Green Infrastructure Model Local Law Project

An in-depth look at the efforts of the Stormwater Coalition of Albany County

Stormwater Coalition of Albany County

Members

- City of Albany
- Albany County
- Town of Bethlehem
- City of Cohoes
- Town of Colonie
- Village of Colonie
- Village of Green Island
- Town of Guilderland
- Village of Menands
- Town of New Scotland
- Village of Voorheesville
- City of Watervliet
- University at Albany State University of New York

Project Need

MS4 Permit Requirements

- Implement components of a Stormwater Management Program, addressing:
 - Post- Construction Stormwater Management
- Traditional MS4s: "...encouraged to review, and revise where appropriate, local codes and laws that preclude GI..."
- Alb Co & University at Albany: "...must incorporate principles of Low Impact Development (LID), Better Site Design (BSD) and other Green Infrastructure Practices to the MEP."; "...must consider natural resource protection, impervious area reduction, maintaining natural hydrologic condition in developments, buffers or set back distances for protection of environmentally sensitive areas such as streams, wetlands, and erodible soils in the development of environmental plans."
- Environmental stewardship and sustainability

Funding

- In November 2009 the Stormwater Coalition of Albany County applied for a NYSDEC Environmental Protection Fund Water Quality Improvement Project grant
 - Purpose: Among other, to develop Model Green Infrastructure Local Law(s)
- In December 2010 the Coalition was awarded the grant
- Mid-April 2011 the work plan was submitted to, and approved by, NYSDEC

PDH Question 1:

How does the project meet the NYSDEC MS4 permit requirements?

Coalition formed a small focus group called the Green Infrastructure Local Law Advisory Committee (GILLAC).

Consisted of staff from member MS4s with planning, stormwater engineering and code enforcement experience and responsibilities.

Ultimately tasked with scrutinizing their local laws and acting as a liaison.

Realized early on that there was not enough money to address each of their goals individually, and compromise would be necessary for success of the whole.

GI Local Laws – Project Team

- By mid-2011 a Request for Proposals was developed and approved by GILLAC
- By January, 2012 the consulting firm, Barton and Loguidice, with legal support from others, was selected
- Once hired, the Team most directly involved with all aspects of the project took shape
 - Nadine Medina, PE from Barton & Loguidice, PC; Legal Team; and the two GILLAC Co-Chairs, Nancy Heinzen, Stormwater Coalition Program Coordinator and Leslie Lombardo, Senior Planner, Albany County Planning Board
- The GILLAC Co-Chairs served as a liaison to the remaining Coalition members

Formation of a small project team with strong and knowledgeable leadership had <u>significant</u> implications in COST SAVINGS, STREAMLINING, and EFFICIENCY.

Project Methodology

Scorecard Development

- Coalition members developed the Scorecard, drawing from various resources
 - Center for Watershed Protection Code and Ordinance Worksheet
 - Code and Ordinance Worksheet for Development Rules in NYS
 - USEPA Managing Wet Weather With GI Water Quality Scorecard
- Purpose was to evaluate existing municipal zoning ordinances, comprehensive plans, review procedures, and local laws against recognized green infrastructure practices
- Resulted in an overall "Green Score"
- In addition to overall scores, the total score was broken out into sub-categories for:
 - Reduction of Impervious Cover
 - Preservation of Natural Areas and Conservation Design
 - Design Elements for Stormwater Management
 - Promotion of Efficient, Compact Development Patterns and Infill
- Completed scorecards were provided to the Co-Chairs of GILLAC, and were reviewed & corrected, as needed

Customize a scorecard based on YOUR project's desired goals and outcomes!

After the scorecards were returned to us for review, we found that some question did not apply to all MS4s (SUNY/County), resulting in artificially lower scores.

