



CLARK COUNTY
PUBLIC WORKS

Clean Water Program



Clark County Clean Water Commission 2006 Annual Report

to the
Board of Clark County Commissioners



Clark County Clean Water Commission Members

Mr. Bill Owen, P.E., Chair

12713 NW 21st Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98685

Mr. Tim Crawford, Vice Chair

PO Box 1766
Battle Ground, WA 98604

Mr. Robert Even

14300 NE 20th Avenue, D102
Vancouver, WA 98686

Mr. Don Moe, P.E.

1325 SE Tech Center Dr., #140
Vancouver, WA 98683

Ms. Patty Page

12807 NW 20th Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98685

Mrs. Susan Rasmussen

30101 NE 58th Avenue
La Center, WA 98629

Mr. Art Stubbs

6804 NE 86th Court
Vancouver, WA 98662

Ms. Virginia van Breemen

P.O. Box 559
4106 NE Stoughton Road
La Center, WA 98629

Mr. Ronald Wilson

3305 NE 116th Street
Vancouver, WA 98686

Former 2006 Members:

Ms. Anne Jackson, Ph.D.

2613 NW 199th Street
Ridgefield, WA 98642

On behalf of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, I approve the 2006 Annual Report to the Board of Clark County Commissioners.



Clean Water Commission Chair



Date



For an alternate format, contact the Clark County ADA Compliance Office.
V (360) 397-2025; TTY (360) 397-2445; Email ADA@Clark.WA.GOV

Executive Summary

This report provides the Board of Clark County Commissioners an overview of work efforts performed by the Clark County Clean Water Commission (CWC) in 2006. It begins by listing the topics it covered in 2006, including those regarding capital improvements, water quality education, stormwater low impact development, and others. Subsequent sections provide more detail regarding the status of the incentive program, a summary of public comments, and observations regarding the Clean Water Program's recent expenditures.

As specified in the county ordinance that formed the CWC, its members held a work session to assess the effectiveness of the Clean Water Program during 2006. Two sets of information resulted from this discussion. First, CWC members ranked the individual activities and overall program on their effectiveness in using the Clean Water Fee revenue to complete their work. On a scale of "Very Good" to "Very Bad", the CWC members gave the overall program a score between "Good" and "Very Good". Administration and Monitoring efforts received the highest marks ("Very Good"). Enforcement & Regulation work ranked the lowest of the individual functional areas of the Clean Water Program (between "Average" and "Bad"). Second, CWC members identified strengths and areas of improvement that county staff could use to refine their activities.

In an effort to help guide the actions of this advisory group during 2007, the CWC voted to focus on the following issues:

- Clean Water fees as they relate to projected costs of compliance with the new NPDES municipal stormwater permit
- Continuation of 2006 topics, including septic tank impacts on water quality and promoting stormwater low impact development opportunities in Clark County.
- Education/public relations/coordination
- Incentives

Given this information, the Clark County Clean Water Commission makes the following recommendations for your consideration during the 2007 calendar year:

- *Become well versed with the changes proposed under the new NPDES permit.* Effective February 16, 2007, this new permit requires more from the county than in previous years. As such, it is likely that the Clean Water Program Service Fee will need to be increased. Your ability to publicly articulate the reasons for the adjustment of this utility fee will help ease concerns from those paying these fees.
- *Attend at least one Clean Water Commission meeting in 2007* to share your priorities regarding clean water issues and to hear current issues this advisory board is addressing.

2006 Annual Report
Clark County Clean Water Commission

Executive Summary i
Introduction..... 1
Role of Clark County Clean Water Commission..... 1
Review of 2006 Action Plan Accomplishments 2
Evaluation of Clean Water Program Effectiveness 4
Summary of Clean Water Program Expenditures..... 5
Status of Incentive Program 6
Summary of Public Comments..... 6
2007 Action Plan10
Recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners10

Appendix A: Clean Water Program Evaluation Work Session Notes
Appendix B: Summary of 2003-04 Clean Water Program Expenditures
Appendix C: Summary of 2005-06 Clean Water Program Expenditures
Appendix D: Log of Public Comments at 2006 Clean Water Commission Meetings

Introduction

This report provides the Board of Clark County Commissioners an overview of work efforts performed by the Clark County Clean Water Commission in 2006. The report focuses on the role of the Clean Water Commission, its accomplishments, observations, and activities it plans to undertake in 2007. Information regarding the county's 2006 expenditures for the Clean Water Program and its overall effectiveness are also included. The report concludes with a short list of recommendations to the BOCC.

Role of Clark County Clean Water Commission

The role of the nine-member Clean Water Commission is to serve as an advisory board to the Board of Clark County Commissioners on matters relating to improving the quality of stormwater runoff.

The CWC meets on the first Wednesday evening of each month. All of the meetings are open to the public. An important aspect of the CWC is that it provides the chance for the community to have a voice in managing one of our most precious resources, water. During each meeting an agenda is followed whereby the public, Clark County staff and the CWC listen to matters of importance regarding stormwater runoff. After information is presented to the group, participants at the meetings are allowed to discuss and give input.

The CWC's task is to listen to all information presented, ask questions of the presenters, listen to the public input and then make recommendations to the BOCC as necessary. These recommendations would most likely relate to the following subjects:

- Educating the public in stormwater matters
- County policy on stormwater issues
- Budget, revenue and stormwater fees
- Capital improvement projects
- Stormwater and facility maintenance
- NPDES compliance issues

Our responsibility is to serve as a link between the Clean Water Program staff, the public and the BOCC. All of us listening, learning, and working together can help to ensure that our stormwater runoff is clean as possible, enabling Clark County to be the most liveable community it can be!

Review of 2006 Action Plan Accomplishments

The Clean Water Commission 2006 Action Plan resulted in several activities:

1. Participate in selection and ranking of capital improvements: Select members to sit on the Stormwater Capital Improvement Program Involvement Team (SCIPIT), which will formulate criteria for selecting stormwater capital improvements and rank submitted projects.

ACTION: Five Clean Water Commissioners participated in the SCIPIT process during 2006. This included identifying evaluation criteria, setting weights, and reviewing final scores for each project.

RESULT: The BOCC approved the SCIPIT's final product, the *2007-2012 Stormwater Capital Improvement Program*, as a consent agenda item on February 13, 2007.

2. Examine Water Resources Education & Outreach Program: Continue working in subcommittee to learn more about and to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the Water Resources Education & Outreach Program.

ACTION: Three Clean Water Commissioners formed an education subcommittee, which met periodically in 2006 to provide feedback regarding on-going activities of the Program's Education & Outreach staff.

RESULT: On-going.

3. Promote stormwater low impact development: Continue studying how stormwater low impact development could improve water quality in Clark County. Identify a developer/partner that is willing to build a model project using some of the techniques.

ACTION: The CWC culminated its multi-year effort by developing a *Proposal to Encourage Low Impact Development in Clark County* in November 2006. CWC members conducted research, developed example cost estimates, and documented their findings to promote the use of these sustainable stormwater techniques within the county. The CWC presented its findings and proposal to the BOCC on January 24, 2007.

RESULT: The BOCC concurred that the county should look for public works and private development projects that include these stormwater management techniques.

4. Research stormwater filter vaults and other stormwater facilities: Continue learning about stormwater filter vault systems, and educate stakeholders about the issues involved with their use. Learn about maintenance costs for all types of stormwater facilities.

ACTION: Two Clean Water Commissioners joined Clark County Maintenance and Operations staff on field visits to learn more about the issues associated with these vaults.

RESULT: The commissioners learned that it costs the county approximately \$100-\$110 per cartridge to replace its contents so the filtering system operates effectively. This does not include any labor costs. There are 600+ filter cartridges in 100 stormwater filter vaults located around the county that need replacement every two years. They determined that the County is understaffed to adequately inspect and maintain the 100+ stormwater filter vaults and other stormwater facilities around the county. They also recommended that the CWC conduct annual checks with the Operations staff to determine the operational status of these vaults.

5. Investigate the impact of septic tanks: Hear a presentation by the Clark Regional Wastewater District or by Clark County Public Health on existing or potential water quality problems caused by septic tank systems.

