

Edit #	SECTION EDITED	REDLINE PAGE #	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE	JUSTIFICATION/WHY WAS THIS CHANGE MADE?
	All Chapters and Appendices, and Definitions Section.			
1	Throughout	N/A	Changed all DPER references to DLS-Permitting.	King County's Department of Permitting and Environmental Review (DPER) is now the Permitting Division within the recently formed Department of Local Services.
2	Throughout	N/A	Updated headers/footers.	Per the 2021 KCSWDM update.
	CHAPTER 1, Drainage Review and Requirements			
3	Section 1.1.2.3 "Directed Drainage Review"	1-21	Under the heading "Scope of Requirements" the last paragraph is missing the word "to" as follows: Engineering plans and calculations stamped by a civil engineer may be required [to] be submitted...	Correction/errata.
4	Section 1.1.1, "Projects Requiring Drainage Review"	1-12	Edit footnote #6 : Change from "Ref Section 3" to "Reference Section 2".	Correction/errata.
5	Section 1.1.3 "Drainage Review Required by Other Agencies"	1-23	Added "UIC Well Registration" to list of Ecology Permit/approvals in table.	Clarification.
6	Chapter 1, Core Requirement 3, Target Surfaces, #6	1-46	Text for Replaced surfaces for parcel redevelopment projects edited: "...exceeds 50% of the assessed value of : (a) the existing project site improvements on commercial or industrial projects or (b) the existing site improvements on other projects."	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
7	Section 1, page 72, "Intent"	1-72	Removed reference to Exemption 5	Correction , there is no exemption 5.
8	Sectin 1.2.5.2F "Flexible Compliance"	1-63	The second of last sentence has a duplication of the word "protection."	errata.
9	Chapter 1, various		Changed DPER to DLS-Permitting	Updated due to re-organization/creation of Local Services Dept.
10	Section 1.2.8, "Exemptions from Core Requirement 8"	1-69	Delete all occurrences of "that is not fully dispersed" from Exemption #1 , 2,, and 3 of Core 8(Water Quality Facilities).	Equivalency with Ecology Requirements. Included in Ecology review submittal as a "Table 10.2" substantial change.
11	Section 1.2.8, Target Surfaces, #6	1-73 1-76 1-79	Text for replaced impervious surfaces on parcel redevelopment projects edited:...exceeds 50% of the assessed value of : (a) the existing project site improvements on commercial or industrial projects or (b) the existing site improvements on other projects , whichever applies."	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
12	Section 1.2.8 "Exemptions from Core Requirement #8", Exemption 3, Cost Exemption for Parcel Redevelopment Projects.	1-69	Edit text of part a: ...less than 50% of the assessed value of (a) the existing project site improvements on commercial or industrial projects, or (b)the existing site improvements on other projects.	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
13	Section 1.2.8 "Exemptions from Core Requirement #8"	1-70	Modified Exemption #4 "Soil Treatment Exemption by adding disallowances for using this exemption for areas that are infiltrated (1) within one quarter mile of a sensitive lake , or (2) within one quarter mile of fresh water with existing or designated aquatic life use whose land use would otherwise trigger application of a facility from the enhanced basic treatment menu, or (3) within one quarter mile of a phosphorus or metals problem as described in section 1.2.2.1.2	Consistency w/Core Requirement 2, DS WQ problems, and 1.2.8.1 "Exceptions".
