

The background features a series of concentric circles in light gray, some solid and some dashed, creating a ripple effect. A large blue callout box with a downward-pointing arrow is centered on the page.

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