



City of Lacey:



Doug Christensen
Water Resources Engineer
Public Works Department
400 College Street SE
Lacey, WA 98509

(360) 438-2687
dchriste@ci.lacey.wa.us

Scope of Assistance:

Prior to the meeting, the City staff, PSAT staff and AHBL agreed on a scope of services for the regulations to be reviewed. The following are the tasks that the City staff directed the consultant team to complete:

- ◆ Review 14.31 – Zero Effective Drainage Discharge
- ◆ Review information on the City of Olympia's stormwater manual (Lacey will be adopting a similar manual – 2001 DOE w/ some 2005 equivalency updates)
- ◆ Review residential ROW sections
- ◆ Contact the City of Tumwater about successes with zero discharge ordinance

This direction resulted in a comprehensive review of Lacey codes and standards, along with a detailed review and analysis of Lacey's Zero Effective Drainage Discharge chapter by the consultant team.

The policy review meeting with the City of Lacey staff occurred on June 29, 2006. At the meeting, City staff directed the consultant team on the content of the desired technical assistance. This direction resulted in the preparation of several work products to be reviewed by the City at the regulatory amendments meeting on September 8, 2006. An outline of these work products is presented below in a topical manner with the full text of the updates attached separately.

Work Products:

1. 14.31 – Planned Low Impact Development (PLID)

During the first meeting the City indicated interest in the possible addition of a Planned Low Impact Development (PLID) Chapter to the Lacey Municipal Code as a replacement to the zero effective drainage ordinance (Chapter 14.31 LMC). The consultant team prepared a PLID Chapter that establishes objective design requirements for projects applying for LID status.

2. 16.60 – Planned Residential Development

At the request by the City, the consultant team amended the existing Chapter 16.60 LMC to extend planned residential development (PRD) provisions to LID projects. The amendments allow for LID projects that concurrently qualify for PRD status to benefit from the 20 percent density incentive of a PRD.

3. Roadway Sections and Details

The consultant team provided the following six new standard drawings:

- ◆ LID Street Design Major Local Residential (Dwg. No. 4-4L.1) – Super elevated local road with sidewalks on each side, 54' ROW
- ◆ LID Street Design Minor Local Residential (Dwg. No. 4-4L.2) – Super elevated local road with sidewalks on each side, 50' ROW
- ◆ LID Street Design Minor Local Residential (Dwg. No. 4-4L.3)



- ◆ Bulb-Out LID Parking For Residential (Dwg. No. 4-4L.4) – Placement of tree filter boxes within street parking scenario
- ◆ LID Tree Box for Residential (Dwg. No. 4-4L.5) – Detail for tree box placement
- ◆ LID Curb Inlet Detail (Dwg. No. 4-4L.6) – Curb cut allowing stormwater to enter bioretention area
- ◆ LID Parking Standards (Dwg. No. 4-4L.7) – Provides for bioretention areas within parking lots
- ◆ LID Parking Details (Dwg. No. 4-4L.8A & 4-4L.8B) – Shows bioretention sections to be used within parking lots
- ◆ Bioretention Detail (Dwg. No. 4-4.L9) – Shows the minimum standards for a bioretention swale, with requirements for soil depth and type, maximum slopes, and swale depths
- ◆ LID Tree Box Section Detail (Dwg. No. 4-4L.10) – Section for a standard tree box planting

4. Supplemental Information

City staff requested additional information on the maintenance of Gravelpave² and Grasspave² pervious surfacing products. Maintenance guides for both products were provided by Invisible Structures, Inc. and added to “Maintenance of Low Impact Development Facilities” – a document prepared by the consultant team for the 2005 LID technical assistance grant program.

Findings:

The City of Lacey adopted regulations in 1999 that delivered an opportunity for developers to utilize low impact development techniques and alternative development practices. Zero Effective Drainage Discharge Chapter 14.31 was evidence to the efforts of City staff to implement LID practices throughout the community, however the regulations established within the chapter could be improved through clearer design objectives, more specific requirements, and flexibility within native vegetation retention requirements.