14	Chapter 1, page 1-80, Treatment Trades, Part C	1-81	Added text ". 2.The existing non-targeted pollution- generating surface that is treated for purposes of the treatment trade must be documented and tracked by DLS-Permitting. Documentation should clarify that future redevelopment of the existing non-targeted, treated area used for the treatment trade will incur additional water quality treatment requirements if the redevelopment exceeds Core Requirement 8 thresholds. Any additional water quality treatment triggered by redevelopment of the non-targeted, treated area must be achieved by implementing an additional treatment trade."	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
15	Chapter 1, Core 3, Mitigation Trades, Part G.	1-53	Added text: "5.The existing non-targeted surface area that is mitigated for purposes of required flow control must be documented and tracked by DLS-Permitting. Documentation should clarify that future redevelopment of this existing non-targeted area used for the mitigation trade will incur additional flow control mitigation requirements if the redevelopment exceeds Core Requirement #3 thresholds. This additional flow control mitigation must be met in addition to that previously required and provided for the mitigation trade. Applicants may be advised to size flow control facilities sufficient for both the mitigation trade area and future development of the existing non-targeted area.	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
16	Section 1.2.2.1.1 "Downstream Drainage Problems Requiring Special Attention", Potential Impacts to Wetlands Hydrology Problem (Type 4)	1-30	Added text: "Projects or threshold discharge areas within projects discharging to wetlands, unless exempt from providing a flow control facility per Core Requirement 3, must demonstrate that the existing wetland hydroperiod is maintained in accordance with the wetland hydrology protection guidelines in Reference Section 5. " and " and, if applicable, the analysis of project compliance with the wetland hydrology protection guidelines in Reference Section 5 , DPER DLS-Permitting will determine if changes in the rate, duration, and/or the quantity of surface and storm water runoff from a proposed project or threshold discharge area within a proposed project could significantly alter the hydrology of a wetland-- in which case, DPER DLS-Permitting will require (as described in Section 1.2.2.2 under "Drainage Problem-Specific Mitigation Requirements"), implementation of additional flow control or other measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of this alteration in accordance with the wetland hydrology protection guidelines in Reference Section 5."	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
17	Section 1.2.2.2 Drainage Problem Impact Mitigation, Significance of Impacts to Existing Drainage Problems	1-33	Modified text re: Type 4 Potential Impacts to Wetlands Problems to indicated that compliance with hydrology protection guidelines in Reference 5 is part of DLS determination of whether significant impact will occur that requires mitigation.	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
18	Section 1.2.2.2 Drainage Problem Impact Mitigation, Drainage Problem Specific Mitigation Requirements	1-35	Added text to #3 that... "changes in the rate, duration and/or ..."duration .. could significantly alter wetland hydrology	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
19	Section 1.2.3.1.C Flood Problem Flow Control Areas, Exceptions, #5	1- 49	Deleted Exception 5 text	Exception 5 is redundant since for 100 year peak matching, existing condition is the allowed predeveloped condition as reflected in table 1.2.3A and in the 1,2,3,C: "then historic site conditions shall be assumed as the predeveloped condition except for the purposes of matching 100-year peak discharge rates. For all other situations and for the purposes of matching 100-year peak discharge rates, existing site conditions may be assumed.

Edit #	SECTION EDITED	REDLINE PAGE #	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE	JUSTIFICATION/WHY WAS THIS CHANGE MADE?
20	Section 1.2.8. "Area Specific WQ Facility Requirement" Subsection A "Basic WQ Treatment Areas, Intent"	1-72	Deleted "and 5". Clarified that specifically "metals" impairments are what limit step down to basic treatment where discharging to major receiving water.	Correction. There is no exemption 5 to Core 8.
21	Section 1.2.8. "Area Specific WQ Facility Requirement" Subsection A "Basic WQ Treatment Areas, Exceptions"	1-73	Deleted "altogether" from Exemption 1.	Redundant language.
22	"Section 1.2.8. "Area Specific WQ Facility Requirement" Subsection A "Basic WQ Treatment Areas, Exceptions"	1-73	Rearranged sentence structure in Exception 2.	Clarity.
23	Section 1.2.8.1.A Basic WQ Treatment Areas, Exceptions, #3	1- 74	Replace text "or a lake that is 300 acres or larger" with ", a lake that is 300 acres or larger, or a waterbody listed as a major receiving water per table 1.2.3.B."	Major receiving water definition: "Major receiving waters are also considered safe for application of Basic WQ treatment in place of otherwise required Enhanced Basic WQ treatment (see Section 1.2.8.1), except where the receiving water meets the definition of impaired waterbody or impaired receiving water, specifically with regard to heavy metals." Clarification edit.
