Approach to Setting Local Planning Goals

New York
Who – How do you define “local”?

[From Expectations – The options are:

1. Locality jurisdictional boundaries (city, town, county, borough, township) or collections of such sub-state political subdivisions;

2. Federal facilities;

3. State facilities;

4. Soil & Water Conservation District (Conservation District) boundaries;

5. Regional entity boundaries (i.e. planning district commissions; regional river basin commissions; and utility districts);

6. Watershed or sub-watersheds of Chesapeake Bay tributaries;

7. Targeted areas with high nitrogen, phosphorus, or sediment yields (loadings);

8. Bay segment-sheds as depicted in the 2010 Chesapeake Bay TMDL;

9. Any area (e.g., MS4), entity, or political subdivision based on an identified need for pollutant load reductions for a given source sector or sectors; and

10. Some combination of the above.]
What are you intending to use as measurable goals below the state-basin scale?

[From Expectations, the options for measurable goals are:

- Percentage of BMP Implementation on land uses defined in the Phase 6 Watershed Model;
- Quantifying implementation goals for particular BMPs;
- Programmatic goals (i.e. ordinances with provisions for erosion and sediment control, urban nutrient management, post-construction performance standards) that include specific implementation, oversight, and enforcement requirements;
- Numeric nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment as expressed as reductions or maximum load goals
  - Numeric load goals for one or more pollutants (delivered load of 300 lbs. phosphorus)
  - Numeric reduction goals for one or more pollutants (reduce loads by 4000 lbs. nitrogen)
  - Yield based goals for one or more pollutants (0.41 lbs. phosphorus/acre/year from developed lands);
- Pace of implementation over a certain time frame;
- Percent reduction of existing loads over a certain time frame; and
- Percent of flow in certain tributaries/runoff captured – flow-based targets.]
How? – What are you doing to engage them?

• Outreach
  • Upper Susquehanna Coalition (19 Soil and Water conservation districts)
  • Stormwater Coalitions (2)
  • Regional Planning Boards (2)
• Decision Support Tools
  • CAST
  • Co-benefits
  • Cost Effectiveness
  • Monitoring Trends
When? – What is your schedule?

October 2018 -
• Present final local planning goal decision to USC, Stormwater Coalitions and Regional Planning Boards

November 2018 –
• BMP scenario runs with partners

December 2018/January 2019 –
• Finalize scenario runs
• Finalize draft WIP

February 2019/March 2019 –
• Internal/partner review of draft

April 2019 -
• Public review/input (April 12-June 7)

August 2019 – Final WIP
Approach for tracking progress

• Tracking using annual implementation progress reporting
• Adjustments will be made through 2-Year milestones
Challenges & Successes to Date

- Majority of SWCDs have participated
- Both regional planning boards involved and can provide support
- Apprehension from local partners
- Concern about how funding will be directed based on local planning goals (increased competition vs. cooperation), local goals will become mandatory
- SWCD coalition works well at the basin scale, many programs also funded at the basin scale