

The background features a series of concentric circles in light gray, some solid and some dashed, creating a ripple effect. A large blue speech bubble is centered on the page, containing the title and subtitle text.

# 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
  - Two EPA-led discussion meetings in October – splitting watershed area
  - Upper Susquehanna Coalition (Soil and water conservation districts)
  - Stormwater Coalitions (2)
  - Regional Planning Boards (2)
- Decision Support Tools
  - Primarily CAST
  - Co-benefits
  - Monitoring Trends





## When? – What is your schedule?

### Outreach Schedule:

#### October -

- EPA-led meetings
- Finalize geographic scale decision
- Finalize county or sub-watershed analysis based on scale (working with EPA model team) based on specific target BMPs

#### November -

- Present final local planning goals to USC, Stormwater Coalitions and Regional Planning Boards

# Approach for tracking progress

- *From Phase III WIP Expectations document, “It is up to each jurisdiction to decide how it will track and report progress towards achievement of local planning goals through its two-year milestones and/or annual progress reporting to EPA.”*
- Tracking will be conducted through CAST or BMP submission data





# Challenges & Successes to Date

- Apprehension from local partners
- Concern about how funding will be directed based on local planning goals (increased competition vs. cooperation)