ACTION: The CWC heard presentations on septic tank issues from both organizations during its July 2006 meeting. The product of those and subsequent discussions was a proposal drafted for the BOCC in November 2006 with specific recommendations that would proactively track and address aging septic tanks located near streams having poor water quality due to elevated bacteria levels.

RESULT: The BOCC conducted a work session on March 28, 2007 to discuss these proposals. Ultimately, the BOCC agreed with the first CWC recommendation to modify local code to enhance inspections of these septic tanks and require their design drawings be provided to the county as a matter of record.

The BOCC also asked if the source of bacteria in stream samples can be positively identified as human. Staff discovered that the minimum lab cost to identify whether or not a bacteria source is human is about \$500 per sample, and would involve three to four samples per location.

Evaluation of Clean Water Program Effectiveness

Members of the CWC held a work session to assess the effectiveness of the Clean Water Program during 2006. Two sets of information resulted from this discussion. First, CWC members ranked the individual activities and overall program on their effectiveness in using the Clean Water fee revenue to complete their work. The outcome of this effort is depicted in Table 1. Second, CWC members identified strengths and weaknesses that county staff could use to refine their activities. The full list of these observations and suggestions is presented in Appendix A.

The CWC members gave the overall program a score between “Good” and “Very Good”. The CWC noted that staff commitment to the program is very high. Areas of improvement include more funding and staff to address increased NPDES permit requirements and better coordination between staff within the Clean Water Program to achieve overall program goals.

Administration and Monitoring efforts received the highest marks (“Very Good”). CWC members felt Administrative staff is responsive, knowledgeable, and effective in completing its work with a low administrative budget. The Monitoring group received high scores due to their technical expertise, ability to network with other agencies, commitment to making their findings available via the county Web site, and a successful volunteer monitoring program.

Enforcement & Regulation work ranked the lowest of the individual functional areas of the Clean Water Program with “Average”. Issues that the CWC members identified with this group include insufficient enforcement of stormwater codes (especially on weekends), limited feedback on their program’s effectiveness, and overly harsh enforcement on agriculture lands.

Compared to the CWC 2005 assessment, the Engineering/Capital Program group showed the most improvement. This was due primarily to the creation of the Stormwater Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) and the hiring of a full-time stormwater engineer. Conversely, the Education / Outreach group received a lower score than in 2005. Some of the issues noted include the need to better engage the average population, inability to measure changes in general public perceptions and actions towards water quality, and the need to attract and retain more Watershed Stewards.

Table 1. Clean Water Program Effectiveness Assessment

Program Area	Very Good	Good	Average	Bad	Very Bad	Abstained
Admin	○○○ ○○○ X	○○	○			
Education / Tech. Assistance	○○○	○○○ X	○○○			
Engineering / Capital Program	○	○○○ ○○○ X	○○			
Enforcement & Regulation		○○	○○○ X	○	○	○
Maintenance & Operations	○○○ ○	○ X	○○○			
Monitoring	○○○ ○○○ X	○○	○			
Overall Program	○○○	X ○○○ ○○	○			

Legend

○ Individual Scores

X Composite Score

Summary of Clean Water Program Expenditures

The 2005-06 biennial budget is about three million dollars more than the 2003-04 biennial budget (see Appendices B and C). The increase is attributed to the planned implementation of the \$3.8 million regional stormwater facility called Curtin Creek Stormwater Enhancement Area. Due to litigation, the project was placed on hold in 2006. In early 2007, challenges to the project ceased, thus it will be constructed in 2007 using the fund balance from 2006. More than \$9 million in fund balance will carry over into the 2007-08 biennial budget.

Expenditures over the last 24 months equal roughly 65% (approximately \$4.6 million) of the Clean Water Program’s \$13.3 million budget. Capital expenditures were less than expected due to the delay of the Curtin Creek project. Stormwater capital planning (non-capital improvements) expenditures were slightly over budget. Water quality monitoring and reporting spent about 61% of its budget. Public Education and Outreach spent around 88% of its budget. Regulation and Enforcement expended 122% of its budget. Operations and Maintenance spent 94% of its budget. Administration and Coordination

spent about 68% of its budget. Additional activities (support of Endangered Species Act) spent 100% of their budgets. Additional information is available in Appendices B and C.

The inability to spend its budgeted amount over the past four years may cause problems for Clark County as it begins a process to re-evaluate the Clean Water fee. Certainly, the new NPDES permit published in early 2007 will require additional staffing and capital resources to meet its requirements. However, the fact that the County has met its NPDES permit requirements without spending all the Clean Water fees it collects will give members of the public some pause. Staff has explained to the CWC why this money, primarily from the capital program budget, was left unspent. Reasons include delayed construction due to legal challenges, and the difficulty of retaining an employee to serve in the stormwater capital engineering position. The new SCIP will help stabilize the latter problem and will identify more projects than the existing capital budget can fund.

Status of Incentive Program

The Clean Water Commission made no substantive effort to address incentives for the Clean Water Program Service Fee during 2006. Suggestions for incentives were provided to the BOCC in the CWC's 2001 Annual Report. Since that time, the CWC members concluded that the Clean Water fee is too small for average homeowners to concern themselves with a discount. Furthermore, the CWC is given the impression that any reduction in Clean Water fee revenue would negatively impact the ability of county staff to complete its required NPDES permit activities.

However, if the county chooses to review the fee structure this year, incentives (both fee-related and others) will be a topic of discussion to help entice average homeowners to become more actively involved in water quality issues. Incentives could also encourage business owners, who typically pay a substantially larger fee, to reconsider how they manage stormwater on their property.

Summary of Public Comments

Feedback from the public regarding the Clean Water Program is organized in two sections: Public Comments in Response to Billing Mailings and Public Comments at 2006 Clean Water Commission Meetings.

Public Comments in Response to Billing Mailings

Approximately 54,000 Clean Water Program Service Fees bills were produced in 2006. Of those, fewer than 1% result in comment. It seems fair to assume that the low volume of calls overall is a sign that Clean Water Program education efforts have given Clark County citizens confidence that their Clean Water fees are well-spent for a good cause.

When citizens do have a concern about their Clean Water fee, many of them call the Treasurer's Office, and are able to have their questions answered or issues resolved. Those calls to the Treasurer that are program activity questions or complicated billing calculation questions are forwarded to Clean Water Program. Others contact the Clean Water Program directly by phoning the number provided, by including a note with their payment, or by sending an email to the address provided.

Most contacts were within the first month after billings were mailed. The most prominent themes of contacts were: 1) the fee-payers not perceiving any personal benefit (e.g. no visible infrastructure near them) from the program, or 2) the fee-payers feeling that they have paid for those benefits in a different way, such as through their neighborhood association. After about 15 weeks, calls related to the fee taper off.

The policy of the program is to respond directly to all citizen-initiated contacts, as long as valid contact information is supplied. Comprehensive records of these contacts are maintained. In 2006, Clean Water Program staff fielded a total of 373 public contacts, mostly by phone. Of these, 257 (68%) callers' concerns were satisfied in the course of the first contact. This high level of successful response can be credited to the knowledge base accumulated by staff over time.

One hundred sixteen calls required some research and follow-up. Of these calls, 79 (68%) were related to clerical or accounting issues, while 37 (32%) were related to the program itself. For most of these, questions or concerns were resolved to the citizens' satisfaction. (See Table 2 for details.)

In conclusion, the Clean Water Commission finds that the Clean Water Program staff maintains very positive relations with the public in regard to fees and the program itself.

Table 2. Clean Water Program Citizen Initiated Contacts

<i>Issue Types, when recorded</i>	2003	2004	2005	2006
Address error			8	8
Billing error			22	16
Billing question	115	304	101	35
Calculation error			11	11
Calculation question	66	105	13	4
Clean Water Program questions			51	14
Drainage issues			4	3
General complaint	22	49	52	11
Hardship/Senior exemption			3	5
Request for info	30	65	5	4
Fee vs. tax issue	1	27		
Incentives/self-interest	26	5		
Other	11	8	23	5
SUBTOTAL of issue types	271	563	293	116
Issues resolved on first call*	68		66	257
TOTAL contacts recorded	339	563	359	373
<i>Actions Taken</i>				
Information requested, sent			15	9
Site visits			5	4
Appeal Forms requested, sent**	49		11	4
Appeals submitted	29		6	6
Appeals approved	7		1	1
Appeals denied	22		4	5

* Issues that are resolved quickly on the first call without need for follow-up frequently are not categorized.

