

# King County Challenges, Tools, and Lessons Learned adapting Ecology MR#5

FOR LID PLAN REVIEW WORKSHOP

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Challenges

**Challenge:** Strictly adopting Ecology's approach to implementation of on-site low impact development (LID) best management practices (BMPs) could result in fewer installations and therefore provide less environmental protection than required under our current rules. Till soils that are predominant in King County would render infiltrative BMPs infeasible on many project sites using Ecology's infeasibility criteria.

- **Proposal:** Use Ecology's maximum feasible approach while maintaining minimum implementation requirements based on site size and impervious coverage. Provide BMPs to meet minimums that are not dependent on soil criteria e.g. "Native Vegetation Preservation" and "Reduced Impervious Footprint" BMPs. Also exploring "Fee in Lieu" option to meet minimum BMP requirements on otherwise infeasible sites.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Challenges

- **Challenge:** Ecology's top-down approach shows a preference for permeable pavement and bioretention --requiring applicants demonstrate infeasibility of these, often via soil testing (infiltration and soil quality) before selecting other popular BMPs including dispersion and limited infiltration systems. We are concerned about added costs put on applicants to arrive at preferred BMPs like dispersion (that do not require similar costly testing).
- **Proposal:** Put dispersion and limited infiltration on a "Cafeteria" list treated as equal choices alongside permeable pavement and bioretention. Balance this approach with minimum requirements discussed above.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Challenges

**Challenge:** Ecology required LID Performance Standard Modeling for large rural sites. This is an extra expense to rural customers and contradicts the purposes of our low impact drainage review process.

**Proposal:** Develop a BMP list approach alternative to the modeling. Includes using specific list of pre-modeled, compliant BMPs to target surfaces and preserving native vegetation on site.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Challenges

- Challenges still working on:**
- Minimum sizes where BMPs are infeasible
  - Development of standard BMP designs acceptable to Roads Dept. for placement in right-of-way.
  - Compost quality concerns where used in BMPs

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Tools

- Current Tools for Implementing BMP requirements:**
- BMP design details and requirements in Appendix C of KC Surface Water Design Manual.
  - Maintenance/Inspection Covenants
  - Small Site Drainage Review Process
- Future Tools:**
- BMP selection/infeasibility determination flow chart/checklist.
  - Charts to assist review staff in determining projects qualifying for Small Site Review (e.g. flow control facility not required).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Lessons Learned

- Work with affected constituencies early. Determine potential impacts to their activities/programs and “hand-hold” as necessary to get feedback early.
- Consultation w/Permitting dept. was invaluable as they have the critical “how its implemented” perspective.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Contact Info.

Contact Information:

Mark Wilgus, King County Stormwater Services Section  
Email: [Mark.Wilgus@Kingcounty.gov](mailto:Mark.Wilgus@Kingcounty.gov)  
Phone: 206-477-4848

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---