Original Scorecard

- MS4s were provided with a scorecard
- Were asked to identify all development rules that apply in municipality
- Also asked to identify the local, state, and federal authorities that administer or enforce development rules
- Background documents (existing code language, etc) were gathered and copies provided
- The scorecard was completed and scored by each MS4

Introduction

Stormwater Coalition Scorecard - Inventory of Municipal Codes for Green Infrastructure Practices (September 2011)

The Stormwater Coalition Scorecard allows an in-depth review of the standards, local laws, ordinances, and codes (i.e., the development rules) that shape how development occurs in your municipality. You are guided through a systematic comparison of your local development rules against recognized green infrastructure practices. Institutional frameworks, regulatory structures and incentive programs are included in this review. A combination of documents were used including the Center for Watershed Protection Code and Ordinance Worksheet; the Code and Ordinance Worksheet for Development Rules in New York State (a document developed by NYS Department of Environmental Conservation Hudson River Estuary Program, NYS Water Resources Institute in Cooperation with the Center For Watershed Protection); and the U.S. EPA Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure Municipal Handbook-Water Quality Scorecard. The scorecard consists of a series of questions organized into four categories. Points are assigned based on how well the current development rules agree with suggested development principles that support green infrastructure. Green infrastructure practices are included within the NYSDEC MS4 Permit and the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual (August, 2010).

PREPARING TO COMPLETE THE COALITION SCORECARD

Two tasks need to be performed before you begin the scorecard. First, you must identify all the development rules that apply in your municipality. Second, you must identify the local, state, and federal authorities that actually administer or enforce the development rules within your municipality. Both tasks require a large investment of time. The development process is usually shaped by a complex labyrinth of regulations, criteria, and authorities. A team approach may be helpful. You may wish to enlist the help of a local plan reviewer, land planner, land use attorney, or civil engineer. Their real-world experience

with the development process is often very useful in completing the worksheet.

Identify the Development Rules

Gather the key documents that contain the development rules in your municipality. A list of potential documents to look for is provided in Table 1. Keep in mind that the information you may want on a particular development rule is not always found in code or regulation, and may be hidden in supporting design manuals, review checklists, guidance documents or construction specifications. In most cases, this will require an extensive search. Few communities include all of their rules in a single document. Be prepared to contact state, federal, or local agencies to obtain copies of the needed documents.

Don't be afraid to be detailed! Providing instructions on how to complete the scorecards helps ensure continuity and as much an "apples-to-apples" approach as possible. This is VERY important in collaborations.

Reiterate that this is not a test. While it may seem noncritical, you may find that a human's inherent desire to score highly may carry with it unintended consequences.

For

(Name of MS4/Municipality)

QUESTIONS	Yes	No	Score	Local Law ID reference: code name/section/page #	Clarification notes
Category I: Reduction of Impervious Cover					
Street width and length:					
 What is the minimum pavement width allowed for streets in low density residential developments that have less than 500 daily trips (ADT)? 					
If your answer is between 18-22 feet, give yourself 1 point					
 At higher densities are parking lanes allowed to also serve as traffic lanes (i.e., queuing streets)? 					
If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point					
 Do street standards promote the most efficient street layouts that reduce overall street length? 		o			
If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point					
Right-of-Way Width:					
4. What is the minimum right of way (ROW) width for a residential street?					
If your answer is less than 55 feet, give yourself 1 point					
5. Does the code allow utilities to be placed under the paved section of the ROW?					
If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point					
Cul-de-Sacs:					
6. What is the minimum radius allowed for cul-de-sacs?					
If your answer is less than 35 feet, give yourself 1 point					
If your answer is 36 feet to 45 feet, give yourself .5 point					
7. Can a landscaped island be created within the cul-de-sac?					
If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point		1. at			
8. Are alternative turnarounds such as "hammerheads" allowed on short streets in low density residential developments?					
If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point					
Subtotal					

Coalition Scorecard_Questions_2011_9-7_For Distribution_FINAL.xlsx

Scorecard Page 1 of 15

Set realistic, but stringent, time frames for scorecard data collection. This is necessary to keep the project moving for the benefit of the whole.

Assign the most appropriate MS4 representative(s) to complete or coordinate this task. It is critical in achieving timeliness and a high degree of confidence in the results.

