

Comments on the Draft 2019 SWMMWW		
Draft 2019 SWMMWW Section (select from drop down)	Comment	Comment Made By
I-2.4 Phase I and Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permits	Section S5.C.5 has created confusion that should be resolved. There have been number comments to us about applications submitted during different time periods than expressed in a.i and a.ii Perhaps a new a.iii which would state that all other applications submitted will be reviewed with the stormwater regulations in effect at the time of complete application, as per RCW 58.17.170. Note: This change should be made to the Phase I, Western and Eastern Phase II draft permits	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-2.4 Phase I and Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permits	Section S5.C.8 While 8.a.ii states that the purpose of the Source Control for Existing Development is for "commercial and industrial properties", 8.1.iv discusses pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer discharges which raises a concern that attempts to apply this program to existing subdivisions might occur. Suggest you edit 8.a.i to include a statement such as ... associated with existing land uses and activities. (see Appendix 8 to identify pollutant generating sources). This would clarify that this program is limited to only those uses listed in Appendix 8.	Building Industry Association of Washington
(General Comment)	Low Impact Development techniques are new and effective tools to manage stormwater. LID began ans should be a market-based environmental solution. The tools that are available should be promoted and supported by DOE, rather than required. It is well known that each site is different, and many LID techniques may not be appropriate and desirable for a specific site. The requirement creates a disincentive and the where feasible test encourages attempting to find the techniques are "not feasible" rather than attempting to find ways to implement LID techniques. The sequencing of LID techniques in the prescriptive path should be eliminated as it attempts to pre-select techniques - this should be left to the design engineer.	Building Industry Association of Washington
BMP T5.30: Full Dispersion	Disappointed to see text not allowing full dispersion areas within critical area buffers, such as wetland and stream buffers. Was this note really meant to only apply to slope buffers without geo-review? If the goal is to promote full dispersion areas retained in forest and native vegetation, why not grant this flexibility?	Building Industry Association of Washington
Appendix I-A: Flow Control Exempt Receiving Waters	There should be a number of units or density of units per acre for multifamily projects. It doesn't make sense that a 3 unit townhome project needs to apply enhanced treatment.	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-3.4.7 MR7: Flow Control	Page 148 - Section: How would one reconcile the flow control performance standard with MR8. - The situation described in this section with a wetland separated from a stream by some conveyance facility that one could install a flow control device is rare. From experience most streams run through wetlands and there would be no way to hydraulically separate to install a flow control device.	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-4 UIC Program Administration and Design Guidelines	Facilities should be exempt from the UIC program if they follow the Stormwater Manual	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-C.2 Levels of Wetland Protection	Level 1 protection - Wetlands with habitat scores over 8 have been added. We believe that this is an over reach and this section should be limited as previously to Category I and II wetlands until the modeling can be vetted to a greater extent.	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-C.5 Hydro period Protection Guidelines for Wetlands	This modeling requirement is new. It would be very helpful if Ecology could provide some sample projects and calculations so show how this works. Also has the been pilot tested with projects using the manual as written?	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-C.5 Hydro period Protection Guidelines for Wetlands	Why is this section in metric?	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-C.5 Hydro period Protection Guidelines for Wetlands	1 year of Hydro period monitoring is a long time to delay projects and will only increase the cost of housing etc. with not much certainty that the modeling will be better with the cost of waiting that long. In addition many times the wetland in question is not on the property being developed so in order for the project to move forward would permission from a neighboring property owner be mandatory? If they aren't willing to give permission to monitor the surface water does that mean the project doesn't move forward?	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-C.5 Hydro period Protection Guidelines for Wetlands	Flow monitoring - This becomes difficult when in many situations the wetland in question is offsite and applicant may not have permission to enter the property that the wetland is on.	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-C.5 Hydro period Protection Guidelines for Wetlands	Strategies to protect the Hydro period - Is it required that an applicant reduce the scale of their project if they can't get modeling to be favorable? Given the uncertainty of the model asking someone to give up their property rights seems over reaching. There needs to be more discussion on how the permitting agency is supposed to implement this section. There should be a pilot test in one jurisdiction for this modeling and associated requirements before it is applied across western Washington.	Building Industry Association of Washington
V-5.4 Determining the Design Infiltration Rate of the Native Soils	Option 2 should be acceptable if a licensed Geotech or Geologist feels that the soil most likely not be able to infiltrate at a rate that makes LID BMP's feasible. If the small scale test shows that the infiltration rate is good enough to allow infiltration then Option 1 should be required as outlined in the manual. It is very expensive to do the large scale test when the Geotech or Geologist knows the results will be below 0.3 inches/hour.	Building Industry Association of Washington
BMP T5.12: Sheet Flow Dispersion	A new requirement is that dispersion areas is not allowed in critical areas or buffers. Critical areas are understandable for most types but the undisturbed area that storm water is dispersed through should be allowed in buffers. Also not allowed on slopes over 20%. A very large portion of western Washington is over 20%. These requirements will make it so fewer projects can use dispersion	Building Industry Association of Washington
BMP T7.30: Bio retention	On page 913 it states that that the distance between the bottom of the Bio retention soil mix and the crown of the pipe must be not less than 6 inches and not more than 12 inches. The question is why can't the designer specify a larger washed rock reservoir and lower the underdrain? This would help support more infiltration and a larger storage area mitigating flows.	Building Industry Association of Washington

III-1.2 Choosing Your Runoff Treatment BMPs	Page 486 Step 5 - The Enhanced treatment Performance Goal. Has levels of metal removal increased? If so have the associated BMP's been tested for there effectiveness? It is also concerning that all multifamily sites have the same treatment requirement as commercial and industrial sites. This could be a small 3 unit townhome project that has the same treatment requirement as a commercial or industrial site.	Building Industry Association of Washington
I-3.4.4 MR4: Preservation of Natural Drainage Systems and Outfalls	Page 127 - Supplemental Guidelines. The statement that easements may be needed and should be obtained prior to engineering approval for down stream flow path is a new statement in the manual and could be very problematic for implementation. We have relied on common law that as long as the Stormwater is discharged in the same (natural) location , the flows are mitigated per the manual and there is no risk to downstream property damage by the proposed project an easement is not required. This langue should be clarified so that local agencies have clearer guidance of what to ask for from project applicants.	Building Industry Association of Washington
Glossary	Adjacent Steep Slope - A slope of 15 percent within 500 feet of the site. This definition needs to be tightened up. First a 15% slope is not very steep at all. Much of western Washington is greater than 15%. Secondly there should be a vertical grade change tied to it. For example slopes over a certain percentage and withe a grade change of least 10 feet. Lastly the steep slope could be upstream of the site and per the definition there is an adjacent steep slope. Shouldn't the definition be if the slope is downstream of the site?	Building Industry Association of Washington
III-2.2 Continuous Simulation Models	Page 508 last bulleted item under Vegetation data. This paragraph seems to conflict with the last paragraph on page 509 in how BMP T5.13 areas are handled. If the area is on the project site areas that have used BMP T5.13 can be modeled as pasture and don't need to be set aside with legal restrictions.	Building Industry Association of Washington