MTAAP AM DISCUSSION GUIDE
March 1, 2016

Group A: Comprehensive Plans
1. Where is this tool most effective?
   a. Not regulatory in either PA or NJ
   b. Multi-municipal comprehension plans, regardless of size
   c. NJ legal authority for multi-municipal stormwater plan
   d. "everywhere"
2. What needs to be included in this tool for it to be effective?
   a. Every 10 year reevaluation update? Not sitting on the shelf?
   b. Accountability
      i. Environmental groups
      ii. EAC/planning commission
      iii. Grant funding (Ches Co)
   c. Natural reservation protection incorporated seamlessly
   d. Faster process of updating
   e. Connected well with update to zoning ordinance
   f. Involved elected officials
   g. Consistency with county plan
   h. What are the incentives to update?
      i. Links to funding
   i. What needs to be included?
      i. NJ: need legislation to make water quality mandatory (currently optional element)
      ii. PA: environmental or stormwater management element
   j. Updated maps, monitoring, DATA, regularly updated
      i. Need someone who is interpreting data – who does that?
      ii. Impaired streams
      iii. Data redefined frequently
   k. Free data resources and visualization resources
   l. Understanding importance of mapping
   m. Understanding of economic value prior
   n. Incentives, drivers to implement
      i. Ex: Oxford, Ches Co
         1. Multi-municipal – 516 implementation agreement
         2. Board of supervisors – changing of guard
         3. Collaboration with others helps move planning forward
         4. Outreach, resources

o. Municipal buy-in (adding own $)
p. Community members who are drinking locally sourced surface/ground tap water
    i. Those with public versus well water supply (Aqua PA)
q. In-house staff or consultants; type of education, use age as a proxy to openness
r. Strong EC/EAC or other champion – watershed organizations, nonprofits
    i. List of recent projects
s. Presence of stormwater collaborative/regional collaboration but *centralized technical assistance*
t. Regulatory driver? But need more incentive
u. Aging infrastructure -> prioritization of pipes
    i. Public health issue
        1. DEP reports
        2. Engineering report cards of infrastructure
        3. Cameras
v. Installation of rain gardens/green stormwater infrastructure?
w. One demo area leads to more demo areas (first mover)
    i. Could be successful or unsuccessful?
    ii. Is there a tipping point?
x. Communities with ag land hesitant to adapt regulations
y. Developing communities hesitant to adopt regulations
    i. Communities with development pressure are more likely to have regulation than low development municipalities – building permit issues, population growth → SF homes
z. Education on economic benefits → taking action
    i. Ex: Lehigh Valley Planning Commission: return on investment study
    ii. Communities with access to economic data are more likely to take action
    iii. Presence of valuation study
aa. Stability of elected government – sweet spot of turnover?
    i. Flipping of political parties
bb. Entrepreneurialism/openness to new information of planners, consultants
    i. Refer to champion question
    ii. Does this come from champion elected officials?
cc. Active land conservation projects
    i. Ex. Haverford
    ii. % preferred lands, lands under easement
    iii. Nature of easement?
    iv. Type of preserved land?

v.   Preservation tax – willingness to float bonds, tax selves
            dd. Access to data (especially for mapping products) and understanding how to
                    use it → better water quality
    3. Who provides technical assistance for this tool?
            a. ANJEC, Sustainable Jersey
            b. Brandywine Conservancy
            c. Many NGOs if funding is available
            d. County planning offices
            e. Program to update comprehensive plan with financial benefits
            f. Floating bonds, DEPs?
            g. Good local volunteer task force
            h. Temple Center for Sustainable Communities
            i. DRBC (data mapping)
            j. USGS

Group B: Preservation Program
    1. Where is this tool most effective?
            a. Wealthy municipalities → preservation
            b. Municipalities with riparian buffers
                    i.   Innovative/progressive munis
                    ii. Easement is a request during SALDO
            c. Restoration is most appropriate in developed communities and ag areas
            d. Stewardship in rural/forested
            e. Preservation is effective in munis that have an OS plan
    2. What needs to be included in this tool for it to be effective?
            a. Stewardship plan and training
            b. Re-thinking the value (econ) of clean water → internalize environmental
                    costs
            c. Public information campaign around value of OS, environmental resource,
                    and water
                    i.   We need help from media and messaging experts
    3. Who provides technical assistance for this tool?
            a. Land trusts!!! Consultants
            b. Conservation districts (stewardship)
                    i.   Cooperative extensions
                    ii. DCNR/state agencies
            c. Who else?
                    i.   Consultants to developers
                    ii. Consumers drive decisions

    d. Public needs to know that water quality is THEIR responsibility → not someone else's!

