

Building Cities in the Rain  
Bicycle Rack<sup>1</sup> Issues  
2-3-15

Bicycle Rack Issues - Issues that have been identified to date by the Building Cities in the Rain Work Group that will need to be addressed:

- Cost of the process (what is the appropriate point to stop studying?) (10/27/14 meeting)
- What is the definition of receiving waters? (10/27/14 meeting)
- Should the public process for adopting a stormwater control transfer program be with the local government's adoption process, or with Ecology's approval process? (12-11-14 meeting)
- How will a receiving area be protected from future impacts of development? It will vary, but something could be put in the guidance to address this issue. We cannot assume that receiving areas within cities will not continue to develop. Redmond uses a latecomer fee to charge a developer in a receiving basin for stormwater control. (1/27/15 meeting)
- Regional priorities should overlay the program. If the program is limited to a city, it will be hard to deal with regional priorities. We need to consider whether a program can go across jurisdictional boundaries. Thurston County is interested in a regional program. (2-3-15 meeting)
- Explore further whether transfers need to be from like land use to like land use – for example, from an area zoned for a mix of residential, commercial and industrial to another area with similar land uses, but not necessarily the same intensity of uses. Like to like seems to become relevant for transfers of runoff treatment. If only flow control is transferred, it can still be a concern if the receiving area is really rural. It would be okay if the receiving area is within a city. (2-3-15 meeting)
- What is the geographic range/nexus between sending and receiving areas? (2-3-15 meeting)

Further observations to keep in mind (2-3-15 meeting):

- Guidance should include a backstop that prevents a watershed that is low-impaired with parkland and low density development from being designated as a receiving area as these watersheds present minimal ecological lift potential.
- Watersheds "at risk" may be most appropriate to prioritize as receiving waters. However, we should not categorically exclude highly degraded areas such as the Duwamish, from consideration.
- Local governments need to be allowed to articulate the goals of their program. For example, Tacoma may have different goals than another city. (i.e., highly urbanized, industrial, dense development vs. rural, suburban, residential)
- Guidance should consider how local priorities fit into broader regional priorities. [This was added to a parking lot list, too]
- A program needs goals that demonstrate a tangible ecological lift e.g., improved BIBI scores, removal from 303(d) listing, reduction of toxics, etc.
  - In Redmond, the Monticello Creek environmental lift was to remove the 303(d) listing, stabilize stream banks, and reduce streambank incision.
- A local government needs to state reasons why the watershed needs to be tackled – a statement of the problems to be addressed.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a new term to use instead of "parking lot" that is less pollutant generating and more compact.