24	Section 1.2.8. Area Specific WQ Facility Requirement" Subsection A "Basic WQ Treatment Areas, Exceptions"	1-74	Clarified language in exemption #3.	Basic WQ treatment (see Section 1.2.8.1), except where the receiving water meets the definition of impaired waterbody or impaired receiving water, specifically with regard to heavy metals." WILGUS: Agree with the proposed edit. It is a clarification.
25	Section 1.2.8. "Area Specific WQ Facility Requirement" Subsection B "Sensitive Lake WQ Treatment Areas, Exceptions"	1-76	Rearranged sentence structure in #1 and #2. Added clarifying note: "A facility from the Sensitive Lake Protection menu is still required unless that requirement has been reduced to the Basic WQ menu by another exception" to Exemptions 2, 3, and 4. Removed "altogether from Exemption 6.	Clarity.
26	Section 1.2.8. "Area Specific WQ Facility Requirement" Subsection B "Sensitive Lake WQ Treatment Areas, Intent"	1-75	Removed reference to 11-B, instead pointing to Section 5.2.1 where groundwater protection soil characteristics are listed.	Accuracy/clarity.
27	Section 1.2.8.1.B Sensitive Lake WQ Treatment Areas, Exceptions, #3	1-77	Replace text "or a lake that is 300 acres or larger" with ", a lake that is 300 acres or larger, or a waterbody listed as a major receiving water per table 1.2.3.B."	Major receiving water definition: "Major receiving waters are also considered safe for application of Basic WQ treatment in place of otherwise required Enhanced Basic WQ treatment (see Section 1.2.8.1), except where the receiving water meets the definition of impaired waterbody or impaired receiving water, specifically with regard to heavy metals." Clarification edit.
28	Part C Sphagnum Bog WQ Treatment Areas	1-78	Added web address for Bog Inventory.	Clarity.
29	Chapter 1, "Key Terms and Definitions",	1-4 1-6	Modified definition of "Impaired Waterbody or impaired receiving water " to remove references to metals and organic pollutants. Modified definition of "Major Receiving Water to directly reference the impaired waterbody and impaired receiving water definition.	Clarity and correction. Organic Pollutants problem type was not included in the 2016 SWDM and the current text is draft language that should've been deleted at that time. Removing general reference to "Metals" for "Impaired waterbody and impaired receiving water" definition as this level of specificity is not required in this context e.g. the state standards include more than just metals exceedances. Other portions of the manual deal w/specific Metals problem concern and how that is applied to design. "Major receiving water" definition now points to impaired water body definition and eliminates redundancy.
30	Chapter 1, Section 1.2.2.1.2 "Downstream WQ Problems Requiring Special Attention, Metals Problem (Type 4), page 1-31	1-32	Added" or (3) where subject to an other local, state, or federal cleanup plan or contaminated site designation" to definition of problem type.	Consistency w/impaired water bodies and receiving waters definition.
31	Chapter 1, Section 1.2, Part A, Exception #3	1-74	Delete "is impaired as described in the full description of major receiving water in the Definitions section or"	Clarification/consistency.
32	Table 1.2.3B "Major Receiving Waters"	1-41	Deleted text from bullet 3: "mainstem" and "Snoqualmie River" to result in : •Snoqualmie River downstream of Middle Fork confluence	Revised text is more clear and functionally identical to Ecology's description of the same.
33	Section 1.2.8.2 "Water Quality Implementation Requirements", part E "Use of Experimental WQ Facilities"	1-82	Deleted text:"... (p. 1-107), Section 6.7, "Alternative Facilities", and Reference 8-F, Section 2.0, Experimental Design Adjustment Process and Requirements."	Unnecessary detail for this section, decluttering. Covered in detail in refenced Section 1.4.
34	Section 1.2.8.2 "Water Quality Implementation Requirements", part E "Use of Experimental WQ Facilities"	1-82	Deleted "...or CTAPE"	This section is specifically speaking to experimental WQ facilities in place of standard facilities listed in Chapter 6. CTAPE applies to ESC facilities.