** Some appeal forms are requested but not submitted; occasionally an appeal will be submitted on fee payer's own form. Appeals are approved or denied by the director of Public Works.

Note: This Table is a best effort to consolidate the available historical data, reconciling varied record keeping in earlier years. It is the intent of CWC to continue reviewing and consolidating this data from year to year

Public Comments at 2006 Clean Water Commission Meetings

The meeting notes covering these comments are included in their entirety in Appendix D. Following is a summary of those comments:

JANUARY: Mr. Thom McConathy expressed concern over outfalls into Vancouver Lake. He urged the commissioners to read the 2003 Performance Audit of the Clean Water Program and to push for more commitment to storm water management on the part of the county. Mr. Duane Koski expressed his concerns about the impact of development on water quality, especially over wetlands.

FEBRUARY: Mr. Mike Kerbs and Mr. Rich LeBlanc asked for, and received, CWC blessing for a citizen group to work on behalf of the Salmon Creek watershed. (Note: The Salmon Creek Watershed Council has been incorporated as a not-for-profit group. Clean Water Commission Chair Bill Owen is serving on the board.)

MARCH: Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart informed the CWC that all applicants, new and renewing, for Clean Water Commission would be interviewed by the BOCC as part of a new protocol. Commissioner Stuart also noted that work is beginning on a regional conservation initiative.

MAY: Mr. McConathy asked about the efficacy of the volunteer monitoring program, expressed concern over perceived lack of adequate enforcement and suggested the CWC request a detailed annual report from Community Development. Mr. Jim Malinowski also expressed concern over lack of adequate enforcement especially in riparian areas and asked CWC to provide information about rights and responsibilities to streamside property owners annually.

JUNE: Mr. McConathy asked that the county map roadside ditches that are contiguous to waterways, and work with other jurisdictions to control nutria and other invasive species.

JULY: Mr. Robert Buker questioned the accuracy of classifying reed canary grass as an introduced and undesirable species and was referred to the Clark County Weed Management Board.

SEPTEMBER: Mr. McConathy urged that commissioners receive information with enough time allowed to review it prior to required action, and that meetings be held in same location each month, well advertised, in order to boost public attendance.

OCTOBER: Mr. McConathy asked for more diligent enforcement of erosion control measures now that rainy season has started. He also reminded us that the new NPDES permit will require watershed planning.

DECEMBER: Mr. McConathy asked CWC to consider doing a comprehensive review of all county water bodies on the 303(d) list.

2007 Action Plan

Each year, the Clean Water Commission receives updates from county staff and provides feedback regarding budget issues and programmatic activities. It also presents an annual report to the BOCC that contains an overview of its work during the previous calendar year and recommendations for further improvement of the Clean Water Program.

The Clean Water Commission will continue to work on topics initiated last year, which include investigating septic tank impacts on water quality, and promoting stormwater low impact development opportunities in Clark County. In addition, the Clean Water Commission anticipates a discussion on the Clean Water fees as they relate to the projected cost of compliance with the new 2007 NPDES municipal stormwater permit. The Clean Water Commission has voted to discuss the following topics, in addition to those discussed above:

- **Education/Public Relations/Coordination:** Explore ways to provide water quality education to the community, public relations opportunities to promote the Clean Water Program, and coordinate resources available for each of the above.
- **Incentives:** Form a committee to discuss options for providing incentives for reducing water quality impacts, particularly when an individual or business may not be required to do so for any other reason.

Recommendations to the Board of Clark County Commissioners

Given this information, the Clark County Clean Water Commission makes the following recommendations for your consideration during the 2007 calendar year:

- *Become well versed with the changes proposed under the new NPDES permit.* Effective February 16, 2007, this new permit requires more from the county than in previous years. As such, it is likely that the Clean Water Fee will need to be increased. Your ability to publicly articulate the reasons for the adjustment of this utility fee will help ease concerns from those paying these fees. The CWC will work closely with county staff to ensure you have the necessary data to make an informed decision. If you have specific requests, please let us know.
- *Attend at least one Clean Water Commission meeting in 2007* to share your priorities regarding clean water issues and to hear current issues this advisory board is addressing.

Appendix A

Clean Water Program Evaluation Work Session Notes

**CLARK COUNTY
CLEAN WATER COMMISSION**

Clean Water Program Evaluation Work Session Notes

Wednesday, April 4, 2007

7:00 – 9:00 P.M.

Public Works Operations Conference Room B-1

4700 NE 78th Street, Vancouver

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Present

Tim Crawford, Bob Even, Don Moe, Bill Owen, Patty Page, Susan Rasmussen, Art Stubbs, Ron Wilson, and Virginia van Breemen

Clark County Staff

Jim Gladson, Trista Kobluskie, Jeff Schnabel, Cindy Stienbarger, and Rod Swanson

Public

Thom McConathy

Introduction

Mr. Gladson facilitated the evaluation of the Clean Water Program by the Clean Water Commission.

Mr. Owen: we may do a more formal evaluation next year. In this exercise, we should evaluate just what the Clean Water Program did in 2006. Some of the goals and missions that we are about to review in preparation are from the program's inception.

Summary of Goals of the Clean Water Program

Mr. Gladson asked Commissioners to review packet items 5 and 6, listing mission, goals and accomplishments of the program.

Mr. Owen: do staff closely follow the mission and goals on a regular basis, or were these documents prepared primarily for the benefit of the Commission? Mr. Swanson: we know the goals of the program and the NPDES permit, but do not look at this document regularly.

Mr. Moe: everybody involved should know how they're contributing to the program.

Mr. Owen: we could just look to see if the program meets the items in the permit.

Mr. McConathy stated that the NPDES permit requires a substantial public involvement effort, which is not at all reflected in the program's stated goals. Mr. Gladson asked Mr. McConathy to reserve his comments for the public comment period after the evaluation.

Mr. Owen: I hope in the future there would be something more grandiose that you strive for instead of line item stuff that you do as your normal day to day work. Mr. Stubbs would like to see all of the goals from different program elements on one sheet as a handout for public meetings. Mr. Owen: there should be a linkage to the ordinance somehow.

Summary of Accomplishments of the Program

Mr. Owen asked for a comparison from previous years for the percentage collected of the Clean Water Fee item listed in the Administration and Coordination section.

Mrs. Rasmussen pointed out that the sum of the individual costs for the capital improvements listed adds up to more than the \$2.8 million total shown.

Overview of Format

Mr. Gladson stated that discussion would be between the Commissioners with a public comment period at the end.

Strengths & Needs Improvement Lists

Administration

Strengths

- good paperwork to study
- personable and accessible staff
- good customer service
- knowledge & commitment of staff
- low administration costs
- working together

Needs Improvement

- less paperwork
- need more staff
- staff does not always tell Clean Water Commission everything
- perceived lack of coordination between program elements (working in silos)
- more coordination with other jurisdictions on broader watershed goals (e.g. Lacamas Lake, Habitat Ordinance)
- "politics" inhibit programs

Education, Outreach & Technical Assistance

Strengths

- staff
- outreach to kids & rural landowners with animals
- technical assistance
- availability of Watershed Stewards to many groups
- Clean Water Commission

Needs Improvement

- expand program
- cannot measure change
- outreach to average citizens
- not engaging enough to general population
- informational gaps (e.g. “care and feeding of your bioswale”)
- attract and keep more Watershed Stewards
- web site should be easier to navigate and more? informative
- more advertisement of partnerships with non-profits
- more attention to media relations (e.g. human interest stories)

Engineering / Capital Program

Strengths

- taking input and identifying projects (SCIPIT)
- development and oversight
- having an engineer on staff
- piggybacking with other agency projects

Needs Improvement

- “test is implementation” (SCIP)
- wider geographic breadth
- more depth in updates to Clean Water Commission (e.g. problems or successes with specific projects)
- CIP programming flexibility when things go wrong (plan B)
- more projects on the ground

