

## LID Questions for Developers & Builders:

1. Ecology is considering applying a fairly strict hydrologic performance standard on new development (in addition to the existing flow control standard). A project applicant will choose from a suite of LID tools to meet the standard.
  - a. Is this workable for your type of project(s)?
  - b. Do you prefer a volume-based (e.g., .02"/hr) or flow duration curve?
  - c. What level would you set for a volume-based standard? (Flow and duration modeling conducted by Ecology is available on its website: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/municipal/lidTECHadvisory.html>)
  - d. Should a project be able to use traditional methods to meet the standard, or must all LID be required on site unless proven infeasible by the applicant?
  - e. If your project is required to meet a flow or duration standard, how much expense do you expect this to add to your typical project (please describe your typical project) for:
    - i. Engineering, design, and approval time?
    - ii. For installation and maintenance?
    - iii. Could these costs be neutralized if pond sizes were significantly decreased or removed altogether?
  - f. Should feasibility be considered by the local jurisdiction and/or Ecology in applying a hydrologic performance standard to new development? (See #5 below.)

2. For redevelopment and small projects, do you support a standardized checklist instead of a hydrologic performance standard?
  - a. How would you define a small project given codes and development patterns in your jurisdiction?
  - b. Ecology is considering <10K sq ft impervious, 5K sq ft pollution-generating impervious, or <3/4 acre land disturbance for a small site. Is this reasonable in your jurisdiction?
  
3. Seattle's draft checklist and supporting worksheets are at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/municipal/LID/SPUImplemGreenSWInfrast.pdf>.
  - a. Is this reasonable/workable for small and redevelopment sites?
  - b. How can it be changed to be more user-friendly?
  
4. Do you want local governments to have flexibility/discretion to decide when LID should not be applied or partially applied on a lot-by-lot basis, or do you want this prescribed (in part or whole) by Ecology? In other words, do you want the certainty of a list, the flexibility of case-by-case application, or a combination of the two?
  
5. Many advisory committee members oppose feasibility off-ramps, and even Ecology has expressed opposition to feasibility off-ramps for new development. Please list all feasibility issues you have encountered on your projects:
  - a. Engineering limitations (soils, slopes, etc.)
  - b. Site constraints (open space, buffers, historical designation, etc.)

- c. Costs (engineering, installation, maintenance, etc.)
  - d. Which of these feasibility factors should be considered when reviewing your project?
6. What is an efficient way for developers/builders to show and local governments to determine feasibility of LID practices?
- a. Documentation similar to the Seattle checklist approach (Use this link to review the required paperwork: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/municipal/LID/SPIImplementGreenSWInfrast.pdf>)?
  - b. Other types of reports, studies, narratives, assertions?
7. Ecology is considering applying the LID changes to the 2012 permit updates and giving Phase I jurisdictions (Seattle, Tacoma, King, Pierce, Snohomish & Clark Counties) until 2014 to amend codes and regs and begin requiring LID on development sites. Phase II jurisdictions would have until 2015.
- a. What do you think about these timelines?
  - b. Is 2015 too aggressive (unrealistic) for the majority of Western Washington jurisdictions?
  - c. What timeline do you recommend for Phase I and II jurisdictions, and specifically your jurisdiction?