35	Section 1.2.8.2 "Water Quality Implementation Requirements", part E "Use of Experimental WQ Facilities"	1-82	Deleted: "When sufficient data on performance and maintenance requirements have been collected and if both are acceptable, the new facility may be added to the appropriate water quality menu for common use through a blanket adjustment or update of this manual."	Inappropriate for this section. How proprietary facilities are added for common use to the SWDM is covered in detail in Section 6.7.
36	Section 1.2.9.4 "Requirements for Use of BMP Credits"	1-95	Added: "and any restrictions noted in this section or Table 1.2.9.A." Added: " For all project types, modeling credits cannot be used for flow control BMPs that will be privately maintained, with the exception of the full dispersion, farmland dispersion, and full infiltration BMPs." Added:"and allowed in Table 1.2.9.A".	The current policy of crediting flow control BMPS located on single family residential lots results in smaller King County maintained regional R/D ponds for residential subdivisions and a larger inventory of distributed individual facility sites that the County must regularly inspect to ensure the BMPs are maintained and functioning to protect downstream systems and comply with its NPDES municipal stormwater permit. This inspection can be difficult and costly because permission must be obtained from the homeowners to access these facilities – often located in fenced backyards. In addition, homeowners have little or no incentive to maintain the BMPs because there is usually no benefit to their property of doing so. If homeowners refuse to maintain the BMPs or are incapable of doing so properly, this puts King County in the position of having to either enlarge regional ponds or take enforcement action against individual homeowners, which can be costly and time intensive and puts downstream systems at greater risk until full performance is restored. Since BMPs are required by the manual to be installed to maximum extent feasible anyway and have minimum implementation levels based on size/type of lot, we don't foresee this reducing the number of BMPs, but regional ponds would be more conservatively sized, for additional environmental benefit and resilience to climate change.
37	Table 1.2.9.A "Flow Control BMP Facility Sizing Credits"	1-96	Added to notes: "Modeling credits cannot be used for flow control BMPs that will be privately maintained, with the exception of the full dispersion, farmland dispersion, and full infiltration BMPs. "	Same as above
38	Section 1.2.9.4.1 "USE OF CREDITS BY SUBDIVISION PROJECTS"	1-97	Added text:"These requirements are in addition to any restrictions for use of modeling credits noted in Section 1.2.9.4 and/or Table 1.2.9.A. "	Same as above

Edit #	SECTION EDITED	REDLINE PAGE #	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE	JUSTIFICATION/WHY WAS THIS CHANGE MADE?
39	Section "1.2.9.4.2 USE OF CREDITS BY PROJECTS WITHIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY"	1-99	Added text: "in addition to any restrictions noted in Section 1.2.9.4 and/or Table 1.2.9.A:"	Same as above
40	Section 1.3.4 SR #4 : Source Controls	105-107	Updated referenced SPPM activity sheets for re: structural improvements.	Consistency w/the revised 2021 SPPM.
41	Section 1.4, "Adjustment Process"	1-109	Deleted text: "The adjustment application form (one standard form serves all types of adjustments except for blanket adjustments) is included in Reference Section 8-F."	Moved to Section 1.4.2 "Adjustment application process".
42	Section 1.4 "Adjustment Process", Experimental Design Adjustments	1-109	Changed text from "do not have sufficient data" to "require additional information"	Clarification.
43	Section 1.4 "Adjustment Process", Blanket Adjustments	1-109	Added text: There is no application process for establishing blanket adjustments because they are initiated solely by the County.	Clarification of process and emphasis.
44	Section 1.4.2 "Criteria For Granting Adjustments", Experimental Design Adjustments	1-111	Rewrote first paragraph for clarity. Added text: "Required water quality monitoring is in addition to any required by Ecology for their approval. King County does not pay for this monitoring. Monitoring costs are covered by the applicant and/or the facility vendor or manufacturer according to their agreement."	Clarification of process and emphasis.
45	Section 1.4.2 "Criteria For Granting Adjustments", Experimental Design Adjustments	1-111	Added subsections specific to Flow Control Facilities, ESC facilities, and WQ facilities.	Clarification of process. Each facility type has unique requirements for EDAs.