Regulations and Enforcement

Strengths

- focus on education
- leverage other agencies (e.g. Sheriff)

Needs Improvement

- better information on actions
- enforcement is lacking
- weekend enforcement is non-existent
- understaffed
- too harsh on agricultural lands

Maintenance and OperationsStrengths

- meeting or exceeding frequency of required actions
- dedicated staff
- decant facility
- advertise program on trucks / visibility

Needs Improvement

- understaffed
- more frequent private facility inspections
- more public input on frequency of maintenance and cleaning (e.g. street sweeping)

MonitoringStrengths

- dedicated staff
- volunteer monitoring program
- public reports are accessible
- network with other agencies and programs
- establishment of program from the ground up
- leadership (e.g. watershed planning)
- volunteers are diverse
- quality of data

Needs Improvement

- update Stream Health Report
- complete web database of water quality
- feed data to education, capital, maintenance programs to drive program decisions

Overall ProgramStrengths

- total staff commitment

Needs Improvement

- speedier implementation of new ideas
- need more money
- remove barriers to green development
- emphasize coordination between program elements
- need more staff
- build county projects to higher green standards

Appendix B

Summary of 2003-04 Clean Water Program Expenditures

**2003-04 Clean Water Program Budget
as of December 31, 2004**

Object Code	Program Element	Budget	% of Total Budget	Expenses	% Spent	Budget Remaining	Notes
	Capital Improvements	\$3,309,299	32.0%	\$2,087,552	63.1%	\$1,221,747	
100s	Salaries	\$469,515	4.5%	\$488,784	104.1%	-\$19,269	A
200s	Benefits	\$112,003	1.1%	\$113,051	100.9%	-\$1,048	
300s	Supplies	\$213,600	2.1%	\$215,458	100.9%	-\$1,858	B
400s	Outside Services Inter-Governmental	\$561,730	5.4%	\$344,593	61.3%	\$217,137	C
500s	Services	\$0	0.0%	\$915		-\$915	D
600s	Capital Outlay Ser. by County	\$1,115,800	10.8%	\$706,864	63.4%	\$408,936	C
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$836,651	8.1%	\$217,887	26.0%	\$618,764	C
	Water Quality Monitoring, Data Management, Reporting	\$1,340,395	12.9%	\$1,208,188	90.1%	\$132,207	
100s	Salaries	\$549,523	5.3%	\$536,344	97.6%	\$13,179	A
200s	Benefits	\$117,599	1.1%	\$116,213	98.8%	\$1,386	
300s	Supplies	\$27,100	0.3%	\$37,180	137.2%	-\$10,080	
400s	Outside Services Inter-Governmental	\$427,700	4.1%	\$296,060	69.2%	\$131,640	E
500s	Services Ser. by County	\$146,000	1.4%	\$145,626	99.7%	\$374	F
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$72,473	0.7%	\$76,765	105.9%	-\$4,292	E
	Public Education and Outreach	\$1,176,113	11.4%	\$842,504	71.6%	\$333,609	
100s	Salaries	\$389,281	3.8%	\$331,619	85.2%	\$57,662	A
200s	Benefits	\$82,093	0.8%	\$74,155	90.3%	\$7,938	
300s	Supplies	\$22,800	0.2%	\$7,215	31.6%	\$15,585	
400s	Outside Services Inter-Governmental	\$354,001	3.4%	\$130,467	36.9%	\$223,534	G
500s	Services Ser. by County	\$286,020	2.8%	\$156,587	54.7%	\$129,433	G
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$41,918	0.4%	\$142,461	339.9%	-\$100,543	G
	Regulation and Enforcement	1,141,265	11.0%	1,299,690	113.9%	-\$158,425	
100s	Salaries	\$4,335	0.0%	\$3,046	70.3%	\$1,289	A
200s	Benefits	\$948	0.0%	\$705	74.4%	\$243	A
400s	Outside Services Ser. by County	\$0	0.0%	\$13,796		-\$13,796	H
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$1,135,982	11.0%	\$1,282,143	112.9%	-\$146,161	J
	Operations and Maintenance	\$1,514,156	14.6%	\$1,855,971	122.6%	-\$341,815	
100s	Salaries	\$11,186	0.1%	\$9,858	88.1%	\$1,328	J
200s	Benefits	\$2,904	0.0%	\$2,560	88.2%	\$344	
300s	Supplies	\$0	0.0%	\$1,997	0.0%	-\$1,997	
400s	Outside Services Ser. by County	\$0	0.0%	\$7,204	0.0%	-\$7,204	K
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$1,500,066	14.5%	\$1,834,352	122.3%	-\$334,286	L

Administration & Coordination		\$884,136	8.5%	\$784,827	88.8%	\$99,309	
100s	Salaries	\$214,262	2.1%	\$202,967	94.7%	\$11,295	J
200s	Benefits	\$47,480	0.5%	\$44,798	94.4%	\$2,682	J
300s	Supplies	\$10,600	0.1%	\$11,856	111.8%	-\$1,256	
400s	Outside Services	\$186,841	1.8%	\$190,916	102.2%	-\$4,075	M
600s	Capital Outlay Ser. by County	\$0	0.0%	\$163		-\$163	
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$424,953	4.1%	\$334,127	78.6%	\$90,826	N
Additional Activities		\$989,405	9.6%	\$989,405	0.0%	\$121,000	
550	Operating Transfer	\$86,125	0.8%	\$86,125	100.0%	\$0	O
790	Other Debt Principal	\$882,000	8.5%	\$882,000	100.0%	\$0	P
820	Interest Interfund Debt	\$21,280	0.2%	\$21,280	100.0%	\$0	P
Total		\$10,354,769	100.0%	\$9,068,137	87.6%	\$1,286,632	

- A. The 2003-04 budget will cover staffing costs for all program elements through 12/31/04. Funds will be moved from 204...499 to cover these costs.
- B. The cost is based on: object code 380: \$166,122 for road material for Thomas Lake CIP (#400110); code 381: \$4,300 drainage material for Thomas Lake and \$6,000 for Drainage Improvement District #7; code 384: \$4,200 for aggregate material for DID #7 and \$750 for Thomas Lake; code 389: \$8,900 for other engineering material for the Thomas Lake and Salmon Creek/Hwy 99 CIPs, etc.
- C. This covers the design and construction costs of several new CIPs and implementation of retrofits to improve stormwater quality control and treatment.
- D. A cost attributed to the Thomas Lake CIP.
- E. Installation of rainfall and stream gauges, collecting and testing samples, and reporting findings.
- F. This represents watershed characterization work in coordination with the Lower Columbia River Fish Recovery Board.
- G. This supports the following: Watershed Stewards (\$157,300), Small Acreage Program (\$78,720), Environmental Information Cooperative (\$50,000), Student Watershed Research Project (\$35,000) and development of the Clean Water Program Billing Insert/Annual Report (\$~25,000), Clean Water Commission material (\$~5,000). It also provides funds for general public outreach and education to promote water quality education to the community.
- H. This should have been billed to 204 (educational work: \$~10,000 is for an interlocal agreement to provide K-12 students water quality classes in the urban area (outside of the city of Vancouver); \$1,000 for annual maintenance of the digital imaging program, etc. This occurred in 2003 and cannot be moved at this point.
- I. The Department of Community Development is implementing this effort and will bill the CWP every six months.
- J. Some salaries will be moved from Operation and Maintenance to Administration and Coordination. These are funds already designated for PW Water Resources staff.

