

## Watershed-based Stormwater Management Plans Strategy Worksheet: RB-S7

<p><b>Strategy:</b> Develop and implement watershed-based stormwater management plans for all watersheds with major existing or anticipated development, to ensure no degradation of stream ecosystems or increase in flooding and mitigate existing impacts.</p>	<p>Strategy Priority: <b>H</b> (H/M/L)</p>
<p><b>Objectives Addressed by Strategy:</b>  <b>NSSM-O1B:</b> To have no increase in potential flood damages, by 2008.  <b>NSSM-O1C:</b> Minimization of stream damages caused by excessive stream flows.  <b>LRSW-O1B.</b> Identify potential future stormwater induced alterations to the physical characteristics or functions of receiving water bodies in subwatersheds of the Lower Raritan WMA to prevent alteration to the physical characteristics of the receiving water bodies. By 2006, no net increase in the peak flow conditions/stormwater discharge volume for each HUC-14 subwatershed.  <b>LRSW-O3B.</b> No increase in the potential for flood damages due to <b>new development</b> or redevelopment.  <b>LRSW-O4A.</b> By 2008, watershed-based stormwater management plans will be adopted to guide the control of stormwater from new development and redevelopment and guide the improvement and maintenance of existing stormwater systems.  <b>MSW-O2A:</b> Assessment of scour, erosion and sedimentation problems and identification of solutions</p>	<p>Strategy Schedule: 2003+ (Begin/End)</p>
<p><b>Narrative Description of Strategy:</b> Stormwater requirements for new development are determined project-by-project, as are system modifications. Statewide technical requirements will be overprotective in some places, under-protective in others, and in both cases can be out-of-synch with watershed needs. Finally, the effectiveness of stormwater systems, as-built and over time, is not evaluated and maintained. NJDEP's proposed stormwater management rules at NJAC 7:8 recognize these points and provide an alternative approach. The January 2003 proposal would authorize development of watershed-based stormwater management plans that will supersede the standards normally required for specific sites, including the Residential Site Improvement Standards. Several incentives exist for taking this step: solving high profile public issues (e.g., local flooding, water supply), providing a local alternative to the Residential Site Improvement Standards, reduced construction and O&amp;M costs through more efficient systems, the potential to address NJPDES municipal stormwater permits regionally, TMDL implementation, and increased authority to regulate and influence stormwater practices. All of these issues exist in the Raritan Basin – nearly every stream shows some stress from stormwater flows, and nearly all streams face additional development and land use changes that will require stormwater management. Watershed-based stormwater management has the potential to benefit streams, government, citizens and developers.</p> <p>This strategy focuses on how to achieve development and implementation of such plans in key subwatersheds of the Raritan Basin. Most of the steps are standard planning practice and will be guided by the NJDEP regulations, which require that the plans be based on watersheds, rather than governmental jurisdictions. Two issues are critical – lead entities and funding. Given funding, appropriate lead entities can be a county government, municipal coalitions (e.g., Spruce Run Initiative, Great Swamp/Ten Towns Coalition), water utility, municipality, major landholder, Soil Conservation District and the Delaware &amp; Raritan Canal Commission. Several of these entities could only be the lead planning entity with outside funding. Strategy RB-S6 "Institutional Capacity for Stormwater Management Operation and Maintenance" also recommends an alternative not currently available in New Jersey – the stormwater utility. Most innovative stormwater work being performed nationally is by stormwater utilities – whether as a utility authority or as a line department within municipal or county government.</p> <p>Funding would be relatively simple under the stormwater utility approach. Stormwater utility fees are assessed much like electrical, water or sewer utility fees, and could be applied in part to development of these plans. Other funding sources are more limited, such as NJDEP grants under Section 319, or general budget revenues (e.g., as used by Morris County and NJWSA). It may be possible to charge developers for use of the models for their site-specific projects, as a cost saving to them that also reimburses the planning lead. Developer "stormwater mitigation fees" could also be used where the use of site-specific practices would actually reduce system benefits, and an in-lieu fee is assessed instead. Special legislative appropriations could be used, as is currently the case in several southern NJ subwatersheds through work of Soil Conservation Districts. Finally, legislation could be adopted to allow lead entities to develop the plans and then charge municipalities and developers pro rata shares of the costs, depending on the relative levels of impervious surfaces existing and projected in the watershed.</p>	
<p><b>Areawide WQM Plan Consistency Determination Issues:</b> Potential TMDL strategy for NPS-dominated streams</p>	

**Strategy Name: Watershed-based Stormwater Management Plans**

Page 2 of 3

Action Plan (Steps or Tasks)	Responsible Parties for Planning, Design & Implementation	Responsible Parties for Oversight	Resource Needs (L,M,H,VH)	Committed or Recommended Resources	Major Challenges and Opportunities	Evaluation Method & Indicators	Schedule and Milestones for Implementation
1. Using Raritan Project Technical Reports, identify subwatersheds with existing or projected impervious surface such that watershed-based stormwater management plans would be valuable	C: R: Raritan TAC	C: R: WMA Committees, RBC	L	C: Raritan Reports R: Existing resources		Listing of subwatersheds using %TIA, population projections and available land	
2. Develop and implement a system for assigning relative priorities for plan development to each subwatershed	C: R: Raritan TAC	C: R: WMA Committees, RBC	L	C: R: Existing resources	Ranking heavily developed subwatersheds v. developing subwatersheds in terms of priority – existing v. potential damage	Priority list of 15-25 subwatersheds for initial work	
3. Identify appropriate lead entities for each high priority subwatershed	C: R: WMA Committees	C: R: RBC	L	C: R: Existing resources	Leads may not commit without funding	Leads identified and committed	
4. Develop funding and committees for each high priority subwatershed	C: NJWSA <sup>1</sup> R: Lead entities	C: R: WMA Committees	L for committees M-H for each project	C: R: Existing resources, 319 grants, special appropriations, developer contributions	Plans will cost \$200K or more for a sizable subwatershed	Active projects	

<sup>1</sup> Commitment for the Mulhockaway Creek Stormwater Management Plan (funded 2002); potential commitment for Cedar Grove Brook (funding application 2002)

**Strategy Name: Watershed-based Stormwater Management Plans**

Page 3 of 3

Action Plan (Steps or Tasks)	Responsible Parties for Planning, Design & Implementation	Responsible Parties for Oversight	Resource Needs (L,M,H,VH)	Committed or Recommended Resources	Major Challenges and Opportunities	Evaluation Method & Indicators	Schedule and Milestones for Implementation
5. Develop watershed-based stormwater management plans for high priority subwatersheds	C: NJWSA R: Lead entities	C: NJDEP R: Project advisory committees as required by NJAC 7:8 (proposed)	M-H per plan VH overall	C: R: Project funds from Action Step 4	Must meet all aspects of NJDEP regulations at NJAC 7:8	Advisory Committee and NJDEP agreement that plan meets objectives and regulations	
6. Adopt plans through NJDEP and Site Improvement Advisory Board processes, and as a component of Municipal Master Plans and ordinances	C: R: NJDEP, SIAB	C: R: WMA Committees, RBC	L-M per plan M-H overall	C: R: Project funds from Action Step 4, existing resources		Full adoption	
7. Implement plans and evaluate over time	C: R: Lead entities and involved municipalities	C: R: WMA Committees, RBC	H-VH per plan	C: R: Project review fees, developer costs, municipal and county stormwater program resources	Regulation of new land uses will be easier than retrofit of existing land uses	Plan compliance and results assessment	