

Name/Agency:

City of Kirkland

Date:

22-Mar-23

Issue: (Description of issue raised by permit language)	Proposed Solution/Recommendation:	Justification/Rationale for proposed change:
General		Appreciate that Ecology noted and addressed concerns raised by the PAC
Type of Project Selected	Do not require SMAP implementation.	Kirkland maintains a list of projects that have been identified via planning efforts similar to SMAP, and what gets built depends more on opportunity. Planning efforts are not lost if they don't proceed immediately to implementation.
Type of Project Selected	Retain flexibility in opportunistic vs. SMAP implementation or remove language regarding these two approaches to project selection.	Projects are not necessarily better if they come from SMAP or from opportunistic processes - retrofits are needed everywhere. Allowing for an open process will enable jurisdictions to prioritize projects based on a range of factors that include watershed priority/need, project cost/benefit ratio, coordination with other city projects and programs, and availability of grant funding. This comprehensive prioritization results in more efficient use of funds and therefore a greater retrofit benefit.
Type of Project Selected	Broaden the definition of Watershed Collaboration to include projects such as stormwater parks that include multiple community benefits.	Efficient use of funds can address equity issues while maximizing stormwater retrofits. Not every jurisdiction has the opportunity to participate in Watershed Collaboration
Level of Effort - calculating equivalent area	grant 1/2 of acreage draining to a facility for converting from Basic to Enhanced treatment	Provides an increased benefit, especially in regards to 6PPD-Q treatment, but recognizes that some treatment already exists
Timing of requirements	Use January 1, 2023 as "started construction" date	Projects are often put out to bid in January/February and don't want to hold on construction until June 30 because of Permit
Timing of requirements	Use 12/31/2029 as date for "fully funded"	"fully funded" means the project is on the adopted CIP. Often the CIP is adopted late in the year along as part of the overall budget process.

Interaction with proposed updates to Appendix 1	Consider calculating equivalent area for replaced impervious portion of transportation projects that is being proposed in Appendix 1 changes to Permit, and allow that to count towards the level of effort, particularly if projects are multi-modal non-car focused	Transportation projects contribute to overall retrofit efforts and so credit should be granted for these alongside other retrofit efforts. Transportation projects must happen to meet concurrency under GMA. Recognizing and encouraging retrofit as part of these required projects supports jurisdiction goals beyond stormwater.
Interaction with proposed updates to Appendix 1	Appendix 1 will require a LOT of retrofit as part of transportation projects - consider whether it is reasonable to require both that level of effort and this level of effort for "priority developed areas"	Concern that this is more than Phase II jurisdictions can reasonably fund/accomplish
Type of Restoration	Provide increased point/value to restore acreage that is on steep slopes/high landslide hazard areas	Support work on difficult locations otherwise work on these locations will continue to be pushed out
Funding	Continue to provide ample grant funding for retrofit planning, design, and construction	Retrofits in Kirkland have only been feasible because of this source of funding, and associated jurisdictional staff and resources. Permit compliance for many jurisdictions may rely on an external source of funding