

City of Shoreline

RFQ 4454

Addendum 1

9/25/2007

1. What are the biggest challenges/concerns the City faces in complying with/implementing the Phase II permit?

Our current surface water code is based on King County Code Title 9 from the early 1990s with many addenda and other administrative modifications. The code is very much out of line with the best available science on stormwater controls that are reflected in the NPDES Phase II requirements. The City recently updated its Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). The revised stormwater code has to mesh with the CAO.

2. Is this project strictly looking at just current City requirements or will it include evaluating programs, policies, and reporting as they support NPDES?

The code needed to be revised to reflect NPDES Phase II requirements.

3. Will there be a public involvement component of the Stormwater Management Program development?

There will be public involvement in all components of the stormwater code update

4. a) Do you plan on updating the City's 2005 Surface Water Master Plan to more accurately reflect the requirements of the NPDES Phase II that was issued in Feb 2007?

Not at this time; perhaps in a year or two.

b) Are there any other issues that the City feels may not have been addressed in the 2005 Plan?

This project may uncover some issues.

5. In addition to the Work Plan for this scope of work, will you also need assistance for implementing future requirements over the full course of the permit cycle?

An assessment of the resources necessary to implement the new code may be included as part of the consultant's scope but the actual implementation will not.

6. Do you anticipate changes to your development code to update or more comprehensively include the following issues:

- LID ordinance that provides development incentives over and above those outlined in the 2005 KCSWDM (or Ecology manual). Yes.
- Illicit connections (discharges, detection & elimination, enforcement) - We have some code language in the current code on this issue but may need to be updated
- Updates to code defining City maintenance or inspection of private facilities (enforcement). We have some code language in the current code on this issue but may need to be updated.

7. Do you anticipate adopting the 2005 KDSWDM at this time or taking interim measures until the KC manual is deemed equivalent to the 2005 Ecology Manual.

The code needs to be revised first. It is anticipated the code will specify the 2005 KCSWDM as the City standard since developer in the areas are familiar with KC requirements. Information from King County indicates "equivalency" may happen by January 2008. The equivalency to the state technical standards in the NPDES Phase II permit will likely include not only the 2005 KCSWDM with some changes but also other County regulations that combine with those in the KC SWDM to meet equivalency requirements. For example, the soil treatment BMPs required in the DOE manual (soil amendments and avoidance of compaction) are not contained in the KCSWDM but are instead contained in King County's Clearing and Grading Code (KCC 16.82). There are several other requirements like that. Also, there were some equivalency issues with the thresholds for when permits are required that trigger drainage review under the SWDM. These thresholds are contained in other parts of King County regulations. Consequently, when DOE deems the KC SWDM equivalent, they will likely specify a list of conditions for approved use of the SWDM in other jurisdictions.

8. Does this scope of work require an updated evaluation on financial impacts to the City?

Yes

9. What is meant by "final stage of grant approval"? What is the size of the grant? Would the City still need assistance on any part of this work should the grant not be approved and the City will still be required to comply with NPDES requirements?

When the RFQ was published, the grant application had been submitted, signed by the City, and the application was accepted by Ecology as "complete." We recently (9/24) received a contract from Ecology for the grant. It has been sent to the City Manager's office for signature and will be returned to Ecology for their final signature.

The grant is from Ecology's Local Government Stormwater Grant Program for FY 2008. Grant details can be found at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/pubs/0710062.pdf>.

10. Do you think that the 2005 Surface Water Master Plan update provides sufficient coverage of your needs now that the Phase II permit is in effect, or do you foresee using the hired consultant to assist in updating your SWM Plan or otherwise helping to redefine program focus and priorities?

See the answer to question 4 a. This project may help to point out program areas that need to be redefined or re-prioritized.

11. The RFP is focused on code revisions to adequately reflect current and near future stormwater management requirements. Would you say that code modifications are the crux of the need that the consultant will be hired to assist with? (i.e., is the code aspect of the work more important and thus potentially more time consuming than the needs analysis and updating of technical guidance?)

The technical piece will drive the code revisions. The code needs updating & clarification but it must also meet the upcoming technical requirements.

12. The City has worked with several stormwater consultants in recent years. Are you looking for a fresh, independent perspective now or does past familiarity with the City's stormwater programs have a bearing (albeit indirectly) on your selection process?

We are looking for the most qualified firm based on the evaluation criteria in the RFQ.

13. Do you have a predefined budget set aside for this effort? If so, are you able to say how much is allocated for this work?

A firm budget has not been established but it may be between \$50,000 and \$75,000.

14. What is your single greatest concern about the work to be done per the scope as outlined in this RFQ?

One of the major concerns is for the code changes to mesh with the recent critical areas ordinance changes and to move the City towards full Phase II compliance.

The deadline for qualifications by interested parties is still **October 3, 2007** by 4:00 p.m. Pacific Local Time.