Preliminary Scorecard Analysis

- The following outlines the detailed process Ms. Lombardo undertook to analyze the scorecards:
 - Checked, and corrected if necessary, the math on scorecard subtotals
 - Confirmed references to municipal code, where provided, and added clarification if needed
 - Added a column to each scorecard labeled "real score if no code", and went back through scorecards to add or remove points based on MS4 notes such as "No code" or "Handled by review process of Planning Board or staff", etc
 - Added clarification notes as needed to assist in consultant analysis

Inventory of Municipal Codes for Green Infrastructure

For: _____ (Name of MS4/Municipality)

QUESTIONS	Yes	No	Score	Real score if no code	Local Law ID reference: code name/section/page #	Clarification notes
Sidewalks and Curbs						
9. What is the minimum sidewalk width allowed in the municipality? 5 feet If your answer is 4 feet or less , give yourself 1 point.		x			ADA requires 5 ft minimum	
 Are sidewalks always required on both sides of residential streets? If your answer is NO, give yourself 1 point. 		x	1			
 Are sidewalks allowed to be sloped to drain to the front yard instead of the street? If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point. 	x		1	0	Allowed through plan review if site supports it	no code
12. Can alternate pedestrian networks be substituted for sidewalks (e.g., trails through common areas)? If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point.	x		1	0		no code
Driveways						
 13. What is the minimum driveway width specified in the municipality? NAfeet If your answer is 9 feet or less (one lane) or 18 feet (two lanes), give yourself 1 point. 	x					NA
14. Can pervious materials be used for single family home driveways (e.g., grass, gravel, porous pavers, etc)? If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point.	x		1	0	Allowed through plan review	We have a 13 lot residential subdivision which is a case study for porous pavement driveways and road not in code
15. Can a "two track" design be used at single family driveways? (grass in between) If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point.	х		1	0		•
16. Are shared driveways permitted in residential developments? If your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point.	х		1	0		•
17. Are driveways allowed to be sloped to drain to yard areas instead of the street?	х					All added impervious area are required to be treated onsite if regional controls are not in place
ir your answer is YES, give yourself 1 point. Subtotal			7	1	1	no code, no points

20

Final Scorecard Analysis

- Revised and original scores were provided to the B&L for analysis
- B&L discovered there were instances in which responses were inconsistent between MS4s
- Some questions did not apply to all MS4s
- Project Team determined that some of the scorecard questions could best be addressed by additional MS4 education rather than provisions in a local law
- Various approaches were analyzed by the Project Team
- Scores were adjusted a final time to ensure that questions such as these were scored consistently

PDH Question 2:

What are some common pitfalls to avoid when creating a "scorecard"

TIP

Having an "independent", knowledgeable, party review and revise as necessary, the scorecards was critical to ensure an overall consistent approach in line with the project intent.

DOCUMENT any changes made, as well as the reason for them. When using state/federal funds, you will be expected to stick to your work plan and grant application. This requires you to adapt throughout your process when working in a collaborative setting.

Gap Analysis

- The Project Team did not believe that comparing all scores to one another would provide a consistent review approach
- The Project Team decided to provide an overall Gap Analysis based on numeric percentages, as in the percent responding yes to using a green infrastructure practice
- Analysis incorporated all MS4s as well as separate Gap Analysis for Cities, Towns, Villages, and University at Albany & Albany County
- Analysis indicated that questions that were not applicable to University at Albany and Albany County (cul-de-sacs, etc) were artificially lowering overall Coalition scores
- Separate gap analysis were prepared