46	Section 1.4.2 "Criteria For Granting Adjustments", Experimental Design Adjustments, "Water Quality Facilities", bullet 1 and 3	1-111	Removed reference to CTAPE	CTAPE applies to ESC facilities, not Chapter 6 WQ facilities.
47	Section 1.4.2 "Criteria For Granting Adjustments", Experimental Design Adjustments	1-111	Added bullet text " •The County reserves the right to not grant an experimental design adjustment for a facility for which it will be responsible for maintenance, where it finds the cost of maintenance will be greater than for a conventional facility."	Clarification of process.
48	Section 1.4.2 "Criteria For Granting Adjustments", Experimental Design Adjustments, bullet 5	1-112	Added "Presettling" to Basic treatment WQ facility types where TSS monitoring may not be required if/where conditions met.	Clarification.
49	Section 1.4.2, Experimental Design Adjustments "Additional Notes"	1-112	Added text "•The number of experimental installations of any one kind will normally be limited to two, until King County has obtained sufficient evidence indicating performance meets criteria"	Clarification of policy.
50	Section 1.4.3, "Adjustment Application Process"	1-112	Added text: Adjustment Application Form The adjustment application form for standard and experimental design adjustments is posted at DLS-Permitting's Forms website, under alphabetical tab (S) and listing: Surface Water Design Manual Requirements/Standards Adjustment Request: https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/local-services/permits/infosheets-forms/permit-application-forms-title.aspx#S .	Informational.
51	Section 1.4.3, "Adjustment Application Process" Experimental Design Adjustments	1-113	Deleted text " ...and engineering information detailed in Reference 8-F shall be included in the submittals." and added text: "Justification supporting comparable performance of the proposed system to a standard design is required."	Clarified. Reference 8F is revised. Added the referenced info w/in Section 1.4.
52	Section 1.4.3, "Adjustment Application Process" Blanket Adjustments	1-113	Added text "Applicants may apply to use SWDM web-posted blanket adjustments by submitting the adjustment application form noted above to the DLS-Permitting engineering plan reviewer reviewing the specific project proposal. "	Clarification.
53	Section 1.4.4 "Adjustment Review Process" , Experimental Design Adjustments	1-113	Edited text for clarity and consistency.	Clarity/consistency.
54	Section 1.4.4 "Adjustment Review Process" , Experimental Design Adjustments	1-114	Add new bullet text "•All information including but not limited to reports and data submitted to Ecology for their TAPE approvals must be submitted to WLRD. This may require coordination between the manufacturer and the applicant.	Clarification of process.
55	Section 1.4.4 "Adjustment Review Process" , Experimental Design Adjustments, bullet 4	1-114	Deleted text" but if it is, monitoring will be required for any water quality treatment experimental adjustment and for any ESC adjustment utilizing any kind of chemical treatment. Monitoring may be required for other ESC experimental adjustments and for flow control experimental adjustments, up to the discretion of DNRP staff. See Reference 8-F for details."	This is redundant to information in Section 1.4.2.
56	Section 1.4.4, "Adjustment Review Process", Blanket Adjustments	1-114	Modified text to read: "Applicants may apply to use SWDM web-posted blanket adjustments by submitting the adjustment application form noted in Section 1.4.3 to the DLS-Permitting engineering plan reviewer assigned to the specific project proposal."	Clarification.