Appendix C

Summary of 2005-06 Clean Water Program Expenditures

**2005-06 Clean Water Program Budget
as of December 31, 2006**

Object Code	Program Element	Budget	% of Total Budget	Expenses	% Spent	Budget Remaining	Notes
	Capital Improvements	\$4,799,788	36.1%	\$1,260,395	26.3%	\$3,539,393	
100s	Salaries	\$356,914	2.7%	\$214,301	60.0%	\$142,613	
200s	Benefits	\$93,067	0.7%	\$54,564	58.6%	\$38,503	
300s	Supplies	\$332,061	2.5%	\$60,431	18.2%	\$271,630	
400s	Outside Services	\$652,011	4.9%	\$339,724	52.1%	\$312,287	
600s	Capital Outlay Ser. by County	\$3,333,535	25.1%	\$519,399	15.6%	\$2,814,136	A
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$32,200	0.2%	\$71,976	223.5%	-\$39,776	A
	Non-Capital Improvements	\$929,002	7.0%	\$955,221	102.8%	-\$26,219	B
100s	Salaries	\$212,193	1.6%	\$424,107	199.9%	-\$211,914	
200s	Benefits	\$74,490	0.6%	\$108,370	145.5%	-\$33,880	
300s	Supplies	\$27,000	0.2%	\$16,353	60.6%	\$10,647	
400s	Outside Services	\$468,625	3.5%	\$277,343	59.2%	\$191,282	C
600s	Capital Outlay Ser. by County	\$1,000	0.0%	\$5,065		-\$4,065	
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$145,694	1.1%	\$123,983	85.1%	\$21,711	
	Water Quality Monitoring, Data Management, Reporting	\$1,753,557	13.2%	\$1,067,316	60.9%	\$686,241	
100s	Salaries	\$714,723	5.4%	\$551,894	77.2%	\$162,829	
200s	Benefits	\$246,310	1.9%	\$133,892	54.4%	\$112,418	
300s	Supplies	\$50,700	0.4%	\$23,220	45.8%	\$27,480	
400s	Outside Services	\$644,000	4.8%	\$256,060	39.8%	\$387,940	D
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$97,824	0.7%	\$102,250	104.5%	-\$4,426	
	Public Education and Outreach	\$1,331,531	10.0%	\$1,167,278	87.7%	\$164,253	
100s	Salaries	\$366,385	2.8%	\$421,221	115.0%	-\$54,836	
200s	Benefits	\$120,674	0.9%	\$93,817	77.7%	\$26,857	
300s	Supplies	\$9,350	0.1%	\$6,977	74.6%	\$2,373	
400s	Outside Services	\$354,000	2.7%	\$254,162	71.8%	\$99,838	E
500s	Inter-Governmental Services	\$316,250	2.4%	\$314,978	99.6%	\$1,272	E
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$164,872	1.2%	\$76,123	46.2%	\$88,749	E
	Regulation and Enforcement	1,160,196	8.7%	1,435,721	123.7%	-\$275,525	
100s	Salaries	\$0	0.0%	\$197		-\$197	
200s	Benefits	\$0	0.0%	\$50		-\$50	
400s	Outside Services	\$2,500	0.0%	\$2,834		-\$334	
900s	Ser. by County Agencies/Dept.	\$1,157,696	8.7%	\$1,432,640	123.7%	-\$274,944	F

Operations and Maintenance		\$2,083,124	15.7%	\$1,956,437	93.9%	\$126,687	
100s	Salaries	\$0	0.0%	\$1,406		-\$1,406	
200s	Benefits	\$10,214	0.1%	\$364	3.6%	\$9,850	
300s	Supplies	\$0	0.0%	\$171		-\$171	
400s	Outside Services	\$2,900	0.0%	\$9,272	319.7%	-\$6,372	
	Inter-Governmental						
500s	Services	\$0	0.0%	\$211		-\$211	
	Ser. by County						
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$2,070,010	15.6%	\$1,945,013	94.0%	\$124,997	G
Administration & Coordination		\$1,126,369	8.5%	\$827,699	73.5%	\$298,670	
100s	Salaries	\$244,593	1.8%	\$179,222	73.3%	\$65,371	
200s	Benefits	\$82,214	0.6%	\$41,043	49.9%	\$41,171	
300s	Supplies	\$9,600	0.1%	\$5,201	54.2%	\$4,399	
400s	Outside Services	\$197,434	1.5%	\$107,792	54.6%	\$89,642	H
	Support to Clark County						
	Critical Areas Ordinance						
550s	Update	\$210,000	1.6%	\$212,198	101.0%	-\$2,198	I
	Ser. by County						
900s	Agencies/Dept.	\$382,528	2.9%	\$282,243	73.8%	\$100,285	J
Additional Activities		\$121,000	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$121,000	K
Total		\$13,304,567	100.0%	\$8,670,067	65.2%	\$4,634,500	

- A. Dollars for additional capital improvements such as Carrie Otter Stormwater Facility (formerly the 199th Street/29th Avenue)(\$700,000)
- B. This is for non-construction engineering work, such as stormwater basin planning, general stormwater engineering support, stormwater inventory tracking, etc.
- C. This includes the Whipple Creek Stormwater Needs Assessment Report; other planning level capital improvements
- D. \$100,000 for maintenance and operation of permanent stream and rain gauge; \$50,000 special projects to identify and solve water quality problems; etc.
- E. \$25,000 River Heroes; ~\$42,000 Post Contest; ~\$35,000 Student Watershed Research Project; ~\$45,000 City of Vancouver water quality monitoring program in schools; ~\$168,000 for Watershed Stewards; ~\$97,000 for Small Acreage Landholders Outreach; ~\$50,000 for Environmental Information Cooperative/Columbia Springs Environmental Education Center provides K-16 education providers (teach the teachers) the tools teach water quality protection in their respective schools.
- F. The Department of Community Development is implementing this effort and the CWP will be billed at least every six months.
- G. Public Works Operations implements this part of the CWP and bills CWP every six months
- H. \$50,000 for temporary service to address CWP fee complaints/processing (as it turns out the number of calls were fewer than anticipated); \$28,000 cost for printing of the CWP fee statement; In 2005-06, the Washington Department of Ecology will receive about \$76,000 to administer the Phase I NPDES Permit; ~\$6,000 for legal services in Hearing Examiner cases, etc.
- I. Transfer of dollars to the ESA program: a) to complete the Critical Habitat Ordinance (budget of \$190,000), and b) complete Water Resources Inventory Area planning and implementation process as required by Ecology (budget of \$20,000)
- J. \$312,491 for the Treasurer's Office to collect and process the CWP fee; etc
- K. Additional funds allocated to county Weed Control by OBIS. This funds are not going to be used by Weed Control and will be used in 2007-08 for stormwater capital improvement projects.

Appendix D

Log of Public Comments at 2006 Clean Water Commission Meetings

January 1, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy stated that the impact of stormwater outfalls to Vancouver Lake is increasing. The 99th Street and Chicken Creek outfalls have quantity problems, are depositing sediment, have no filtration, and are degrading the natural wetlands behind the railroad dike. Aerial photos show the area extending from the shore over time. The Bedrosian Line out of Felida has similar problems, though smaller in scope.

Mr. McConathy urged the Commissioners to read the 2003 Performance Audit of the Clean Water Program. Mr. McConathy stated that he spoke to the auditor (Linda Bade) about including information on whether or not Clark County is meeting the requirements of its NPDES permit. Mr. McConathy discovered from the auditor that Clark County charges the lowest stormwater fee in the country for a Phase I NPDES permittee. [*Point of Information:* according to Black & Vetch, authors of the 2005 Stormwater Utility survey, Clark County's fee ranks 60th out of 85 stormwater program fees in the country.]

Mr. McConathy asked the Commission to consider stormwater remediation capital projects identified in the 1995 Burnt Bridge Creek Plan and the 1995 Salmon Creek Legacy Plan. He urged the Commission to direct county staff to identify systematically problems and solutions in each basin in the county. He asked the Commission to push for more commitment to stormwater management from the county.

Mr. Owen responded that the county is beginning the watershed-by-watershed assessment process, beginning with the Whipple Creek assessment. The approach is a pilot, which will be used on other basins.

Mr. Rowell responded that the county asked the public for additional funding to fix the outfalls into the Vancouver Lake area in the mid-1990s, but the community felt the cost was too high. Therefore, only the minimum work was done to alleviate the worst problems. He stated that the Burnt Bridge Creek and the Lakeshore/Salmon Creek plans contained capital projects that focused only stormwater volume control with minimal environmental (pollution reduction) measures. This was to comply with the state Growth Management Act requirements. The base cost was \$40 million in the Lakeshore and Salmon Creek area. To add water quality treatment, the costs rose to \$240 million. Mr. Rowell added that the Clean Water Commission must help market expensive capital improvement projects to the public.

Mr. Owen responded that large volumes of water discharging at high rates of speed could be construed as a water quality issue, particularly since Salmon Creek has a turbidity problem.