    e. Consumer can drive good land development practices, including conservation/land preservation practices

    f. MS4 program is making progress on water quality issues, even though implementation has been slow

Group C: Ordinances

1. Where is this tool most effective?
2. What needs to be included in this tool for it to be effective?
   a. Enforcement is key
   b. Capacity: time, funding, people capacity, charge fees
   c. Clarity: sometimes wiggle room/flexibility is good – "performance standards" incentivize
   d. Lists: good for clarity – as long as updated and achievable
   e. Flexibility – baseline needs to be high enough
   f. Clear vision in comprehensive plan needed
   g. Good statement of intent needed
   h. Regulatory consistency and clear path needed from developers perspective
   i. Innovating as science and best practices change
      i. Process of updating?
      ii. Living document
      iii. Institutional support
   j. N.C. separate goals from practices: update practices (county rule) as needed, goals remain
   k. Redevelopment: stormwater standards integrated
   l. Time of sale triggers for enforcement of regulations
      i. Many munis push back
3. Who provides technical assistance for this tool?
   a. Regulation agencies: EPA/DEP, DVRPC
   b. Counties
   c. Chambers and Builders Association
   d. Consultants
   e. Local engineers
   f. Solicitors
   g. Fire departments
   h. NGO's – ANJEC/Sustainable Jersey, NLT, BC, PEC, PA Reg Council, PADEL
   i. Association of Townships
   j. Academia

4. ?
    a. Conflicting information, goals
    b. Outdated info, docs
    c. Public desires
    d. NJ – getting to resilience – coalesce at CC change adoption and mitigation
    e. Consensus building
    f. Process needed to bring people together
    g. Difference in "languages"
    h. "silver jackets"
    i. Cross pollination of regs – zoning ordinances, SALDO, plans, stormwater ordinances
        i. New styles: form based codes, more graphics
        ii. Rural counties; cost share technical assistance provider, from government or nonprofits (not developers)
    j. Living docs
        i. Separate goals and practices
        ii. Maintenance – tie to design
        iii. Better ordinances – not more
        iv. Tie land use part of zoning ordinance to natural resources on the ground
        v. Bring state agencies into processes to not trump local decisions

Group D: People
1. Where is this tool most effective?
    a. Citizen appointed committees
    b. EAC/ECs
    c. Where they spend time is dependent on county
    d. Are they being listened to?
    e. Are they reviewing development plans? IF NOT, WHY NOT?
    f. Set by ordinance
    g. Annual spending on EC projects
2. What needs to be included in this tool for it to be effective? [How do you know a Planning Board/Citizen Committee is effective?]
    a. Initiatives/projects
        i. Ex. Stream clean up
    b. Responsible for MS4 education
    c. Liaisons to planning board from elected body
    d. Attendance at planning board meetings, elected body meetings
    e. Zoning variance board

- i. # of variances given
  1. Indication of education
  2. Indication of flawed ordinance? Not necessarily planning board?
- f. Planning board/committee
  - i. Issue of waivers
    1. "good enough"
    2. Ultimately decided by elected body
  - ii. Training
    1. On boarding with professional staff
    2. Required training → or tied to incentive
    3. PA vs NJ
    4. At meetings
    5. Appreciation
- g. Process for finding citizen appointees
  1. Education/advertising
  2. Online application
  3. Community events/table
  - ii. Gap analysis for skills
  - iii. Part of agenda devoted to "planning"
  - iv. Combined training for residents and board members
3. Who provides technical assistance for this tool?
   - a. Mont Co Land Trust's Green Futures
   - b. Peer learning
   - c. Specialized education
     - i. Solicitors
     - ii. Engineers
4. General Discussion:
   - a. Professional staff: how to get new blood OR new thinking?
     - i. Engineer
     - ii. DPW → long term view, proactive
     - iii. Zoning officer that knows the ordinances and plan
     - iv. Municipal solicitor with land use specialty
   - b. Technical assistance: peer learning
     - i. Engineer to engineer
     - ii. In some cases: munis look to county
   - c. Elected body
     - i. Champions
     - ii. Training/job skills