CHAPTER 2, Drainage Plan Submittal				
57	Section 2.3.1.1, Task 2 Resource Review	2-13	Updated DNRP complaints phone number and Road Drainage Problems phone number	
CHAPTER 3, Hydrologic Analysis and Design				
58	Intro	3-1	Added text: "Note that MGS Flood is not currently approved for modeling bioretention. It will be allowed for modeling bioretention by King County only at such time that it is formally approved by Ecology for that use."	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
59	Section 3.1.3, Hydrologic Analysis Using Continuous Models	3-7	Added footnote 4 text: "Note that MGS Flood is not currently approved for modeling bioretention. It will be allowed for modeling bioretention by King County only at such time that it is formally approved by Ecology for that use."	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
60	Section 3.2.2, Continuous Models and the Runoff Files Method	3-21	Added footnote 7 text: "Note that MGS Flood is not currently approved for modeling bioretention. It will be allowed for modeling bioretention by King County only at such time that it is formally approved by Ecology for that use."	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
61	Section 3.2.3 The Approved Model	3-34	Added footnote 9 text: "Note that MGS Flood is not currently approved for modeling bioretention. It will be allowed for modeling bioretention by King County only at such time that it is formally approved by Ecology for that use."	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
62	Section 3.2, Runoff Computation and Analysis Methods	3-11	Delete Footnote 5. 15 minutes timesteps are now available throughout all areas of KC for the approved models, therefore removed notes in Ref 6D and Chapter 3 that reference 1 hour steps being allowable where 15 minute timesteps not available.	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
63	Throughout	N/A	Delete immaterial references to "KCRTs"	KCRTs no longer an approved model.
64	Various	N/A	Deleted references to "in past editions" and "As of this manual update"	Clarity. Reduce redundancy.

Edit #	SECTION EDITED	REDLINE PAGE #	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE	JUSTIFICATION/WHY WAS THIS CHANGE MADE?
	CHAPTER 4, Conveyance System Analysis and Design			
65	Changed DPER to DLS throughout and headers/footers updated.	N/A	N/A	
66	Section 4.1.2 "EASEMENT AND SETBACK REQUIREMENTS"	4-6	Added new #3: " Retained or replaced 12-inch or greater pipe diameter (or equivalent) conveyance system elements that convey offsite flows on a project site on private property shall be covered by the drainage facility declaration of covenant and grant of easement in Reference Section 8-J (or equivalent) that provides King County right of access for inspection, maintenance, and repair. For projects with conveyance system elements as described above that cannot meet or be relocated to meet the easement and BSBLs requirements in Table 4.1 due to the presence of existing structures, applicants are required only to record a notice on title that identifies the subject conveyance elements and states that maintenance and repair of those elements is the responsibility of the property owner. For conveyance system elements as described above that are on a site but not within the project site, applicants are required only to record a notice on title that identifies the subject conveyance elements and states that maintenance and repair of those elements is the responsibility of the property owner. Note: except for those facilities that have been formally accepted for maintenance by King County, maintenance and repair of drainage facilities on private property is the responsibility of the property owner."	Existing conveyance pipes without defined ownership or assigned maintenance responsibility are being built over and current code doesn't address effectively. Many of these will likely require maintenance by King County at some point regardless of whether they are assigned to private maintenance (policy) given that failure will be expensive and cause flooding of other properties and/or roads.
67	Section 4.1.2 "EASEMENT AND SETBACK REQUIREMENTS"	4-6	Added to #6 (renumbered): "Note: The requirement for drainage easements with accompanying widths and BSBLs per Table 4.1 also applies to existing and replaced conveyance elements as described in #3 above."	Same as above
	CHAPTER 5, Flow Control Design			
68	Section 5.2.1, General Requirements for Infiltration Facilities, "Groundwater Protection"	5-51	Replaced original text that was both redundant and inconsistent with requirements elsewhere with general text that points to requirements for infiltration facilities (Chapter 5, Section 5.2.1); Water quality facilities (Core 8, Chapter 1.), and Oil Control (Special Requirement 5 (Chapter 1).	Eliminate redundancy and error.
69	Section 5.2.1, Soil Properties Required for Groundwater Protection	5-52	Changed "may" to "are" in italicized example text.	Clarification/accuracy.
70	Section 5.2.1, "Underground Injection Control Well Registration"	5-54	Revised references to Ecology's UIC Program	
71	Section 5.2.1, Soil Properties Required for Groundwater Protection Outside of Groundwater Protection Areas	5-52	Added "undisturbed" and "in situ" with note describing soil properties must be met by native soils onsite.	Clarification. The intent is that soils used for groundwater protection must be in situ, not disturbed or imported. "Native soils onsite" and "Soil may not be imported" original statements still resulted in applicant's asking if they could "import" onsite soils from one location on site to another location onsite and qualify for groundwater protection.