Mr. Stubbs asked if any study would show how water quality in Vancouver Lake could be improved. Mr. Rowell responded that a committee is currently working together to study the problem. Mr. McConathy replied that more than \$200,000 has been provided by

different agencies to fund a study. He added that more is known about how to clean up a shallow lake since the previous Vancouver Lake study.

Mr. Duane Koski thanked the Clean Water Commissioners for their service to Clark County. Mr. Koski lives in Brush Prairie and grew up in Clark County. He has lived in the Northwest most of his life. Mr. Koski stated that the county is running out of developable land and that builders will build on the cheapest land available, usually wetlands. Home Depot and Costco both recently built on the headwaters of Burnt Bridge Creek. [*Point of Information: the area referenced is actually the headwaters of Curtin Creek.*] Mr. Koski stated that the new development by Costco and Home Depot in that area use septic systems, which is a threat to drinking water (groundwater) in the county and that any development in a wetland area should use sewer. [*Point of Information: the new developments on NE Andresen Road are on sewer.*] He stated that the wetland areas should not be built on at all; the area where Costco and Home Depot were built should have been used as public parkland, with man-made lakes stocked with fish, tennis courts, and walkways. Mr. Koski asserted that the county allows too much development without consideration for quality of life and lifestyle in the county, only to gain more tax revenue.

Mr. Koski recommended allowing only ½-acre lots in the rural areas, with a requirement for well water and private septic systems. He recommended that the County Commissioners change focus from tax dollars to water quality and environment in order to preserve the beauty and livability of the county.

Mr. Koski declared that nuclear waster from Hanford may be entering Clark County surface waters through the channel between Vancouver Lake and the Columbia River. As evidence, he stated that sea run cutthroat trout sometimes run on Burnt Bridge Creek.

Mr. Owen asked if Mr. Koski had particular recommendations. Mr. Koski stated, “Stop building where Costco and Home Depot are until any further building is done on sewer system so we don’t have a chance of polluting our water.” Mr. McConathy replied that commercial development in the county unincorporated area all uses sewer.

Ms. Page responded that maintaining the balance between development and the environment is difficult. She asked how many meeting attendees have shopped at Costco or Home Depot on NE Andresen Street. She recommended addressing the problem using a completely different paradigm.

Mr. Stubbs suggested that members get involved with the Growth Management Act and the new proposal on annexation to Vancouver. Ms. van Breemen stated that many new residents of Clark County do not know how to care for acreage. Ms. Jackson stated that we need better laws. Mr. Stubbs said that we are paying for the sins of our fathers and grandfathers all over the United States. Ms. van Breemen asserted that the new people are creating worse problems. Ms. Page responded that all residents – old and new – contribute to the problem. Mr. Stubbs said we have to figure out how not to make it worse.

Mr. Koski requested to know what the annual Clean Water Fee he pays is doing for him as a citizen of Clark County. Mr. Owen replied that the objective of the program is to protect clean water, most notably to fulfill the requirements of the Clean Water Act by obtaining the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems permit (NPDES). Mr. Stubbs replied, "Sweep streets, clean drains, maintain bioswales, build holding ponds, study where the pollutions are coming from, all kinds of things." Mr. Koski answered that he has done all that on his land, so why should he have to pay the fee? Mr. Stubbs responded, "because you drove over here tonight on a road. You don't sweep the street and neither do I." Mr. Owen responded that public lands that everybody uses create pollutants.

Mr. Koski stated that some long-time residents of Clark County have paid for years to maintain drainage ways on their properties and should not have to pay the new charge. He stated that his land used to be a swamp until his family and others drained the area from Lacamas Lake through Hockinson by building the China Ditch. Part of the ditch runs through his farm, draining the water directly to Lacamas Lake. The taxpayers in that area have been charged for that drainage system. [*Point of Information:* Mr. Koski lives inside Drainage Improvement District #5, which has the purpose of draining land to promote agriculture.]

Mr. Koski stated that he has installed approximately 5 miles of underground pipe to drain the water from his approximately 150 acres. He claimed that where the water enters China Ditch, it is so clean you can drink it. He does not like paying to clean up water in the rest of the county. Mr. Koski requested that those in the drainage area of China Ditch be exempt from paying the Clean Water Fee.

Ms. van Breemen stated that the natural condition of Mr. Koski's land is wetland; therefore, his efforts to drain it actually contribute to water quality problems. Mr. Koski stated that the only way to farm the land in that area is to drain it then add lime to penetrate the clay. Mr. Koski asserted that draining the land to farm it is not harmful, unlike draining the land in order to pave over it.

Mr. McConathy suggested that addressing the greater issues of development in Clark County is beyond the scope of the Clean Water Commission.

Mr. Owen stated that the fee charged by the drainage district, to which Mr. Koski referred, serves a different purpose than the Clean Water fee (draining land of existing water vs. managing surface runoff). Therefore, property owners in the drainage district should not be exempt from the Clean Water Fee.

Mr. Koski contended that many solutions to surface runoff actually create more problems; the stormwater detention ponds found in many new developments allow pollutants to more easily enter groundwater. He stated that a better solution is to simply let the polluted water run off into the Columbia River.

Mr. Koski asserted that the Board of County Commissioners ignores input from citizens.

February 1, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Mike Kerbs and Mr. Rich LeBlanc live along Salmon Creek. They are sportsmen and use trails frequently. They have noticed that water in Salmon Creek does not look very healthy. Mr. Kerbs has read a study by the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, and spoken to Gary Bock of WSU Extension, Jeff Whittler of Clark Public Utilities, and Ron Wierenga of Clark County. Mr. Kerbs asked if any citizen groups have already worked on rehabilitation of the Salmon Creek watershed.

Mr. Rowell stated that studies of the area in the 80s and 90s proposed solutions that were more costly than the public was willing to pay. Mr. Owen: how was it determined that the public didn't want to pay? Mr. Rowell: public hearings. Mr. Stubbs: what projects were so expensive? Mr. Rowell: several restoration projects, regional stormwater facilities in the lower watershed, and implementation of increased regulation. Mr. Lader: high price tags are common for comprehensive, proactive solutions to surface water pollution. This is in contrast to the lower levels of funding usually available to the County.

Mr. Kerbs stated that he has contacted members of the Johnson Creek Watershed Council in Oregon. The basin has similar characteristics, including length, urbanization, and health issues. He and Mr. LeBlanc would like to start a citizen watershed council for the Salmon Creek basin that would work with the Clean Water Commission, Clark Public Utilities, Fish and Wildlife, Washington State University, and the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board. The council would assist with rehabilitation, stream monitoring and other actions. Mr. Kerbs indicated that the council would seek grant funding.

Mr. Kerbs asked how the Commission would view a watershed council for Salmon Creek. Mr. Owen and Ms. Page: we would be happy to see it. Mr. Stubbs suggested incorporating it into the Watershed Stewards program. Mr. Kerbs: the council might use similar methods but would be independent.

Mr. Kerbs asked if the various agencies and stakeholders already communicate and coordinate actions. Mr. Wierenga: the county has few basin or stream-specific citizen groups; however Friends of the East Fork is a good model. A citizen group can require significant resources. The Johnson Creek Watershed Council in Oregon is funded by the state and has several paid staff.

Mr. Wierenga: the Vancouver Lake Watershed Partnership is discussing the formation of a watershed council for the tributaries to Vancouver Lake. Mr. Jim Gladson of Public Works offered to answer questions about the process of forming a watershed council. Mr. Kerbs: one book on the subject recommends getting sponsorship by another council. The

founder of the Johnson Creek Watershed Council recommended incorporation, obtaining non-profit status, and involving all stakeholders.

Mr. Stubbs asked where a volunteer group could get started. Mr. Lader responded that education and outreach to property owners and businesses in the watershed might do the most good.

Mr. Armstrong asked what Mr. Kerbs would like from the Clean Water Commission. Mr. Kerbs: 1) to know that efforts to form a watershed council will be helpful and non-duplicative and 2) to identify Clean Water Commissioners who would like to help.

March 1, 2006 Meeting:

No public comments were made at this meeting.

