

# NWPA Technical Advisory Committee – Feb. 28, 2012

**Josh Ellis (jellis@metroplanning.org)**

**Abby Crisostomo (acrisostomo@metroplanning.org)**

# Ordinance Survey

Thank you to those who completed it!

Algonquin

Aurora

Barrington

Batavia

Big Rock

Campton Hills

Carpentersville

Crystal Lake

DeKalb

DeKalb County

Elburn

Elgin

Geneva

Grayslake

Harvard

Kendall County

Lake County

Lake in the Hills

McHenry

Montgomery

North Aurora

Oswego

Prospect Heights

Sleepy Hollow

St. Charles

Tower Lakes

Union

Wadsworth

Wayne

Woodstock

# Ordinance Types

- Lawn Watering
- New Sod Restrictions
- Residential Indoor Plumbing and Appliance Standards
- Commercial/Industrial Indoor Plumbing and Appliance Standards
- Native Planting Requirements/Landscape Restrictions
- Rainwater Harvesting Requirements
- Waste Water Restrictions
- Water Conservation Pricing
- Conservation Design/Low-Impact Development Requirements
- Designated Sensitive Groundwater Recharge Areas
- Designated Wellhead Protection Setbacks

# Ordinance Assessment Criteria

- **Ease of implementation**

- Simplicity of recommended actions
- Gains versus effort
- Simplicity of implementation

- **Ease of enforcement**

- Monitoring
- Staffing

- **Collaboration**

- Necessity
- Ease

- **Impacts and Metrics**

- Water use
- Unintended consequences

# Ordinance Assessment

<b>Ease of implementation</b>	<b>Simplicity/ complication of behavior change</b>	<p>How many actors need to change their behavior?</p> <p>What is the frequency of the behavior change?</p> <p>What is the cost of the behavior change?</p> <p>What is the geographic scale of the behavior change?</p>
	<b>Water savings compared to effort</b>	<p>What is the scale of the water savings made by the change?</p> <p>Is there a threshold number of individuals at which participation is needed to make water savings worthwhile or that maximizes the water savings?</p>
	<b>Simplicity/ complication of implementation</b>	<p>Does an existing ordinance need to be changed or will new ordinances be implemented?</p> <p>Is the ordinance constantly in effect or is it triggered by an event?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the trigger event?</li> <li>• How is the trigger communicated?</li> <li>• Could there be a regionally agreed upon trigger?</li> </ul>
	<b>Time horizon</b>	<p>How long before there are impacts from the behavior change?</p>
	<b>Local examples</b>	<p>Are there examples already in place within the NWPA community?</p>

# Ordinance Assessment

Ease of enforcement	Monitoring	Who monitors?	Varies, generally municipal staff	0
		How often does monitoring need to occur?	Continuously	--
		How does monitoring work?	Patrolling/site visits, sometimes hotline	-
	Staffing	What is the impact on staff to educate/inform?	High impact	-
		What is the impact on staff to monitor?	High impact	--
	Public	What is the public perception of the behavior change?	Neutral	0
Collaboration	Necessity for collaboration	Is it more impactful/efficient to implement across municipal boundaries due to economy of scale?	Slightly, due to consistency	+
		How many communities need to be involved to implement successfully?	The more the better, but not necessary	+
	Ease of collaboration	How difficult is it politically for communities to collaborate?	Would require deferring to NWPA	+
		How difficult is it legally to implement changes collaboratively?	Low	+

# Ordinance Assessment

<b>Impacts and metrics</b>	<b>Impact on water quantity/use</b>	What are the theoretical impacts on water quantity/use?	Moderate	+
		Are there existing metrics?	Yes, generally not in place (water sales/use)	+
		Are there easy-to-track metrics of success?	Yes	+
		Are there metrics that can show causation, rather than correlation?	No, difficult to isolate	-
	<b>Unintended consequences that need to be accounted for</b>	Impact on municipal/department revenue	Slightly negative	-
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does behavior change result in declines in water sales?</li> </ul>	Yes	-
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any alternative rate structures relating to the behavior change?</li> </ul>	Yes, generally not in place (outdoor meter/rate)	+
		Impact on water quality	Slightly positive	+
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the theoretical impacts on water quality?</li> </ul>	Reduction in fertilizer runoff	+
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there existing metrics?</li> </ul>	None	0
<b>Unintended consequences that need to be accounted for</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there easy-to-track metrics of success?</li> </ul>	None	0	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there metrics that can show causation, rather than correlation?</li> </ul>	Possible	0	
	Impact on energy use	Moderately positive	+	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the theoretical impacts on energy use?</li> </ul>	Reduction in energy used to power sprinklers and to treat runoff	+	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there existing metrics?</li> </ul>	None	0	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there easy-to-track metrics of success?</li> </ul>	None	0	

# Deliverables

- ~~November 22: Maps of communities by ordinance type~~
- ~~January 24: Assessment of implementation, enforcement and monitoring strategies~~
- ~~February 28: Preview of assessment mechanism~~
  - ~~Determining necessary elements for successful ordinances~~
- **March 27: Preliminary recommendations on optimal ordinance types for municipal and interjurisdictional implementation**
- **April 24: Final presentation**
  - **Begin implementation discussion**



# U.S. EPA's Integrated Planning Approach Framework

# Framework

1. Background
2. Principles
  - a. Overarching
  - b. Guiding
3. Elements of an integrated plan
4. Implementation
  - a. Permits
  - b. Enforcement

# Overarching Principles

1. Maintain existing regulatory standards
2. Address most pressing issues first
3. Municipality develops integrated plan

# Guiding Principles

1. Reflect State requirements and input
2. Use existing CWA flexibilities
3. Maximize effectiveness through sequencing
4. Innovative technologies, approaches & practices
5. Community impacts/environmental justice
6. Technology-based and core requirements (no regulatory backsliding)
7. Financial strategy
8. Stakeholder input

# Elements of an Integrated Plan

1. Water quality, human health and regulatory issues
2. Current performance of existing and under consideration wastewater and stormwater systems
3. Community involvement process
4. Sustainability plan/asset management (alternatives, implementation schedule)
5. Measuring success

# Implementation

## Permits

Include integrated plans into NPDES permits

Increase discussion about permit trading

## Enforcement Actions

Look beyond just violation or not, see how actions fit into broader plans

Consent decrees like back-door planning, put the process up front

# Comments and Concerns

- Too vague
- Too expensive
- Complicated to measure success
- Not new
- Need legal stability
- Community involvement
- Need an interactive website
- More than just scheduling/sequencing
- Aligning with consent decrees
- Include source/drinking water
- Utility buy-in
- Uniform standards

# Contact Us:

**Metropolitan Planning Council**

[www.metroplanning.org](http://www.metroplanning.org)

[www.chicagolandh2o.org](http://www.chicagolandh2o.org)

**Josh Ellis, Program Director - [jellis@metroplanning.org](mailto:jellis@metroplanning.org)**

**Abby Crisostomo, Research Assistant -  
[acrisostomo@metroplanning.org](mailto:acrisostomo@metroplanning.org)**