72	Section 5.2, "Presettling"	5-50	Deleted: "Roof runoff need not be treated before entering an infiltration facility".	This statement is only true for roofing that is classified as non pollution generating. Further, determination of water quality treatment requirements is covered in detail in Core Requirement 8.
73	Section 5.2.1, Soil Properties Required for Groundwater Protection within Groundwater Protection Areas	5-53	Added "undisturbed" and "in situ" with note describing soil properties must be met by native soils onsite.	Clarification. The intent is that soils used for groundwater protection must be in situ, not disturbed or imported. "Native soils onsite" and "Soil may not be imported" original statements still resulted in applicant's asking if they could "import" onsite soils from one location on site to another location onsite and qualify for groundwater protection.
	CHAPTER 6, Water Quality Design			
74	Section 6.7.2.1, "General", #2	6-154	Deleted "used for cartridge filters"	Vaults need to conform with materials and structural stability requirements whether for cartridge filters or other types.
75	Section 6.7.2 King County Requirements	6-154	Changed reference to section 1.4 instead of 1.4.4.	Clarification.
76	Section 6.1.2 Enhanced basic WQ Treatment Menu, Treatment Goal	6-7	Deleted Footnote 7.	Text of footnote is incorrect. Correct information is within the body of text currently.
77	Section 6.2.4, Table 6.2.4.A	6-29	Retitled "Lining Types for Stormwater Facilities" and change column 1 header to "Facility Type"	The table contains wq facilities, detention facilities, and combination facilities. Title changed to be generic and accurate.
78	Section 6.2.4, Facility Liners, General Design Criteria, #3, b. addressing planting layer over low perm. Liners.	6-28	Added to footnote: "Compost for application of this requirement in stormwater treatment wetlands must be Specification 1 Compost detailed in Reference 11-C."	This change is considered necessary to be equivalent to Ecology compost requirements for low permeability liners in treatment wetland designs. Both Ecology and SWDM require 18" planting layer placed over low permeability liners where used in stormwater treatment wetlands.
79	Section 6.4.3.2, "Design Criteria" (Stormwater Wetlands), Lining Requirements, #2, addressing planting layer over low perm liners. (page 6-94).	6-94	Added text: "Compost must be Specification 1 Compost detailed in Reference 11-C. "	This change is considered necessary to be equivalent to Ecology compost requirements for low permeability liners in treatment wetland designs. Both Ecology and SWDM require 18" planting layer placed over low permeability liners where used in stormwater treatment wetlands.
80	Section 6.2.4.2, "Design Criteria for Treatment Liner Options", Organic Soil Layer, #6, re: Soil amendment, (page 6-31).	6-31	Added text: "Compost for application of this requirement in stormwater treatment wetlands must be Specification 1 Compost detailed in Reference 11-C."	This change is proposed as it shares intent of same requirement applied to low permeability liner planting layer used in stormwater wetlands.

Edit #	SECTION EDITED	REDLINE PAGE #	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE	JUSTIFICATION/WHY WAS THIS CHANGE MADE?
	APPENDIX A-Maintenance Requirements for Flow Control, Conveyance, and WQ Facilities			
81	No. 4 (Control Structure/Flow Restrictor) and No. 5 (Catch Basins and Manholes), "Results Expected When Maintenance is Performed" column for Metal Grates	A-8 A-10	Deleted "Footnote to guidelines for disposal" text	There is no associated footnote. Not needed.
82	No. 10 (Gates/Bollards/Access Barriers) "Conditions When Maintenance is Needed" for Chain Link Fencing Gate and Bar Gate	A-15	Edited "no functioning" to "non-functioning".	Correction.