April 4, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy stated that the Clean Water Program should reinstate its program to map streams and ditches that are contiguous with wetlands or waterways of the state to support the update of the Operations & Maintenance manual. This could assist the county and emergency response personnel in determining proper procedures when maintenance is needed or an emergency occurs in or near a ditch or stream.

Mr. Owen asked if the O & M manual will be updated under the new NPDES permit. Mr. Swanson: maintenance standards would be updated to 2005 standards. Mr. Owen asked if public comment would be taken during the update. Mr. Swanson: a task force and consultants usually update administrative rules. If we adopt a manual as County Code, to implement the stormwater ordinance or the water quality ordinance, for instance, then the public would have opportunity to comment.

Mr. Stubbs asked if the maintenance and operations crews would have sufficient funding to operate under the new NPDES permit. The group discussed maintenance costs and efficiencies that might be attained with GIS.

May 3, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy wondered how efficient the volunteer monitoring program is. He recently attended a volunteer monitoring workshop given by The Columbia Riverkeeper, which he feels is establishing a more comprehensive, yet less expensive, volunteer monitoring program. He asked for additional information from Water Resources staff.

[*Point of Information:* Mr. Swanson later provided Mr. McConathy with additional information about the Water Resources Volunteer Monitoring program. For instance, the program supports several volunteer projects through the Monitoring Resource Center equipment lending library.]

Mr. McConathy complained that Code Enforcement has insufficiently responded to his calls regarding erosion control violations. He stated that he turned in 3-4 sites per week during the wet season, but does not see that quantity of enforcement actions, or even education actions, in the Code Enforcement monthly report to Water Resources. He indicated that much more enforcement is warranted. He indicated that the Clean Water Program is paying for more enforcement than is being delivered.

Mr. Stubbs responded that a community volunteer code enforcement program has been implemented. Mr. McConathy responded that code enforcement should be done by County staff, not by volunteers from the community.

Mr. Jim Malinowski stated that he is a member of the ESA Task Force. He complained of lack of enforcement in the riparian zones. Recently, a property owner in the rural area moved a creek on his property with a backhoe and received only a slap on the wrist. Other property owners routinely create view corridors by clearing trees right down to a stream bank. These actions are direct violations of the Habitat Ordinance but are not well enforced by the County. Also, enforcement appears to not be uniform. Wealthy property owners seldom receive fines.

Mr. Owen asked the staff if Community Development has an oversight body similar to the Clean Water Commission. Mr. Rowell responded that the oversight for Community Development is the Auditor; he stated that the Clean Water Commission could ask the erosion control and stormwater code enforcement staff in Community Development to provide it with a detailed annual report.

Mr. Owen indicated that he would raise the question of enforcement of codes at the June meeting.

Mr. Malinowski asked the Commission to spearhead an effort to send an annual notice to streamside property owners detailing their rights and responsibilities regarding property management along a stream. This should include regulations from any relevant ordinance.

Ms. Page enthusiastically agreed with the idea. She stated that many new property owners have no idea what their rights and responsibilities are for controlling drainage. She indicated that specific information should be available on the Clark County web site, too.

Mr. Malinowski asked the Commission if it could address the issue of overdrafting the aquifer. He stated that lowering aquifer levels will inevitably lower stream flows. Mr.

Owen responded that this issue is a water rights issue that cannot be addressed directly by the Commission. Mr. Rowell responded that some issues under consideration by the Commission could affect groundwater. For example, the Low Impact Development techniques the Commission and Water Resources staff are advocating will frequently use infiltration, which help to recharge groundwater. Mr. Malinowski asked the Commission to develop a recommendation to Clark Public Utilities District to draw water exclusively from deep sources, from well fields near the Columbia River, for example, and to extend water utility service to the rural areas to reduce the number of shallow-drawing private wells.

Mr. Owen suggested that the Commission could hear a presentation from the PUD. Mr. Rowell reminded that Commission that any recommendation would be directed to the Board of County Commissioners.

June 7, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy requested that the County build upon previous efforts to map roadside ditches that are contiguous to waters of the state or wetlands.

Mr. McConathy suggested that the County begin to work with other jurisdictions, such as Vancouver, to control nutria and other invasive species. Nutria, for instance, can completely destroy plantings that are key to streamside restoration projects and some stormwater facilities.

Mr. Rowell indicated that Clean Water Fee revenue cannot be used for such projects because it is not directly related to meeting NPDES requirements.

Ms. Page asked why. Mr. Rowell replied that the Prosecuting Attorney's Office has indicated that Clean Water Fees may be used only for projects with a direct nexus to stormwater discharge or runoff. Mr. Wilson indicated that nutria can create an erosion problem, which is subject to NPDES requirements. Ms. van Breemen indicated that nutria and other invasives such as knotweed are secondary to the problem – they are not water or stormwater. Mr. Rowell indicated that Water Resources can partner with other county departments and/or other agencies such as Fish & Wildlife to work on projects that jointly treat or dispose of stormwater and control invasive species such as nutria.

Mr. Rowell stated that several lawsuits have already challenged the validity of the Clean Water Fee, and the county must be very careful to spend money from the fund only on projects that are directly related to NPDES permit requirements.

Mr. Moe suggested that it would be helpful for Senior Prosecuting Attorney Bronson Potter to speak on what Clean Water Fee monies may and may not be used for at an upcoming meeting.

July 5, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy requested that the meeting packets be distributed to Clean Water Commissioners well in advance of each meeting to give them time to review items before discussion. Mr. Owen noted that the group would table items if they need intensive review.

Mr. McConathy indicated that a letter he wrote to the Commission had never been submitted to it. Mr. Stubbs stated that he had received the letter via email; other Commissioners agreed. Mr. McConathy stated that items distributed electronically do not become meeting topics.

Mr. McConathy asked about the status of establishing mentors for new Commission members. The group responded that they are working on it.

Mr. McConathy complimented Clark County staff member Ron Wierenga for a recent report he gave at the Vancouver Lake Partnership meeting, and he commended Mr. Wierenga on his collaborative approach to water quality monitoring. He noted that Mr. Wierenga used data from more than 50 monitoring sites, most of which are operated by other agencies or jurisdictions, to gather a complete picture of the Vancouver Lake watershed. Mr. McConathy urged the Commission to ask staff to do more collaborative monitoring work.

Mr. Owen asked if staff collects water quality data from other jurisdictions. Mr. Schnabel replied that staff used data from other jurisdictions to write the *2004 Stream Health Report*, but sometimes it is a challenge to coordinate with other agencies. Staff tries to find ways to work with other entities.

Mr. Owen asked if other entities share the costs of water quality monitoring with Clark County. Mr. Rowell stated that Ecology and Clark Public Utilities share information with the county. Mr. Owen asked about working across jurisdictional lines. Mr. Rowell replied that Clark County is the only jurisdiction to be represented on the Board of the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, and attempts to ensure that NPDES goals are represented in the fish recovery plans. [*Point of Information:* Water Resources staff participates as a local agency representative on the Technical Advisory Committee of the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, not on the Board. Clark County Commissioner Morris sits on the Board, and so do commissioners from other counties in the region.]

Mr. Schnabel stated that there is no countywide task force for water quality monitoring, as Mr. Owen seemed to be suggesting. Clark County coordinates with individual entities when established projects overlap geographically and use similar parameters. For instance, several years ago, staff recognized overlap of water quality monitoring in the Salmon Creek area, and began collaborating with Clark Public Utilities to eliminate duplicative efforts and to share data.

Mr. Owen suggested that a more holistic approach would be to collaborate with other agencies to use data to identify problems, and then determine appropriate solutions. Mr. Barnett said that Oregon has a system of water quality data called ACWA (Association of Clean Water Agencies) that is similar to what Mr. Owen described.

Mr. Robert Buker is a grass breeder and retired professor. He is alarmed that several agencies in the county class reed canary grass as an introduced species, when it is native. He cited *Grasses and Forages: the Science of Grassland Agriculture*, which both indicate clearly that reed canary grass is a native species. He asked what reference the county uses. Mr. McConathy cited Cronquist, *Grasses of the United States* and *Flora of the Pacific Northwest*.

