

City of Maple Valley

See attachment

Date	Name	Agency/Org	Document Location	Issue	Proposed Solution/Recommendation	Justification/Rational
3/20/2023	Halley Kimball	City of Maple Valley	pg. 6, LOE	Using population only for the determining basis for "acres managed" doesn't consider the land area of the municipality, which may dictate how much area they have available/in need of retrofits	A suggestion to take under consideration	
3/20/2023	Halley Kimball	City of Maple Valley	pg. 6, 1.c	The text "projects that have started construction on or afer June 30, 2023" does not align well with a typical stormwater project construction schedule.	Either change to a project where construction took place in 2023	Unclear text
3/20/2023	Halley Kimball	City of Maple Valley	pg. 6, 1.c	Clarify "fully funded by June 30, 2029". Is fully funded that both local and grant funds are secured with a signed agreement and final budget, budgets for municipalities aren't adopted until end of year.	Define fully funded	Unclear text
3/20/2023	Halley Kimball	City of Maple Valley	pg. 6, 1.c	No suggestions on how to translate Non-structural BMPs into the managed acres requirements. When it comes to i. and ii. there is not a quantifiable way to reasonably assess the benefit based on a pre and post evaluation - like equivalent area. The only somewhat fair way would be to assign similar percentages as from the Phase I SSC Table 3 to the areas, but that begs the question why are we not just using the same point approach as Phase I's but scaled by agency size?	None	
3/20/2023	Halley Kimball	City of Maple Valley	pg. 7, 1.e	How are we quantifying line cleaning an additional sweeping? This section states that no more than 50% LOE can be met through these actions, but these actions also don't translate well to managed acres, since there is no equivalent area calc.	Belongs with Non-structural BMPs until a way to translate the calculation is determined	Not possible to quantify based on the current draft methodology
3/20/2023	Halley Kimball	City of Maple Valley	pg. 7, 1 g and h	Both Tribal and Overburdened Communities should have been taken into consideration when the jurisdiction was selecting the basin for their SMAP. Individual projects should still be assessed for benefits/impacts to these communities but I do not think there is a way to incorporate this into the quantification.	No additional assessment of Tribes and Overburdened Communities incorporated in the managed acreage	Already considered in SMAP process
3/20/2023	Halley Kimball	City of Maple Valley	pg. 7 1.f.i 3)	Clarify 15% of acreage credit for collaborative projects that reach an interlocal agreement or committed funding. Is that 15% of the managed acres that project would be worth or is it 15% of the agency's required managed acres (less 0.3?)	Provide additional detail on what is intended	Unclear text
3/20/2023	Halley Kimball	City of Maple Valley	General	Looking long term at this implementation, I think it will be necessary to allow agencies to "bank" a least a portion of their managed acres accrued in the 2024-2029 permit cycles to be used in future cycles. If not this will discourage agencies from implementing projects/actions as soon as funding or opportunities present themselves because they are concerned about meeting future permit requirements	Implement acreage bank	Encourages near term actions rather then spreading them out only to meet permit requirements