	APPENDIX B, Master Drainage Plan Objective, Criteria, Components, and Review Process			
83	No changes except for changing DPER to DLS throughout and headers/footers updated.	N/A	N/A	
	APPENDIX C, Simplified Drainage Review Requirements			
84	Table C.3.2.A Mulch Standards and Guidelines, Compost, Remarks	C-111	Deleted "Sources for compost are available from the KC Commission for Marketing Recyclable Materials at (206) 296-4439	Reference is obsolete.
85	C.2.6.1 Bioretention, "Minimum Design Requirements (Cells, swales, and Planters) #19 and #20	C-78	Deleted "imported" from "Bioretention with imported compost materials are not allowed within one quarter mile of ..."	Ecology confirmed. "Imported" is not a relevant distinction.
86	C.2.6.2, Bioretention, "Minimum Design Requirements (Roadside Bioretention Ditch)" #18 and #19	C-81	Deleted "imported" from "Bioretention with imported compost materials are not allowed within one quarter mile of ..."	Ecology confirmed. "Imported" is not a relevant distinction.
87	C.2.4.4 Use of Gravel Filled Trenches for Basic Dispersion, Design Specifications, #1	C-63	For full dispersion, see #2 under design specs for simple 10 ft trench (full Dispersion) on page C-36: "The 10-foot trench length is the maximum allowed without a notch grade board as shown in Figure C.2.1.D (p. C-42)." Append this same note to #1 on page C-63.	Clarification.
88	C.2.6.3 "Maintenance Instructions for Bioretention"	C-82	Added: "Mulch must comply with Reference 11-C.3 specification for "Bioretention Mulch". Compost must comply with Reference 11-C.2.B specification for "Bioretention Compost"."	Ecology equivalency.
	Appendix D, Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Standards			
89	D.2.1.3.1 Silt Fence, Design and Installation Specifications, #5	D-36	Delete text "not" in "...trench may not be reduced...".	Correction.
90	D.2.1.6.6 Level Spreader, Design and Installation Specifications, #5	D-69	Add text "area downslope of the" between "The" and "level spreader".	Clarification.
91	D.2.1.4.3 Wheel Wash, Maintenance Standards, #3	D-45	Deleted text : "such as a closed loop recirculation system or land application". Added text: "that prevents discharge to surface water"	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
92	D.2.2.1 Concrete Handling	D-75	Added to #1 " chutes, pumps, or internals"; Added to #3 " ..awaiting future concrete pours only", New bullet 4: "Do not wash out to formed areas awaiting infiltration BMPs".	Ecology required edit per Table 10.1 of NPDES Permit.
93	D.2.1.6.2 Pipe Slope Drains, Design and Installation Specifications	D-62	Clarified modeling methods for design flows.	Clarification.
94	D.3.5 Control of Other Pollutants (SWPPS), Pollution Control Measures	D-135-136	Updated references to and added relevant SPPM activity sheets.	Consistency with the revised 2021 SPPM.
	DEFINITIONS Section			
95	Impaired waterbody or impaired receiving water definition, page 15	14	Revised definition consistent w/edits made to same in Chapter 1, key terms and definitions	Consistency w/key terms in Chapter 1
96	Major Receiving water definition, page 18	17	Revised definition consistent w/edits made to same in Chapter 1, key terms and definitions	Consistency w/key terms in Chapter 1
97	References	32	Delete Wikipedia reference to CAC.	Correction. This was an unused reference.
	FLOW CONTROL APPLICATIONS MAP			
98		N/A	Edit major receiving waters list to match table 1.2.3B in Chapter 1.	Consistency w/Chapter 1 and Ecology.
99		N/A	Upsize disclaimer text.	Readability improvement.
100		N/A	Added note re: major receiving waters don't include associated side channels, wetlands, etc.	Consistency w/Chapter 1 , Table 1.2.3B text.
	WATER QUALITY APPLICATIONS MAP			
101		N/A	Clarified that Enhanced Basic is a Land use determination rather than a geographic determination within the map text on the same.	Clarification.
102		N/A	Upsize disclaimer text.	Clarification
	LANDSLIDE HAZARD AREAS MAP			
103		N/A	Upsize disclaimer text.	Clarification