Mr. Owen asked if reed canary grass has a water quality benefit. Mr. Buker replied that the grass shows potential for neutralizing toxic compounds and stabilizes silt. Ms. van Breemen stated that reed canary grass creates a monoculture. Mr. Buker responded that the bunch of reed canary grass he brought as an example also contains Canada thistle, which is invasive and illegal to plant or let seed.

Mr. McConathy suggested that Mr. Buker present his ideas about reed canary grass to the County Weed Board.

Mr. Buker stated that he is a native of Clark County, and his family has owned property at the mouth of Burnt Bridge Creek for many years. He has been interested in water control and water quality for 50 years.

Mr. Buker stated that the City of Vancouver and Clark County should not attempt to encourage the recovery of trout in Burnt Bridge Creek before establishing the probable mercury content of fish in the stream. Fish concentrate mercury, and children could get brain damage from eating the fish. Mr. Schnabel indicated that the City of Vancouver might have data on mercury levels in Burnt Bridge Creek. Mr. McConathy noted that Vancouver Lake has the highest mercury levels in the state. [*Point of Information*: recent monitoring efforts by the Washington Department of Ecology do not support this statement. Refer to *Mercury in Edible Fish Tissue and Sediments from Selected Lakes and Rivers of Washington State*, June 2003, Publication No. 03-03-026 and *Washington State Toxics Monitoring Program, Toxic Contaminants in Fish Tissue and Surface Water in Freshwater Environments*, 2003, May 2006, Publication No. 06-03-019.]

The Commissioners reiterated the suggestion to contact the County Weed Management Board because it is the authority on weeds.

August 2, 2006 Meeting:

No public comments were made at this meeting.

September 6, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy made three comments:

1. Please hold all meetings at a single location and advertise better. When meetings move from one location to another, the public is prevented from easily attending. The Commission should advertise its meetings in the *Sunday Columbian*.

Mr. Owen replied that the Commission might hold all meetings at a single location next year.

2. The packet is too large to properly review when it is received just before the meeting. Commissioners should receive materials at least a week or two prior to the meeting.

Mr. Rowell responded that packet items 9 and 10 are for future reference and that several items from the August packet were for discussion at the September meeting. Much of the information is being provided in advance.

Mr. Owen took responsibility for reminding other Commissioners what items to review prior to the meetings. The group agreed.

3. The grants discussed previously tonight should have been disclosed to the Commission earlier. It is unfortunate that Clark County is not going to attempt to get money from this grant program for 2008.

Mr. Rowell responded that the Clean Water Program currently has no activities outside of NPDES requirements that would qualify for the Centennial Grants. Staff is aware of the requirements and capable of applying for the grants, if warranted. Future program activities may qualify.

Ms. Page stated that she thought the Clean Water Program undertakes only NPDES permit implementation. Mr. Rowell replied that funds collected from the fee can only be used for NPDES permit implementation, however the program can expend other monies on related non-permit activities.

Mr. Owen asked if staff keeps a list of ideas for projects that fall outside the permit requirements but that would be beneficial to water quality. Mr. Rowell replied that the funding the program provided for Japanese knotweed removal is a good example. Mr.

Owen asked why projects such as that would not qualify currently for grant funding? Mr. Rowell replied that the deadline is approaching too quickly to apply for this cycle.

Mrs. Rasmussen noted that the Commission discussed hiring a grant writer for these grants in the past. Mr. Owen asked which grants the program has received in the past. Mr. Rowell: Centennial, and 319. Other programs have won Clark County Groundwater Management Program, Wellhead Protection 1 & 2, Aquifer Vulnerability, Watershed Characterization for Clark County, Monitoring Coordination & Resources Program Project, etc.

October 4, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy commended the Clean Water Commissioners for sustained good attendance this year.

Mr. McConathy asked for Code Enforcement and Development Inspection to more diligently enforce erosion control measures now that the rainy season has started. Starting October 1, all piled or exposed soils on development sites must be stabilized within three days.

Mr. Stubbs reminded the Commission of the volunteer code enforcement group. Mr. Wilson asked if Community Development is still short one NPDES code enforcement officer. Mr. Rowell responded that one person has been hired, but needs training.

Mr. McConathy stated that the new National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) municipal stormwater permit will require watershed planning. He hopes the county will develop a schedule of watersheds for planning. Mr. Owen asked if the county had created a priority list. Mr. Rowell replied that one is being developed as part of the Stormwater Capital Improvement Program (SCIP); when it nears completion, it will be presented to the Commission. Mr. Owen asked when. Mr. Rowell replied that he doesn't know.

November 1, 2006 Meeting:

No public comments were made at this meeting.

December 6, 2006 Meeting:

Mr. Thom McConathy commended Mr. Owen, Ms. Page, and Mr. Stubbs for their good work.

Mr. McConathy asked the Commission to consider doing a comprehensive review of all county water bodies and segments on the 303(d) list (a state list of impaired waterways), saying that the Clean Water Program has never done so. He noted that Salmon Creek exceeds state water quality standards for many parameters, including temperature, pH, BOD, heavy metals, and others, yet temperature and pH are the only parameters for which Total Maximum Daily Load standards (TMDLs) have been set.

[*Point of Information:* Water Resources maintains a binder listing all 303(d) listed water bodies (water bodies not meeting state water quality standards). Interested parties can also check the 303(d) status of any state water body on the Ecology website at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/2002/2002-index.html>.

Salmon Creek or its tributaries are 303(d) listed as described in the following table.

Category	Definition	303(d) Listings in Salmon Creek
5	Polluted waters requiring a TMDL	Salmon Creek: dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature Curtin Creek: dissolved oxygen, pH
4	Polluted waters that do NOT require a TMDL 4a: water bodies that already have an approved TMDL	Salmon Creek: fecal coliform, turbidity Woodin Creek: fecal coliform, ammonia, dissolved oxygen Cougar Creek: fecal coliform Curtin Creek: fecal coliform
2	Waters of concern that should have continued testing	Cougar Creek: dissolved oxygen, pH

There are no listings for BOD or heavy metals in the Salmon Creek watershed. TMDLs have been completed by the state for several parameters.]

Mr. Schnabel replied that a TMDL is one logical extension of listing a water body on the 303(d) list, however TMDLs are written by Ecology at its discretion, not by local jurisdictions. The program does monitor Salmon Creek for parameters other than temperature and pH. Mr. McConathy stated that the program does not monitor for and directly attempt to correct all parameters that exceed state standards. Mr. Schnabel said that it monitors and attempts to correct most parameters.

[*Point of Information:* The Clean Water Program routinely monitors (monthly) for all of the above-listed 303(d) parameters, plus several additional parameters, at eight locations within the Salmon Creek watershed and at seven additional locations county-wide.]

Mr. Owen asked if it would be fair to characterize the program's work as primarily monitoring levels of all those parameters/pollutants, as opposed to correcting. Mr. Schnabel replied that the program does not have resources to monitor for them all. For instance, the program does little monitoring for heavy metals, but best available science demonstrates that street sweeping and catch basin cleaning help remove heavy metals. Therefore, the program is working to correct or lessen that problem by sweeping streets and cleaning catch basins.

Mr. McConathy stated that reviewing the 303(d) list would give an exact benchmark to see if the Clean Water Program is working.

[Staff Comment: The 303(d) list provides helpful information on the condition of local water bodies. However, the factors contributing to water quality problems are diverse and the presence or absence of water quality problems cannot solely be attributed to the success or failure of the Clean Water Program. The 303(d) list also neglects water quantity and impacts to stream biological conditions as major stormwater-related issues. – Jeff Schnabel]

Mr. McConathy asked the Commission to comprehensively review existing TMDLs.

Mr. McConathy stated that the septic tank meetings were commendable. He requested the Commission to write and present a white paper to the BOCC, Public Health, and Clark Regional Wastewater District.

Mr. Stubbs suggested forming a coalition of groups to seek grant funding to subsidize sewer hookups.

Mr. McConathy suggested that the step-system technology could be employed in the county. It combines some of the benefit of sewer with some of the lower costs of septic. Mr. Owen noted that initial costs are lower than sewer, but ongoing maintenance via pumping adds additional cost.

Mr. Even noted that the city of Vancouver has a new program to subsidize sewer connections.