- ASDE and NAVAIDS need footnote G.
- Footnote "F" – delete "located in MPV drainage area (...)".
- Footnote F only applies to ASDE and NAVAIDS, not ASR. (move ASDE and NAVAIDS to new line separate from ASR?)
- Footnote "I" last 3 activities on page A-5. Need explanation of logic behind this footnote.
- New snow equipment storage – inconsistent "retrofit" – "new impervious" Should say "retrofit, new".

General comment – assume “retrofit” refers to 1994, if something different then need definition.

- Westin Hotel – “cancelled but included in SMP” – No water quality treatment included in SMP. Suggest: “project cancelled. No new impervious to be added. Will be retrofit by SASA facility.”
  - \* Or alternatively, strike as was done for Des Moines CK Tech Center?
- Removal of threshold on RW 16L this should be a retrofit? – answer should say “yes” detention provided, cause in a retrofit basin.

General comment – in “New or Retrofit” column, where just “Retrofit” assuming = “No new impervious”.

- Footnote “H” (new NUT, ARF...etc.) add: “increases in net impervious area will require SMP revision”.
- Ramps off 518 – add footnote G.
- Acknowledge table needs to be checked at end for any other potential “ripple effect” changes. Final table should be submitted at close of all other SMP revisions.

### DELIVERABLE 7B (PINK) KING COUNTY FEEDBACK

The Port will make the following requested changes and resubmit the deliverable to Ecology and King County in yellow after D7A is finalized:

- New table “154<sup>th</sup> Street relocation information” will be added to Appendix A.
- Complete Deliverable 7A modeling cleanup to reassess SDN2X, SDN4X vault. This effort will affect the curve.

### DELIVERABLE 8 (PINK) KING COUNTY FEEDBACK

- Page 2-2 – ok, but does this change need to be made somewhere else too in SMP?
- New section 3.7 – good, need to check new SDN3A regarding short on overflow freeboard? If increase dam height may move into category to trigger need for dam safety permit.
- Check Pond F – revised sizing may move into category to trigger need for dam safety permit.
- Page 4-8, typo “IFWS” = “IWS”?

General Note: Some material in volume 1 will need to change per low-stream flow evaluation and mitigation proposal (e.g.: 6.2.1.1 + tables).

**AR 029177**

**SCHEDULE UPDATE – AS OF 5/14/01**

Deliverable	Date Scoped	Pink Submitted	KC Pink Feedback	Yellow Submitted	KC Yellow Feedback	Notes
D1 (ASR Site)	3/14	3/16	3/26	4/4	N/A	Done
D2 (Appendix B2)	3/14	3/22 & 3/28	3/28	3/30	N/A	Done
D3 (Des Moines Creek)	3/16	4/19 & 4/20	4/23	4/27	5/1	5/7 green submittal, 5/14 KC feedback. Done
D4A (Walker Creek)	3/26	5/10	5/14	5/25t	6/5t	
D4B (Infiltration Feasibility)	3/26	5/10	5/14	5/25t	6/5t	Decoupled to accommodate schedule
D5 (General)	3/28	4/26	5/1 & 5/7	5/9	5/14	5/30t green submittal
D6 (Maintenance Feasibility)	3/28	4/13	4/23	4/27	5/1	Done
D7A (Miller Creek)	4/2	5/21t	6/5t			
D7B (154 <sup>th</sup> St.)	4/16 & 4/23	5/11	5/14	5/30t	6/5t	
D8 (Volume 1)	4/2 & 4/9	5/4	5/14	5/25t	6/5t	
D9 (Figures)	5/1	5/25t	6/5t			

t = "targeted;" event occurs in the future.

N/A = not applicable; no feedback required.

"Pink" denotes the first draft of revised materials. "Yellow" is second draft. "Green" is third draft.

**Next Scheduled Meetings**

**Friday 5/25, 9:00 – 12:00:** This meeting is intended to provide an opportunity for the Port and King County to communicate regarding ongoing work and deliverables targeted for submittal on or about this date. No King County feedback is expected, as this effectively is the first day K. Whiting returns to work after scheduled vacation.

**Tuesday 6/5, 1:00 – 4:00:** King County feedback on D7 & D7B (pink) if schedule targets are met. King County feedback on D4A & B (yellow) and D8 (yellow), if necessary.

Upcoming Vacations: P. Fendt out 5/8 – 5/19. K. Whiting out 5/15 – 5/23.

**AR 029178**