QUESTIONS	C/Alb	C/Coh	C/Wvliet	V/Col	V/GI	V/Men	V/Voor	T/Beth	T/Col	T/New S	SUNY A	Alb Cty	# NA	# Munis	# Possible	# Attained	% who attained
Category I: Reduction of Impervious Cover						Correcte	d Scores				<u>.</u>						1
Street width and length:																	_
 What is the minimum pavement width allowed for streets in low density residential developments that have less than 500 daily trips (ADT)? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	12	1	8%
At higher densities are parking lanes allowed to also serve as traffic lanes (i.e., queuing streets)?	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	NA	NA	3	12	9	1	11%
3. Do street standards promote the most efficient street layouts that reduce overall street length?	0	0	3	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA	2	12	10	2	20%
Right-of-Way Width:			N			Correcte	d Scores							Ĵ.			
4. What is the minimum right of way (ROW) width for a residential street?	0	0	0	1	- 10	1		<to>1</to>	3	-0	0	31	0	12	12	7	58%
5. Does the code allow utilities to be placed under the paved section of the ROW?	0	0	1	<u>.</u>	t	8	0	1	- 31	0	- 31	्व	0	12	12	8	67%
Cul-de-Sacs:						Correcte	d Scores				4						
6. What is the minimum radius allowed for cul-de-sacs?	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	NA	2	12	10	1	10%
7. Can a landscaped island be created within the cul-de-sac?	0	0.5	NA	0	0	- 31	0	1	1	0	31	NA	2	12	10	5	50%
8. Are alternative turnarounds such as "hammerheads" allowed on short streets in low density residential developments?	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	NA	NA	3	12	9	1	11%
Sidewalks and Curbs						Correcte	d Scores										
9. What is the minimum sidewalk width allowed in the municipality?	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	20	:0 :	0	.0	12	12	1	8%
10. Are sidewalks always required on both sides of residential streets?	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	-1	0	- 31	3	0	12	12	7	58%
11. Are sidewalks allowed to be sloped to drain to the front yard instead of the street?	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	12	12	4	33%
12. Can alternate pedestrian networks be substituted for sidewalks (e.g., trails through common areas)?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	D	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0%
Driveways						Correcte	d Scores	v				1					
13. What is the minimum driveway width specified in the municipality?	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	NA	0	NA	0	2	12	10	2	20%
 Can pervious materials be used for single family home driveways (e.g., grass, gravel, porcus pavers, etc)? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA	2	12	10	0	0%
15. Can a "two track" design be used at single family driveways? (grass in between)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA	2	12	10	0	0%
16. Are shared driveways permitted in residential developments?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	NA	1	1	12	11	2	18%
17. Are driveways allowed to be sloped to drain to yard areas instead of the street?	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	1	1	12	11	2	18%
Parking Ratios					2 2	Correcte	d Scores	01 - 01 		12 							
 What is the minimum parking ratio for a professional office building (per 1000 ft2 of gross floor area)? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30.	0	NA	4	12	11.	0	0%
 What is the minimum required parking ratio for shopping centers (per 1,000 ft2 gross floor area)? 	Ø	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	NA	NA	2	12	10	4	40%
20. What is the minimum required parking ratio for single family homes (per home)?	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	NA	NA	2	12	10	9	90%
spaces																	
If your answer is less than or equal to 2.0 spaces, give yourself 1 point																	1
 All sourceybring realisioning all pressences is readily times (see itianities) - realisioners) 				Q	UESTION	S REMOV	ED FROM	ANALYSIS	; .	Teconr				10			
Type: analysis of YEE, give powers CT point			BESTAE	UKESSED	THROUG	H EDUCA	TION RAT	HER THAT	N PROJEC	SCOPE							

Category 1

Reduction of Impervious Cover

All MS4 Gap Analysis



Green Infrastructure Model Local Law Project

Cat 1 Gaps_Reduction of Imp Cover_All MS4.xlsx

Cities Gap Analysis



Green Infrastructure Model Local Law Project

Cat 1 Gaps_Reduction of Imp Cover_Cities.xlsx

Towns Gap Analysis



Green Infrastructure Model Local Law Project

Cat 1 Gaps_Reduction of Imp Cover_Towns.xlsx

Villages Gap Analysis



Green Infrastructure Model Local Law Project

Cat 1 Gaps_Reduction of Imp Cover_Villages.xlsx

University at Albany/Albany County Gap Analysis



Green Infrastructure Model Local Law Project

Cat 1 Gaps Reduction of Imp Cover Non Trad.xlsx

Comparison



Gap Identification & Selection

- The Consultant Team created "Sorted Final Gap Identification" spreadsheets
 - Visually presents the percentage of MS4s who answered positively to each question on the scorecard; focusing on MS4s with land-use control (traditional)
 - Bar charts that graph scorecard questions against the percentage of positive results
 - Three additional thresholds (lines) of 10%, 25%, and 50% were added to the graph to illustrate % of positive answers
 - Questions addressed by a majority (over 50%) were determined to not be priority gaps for the Coalition









Gap Selection

- Across all categories, Project Team came up with 14 potential gaps, out of which only 8 would be addressed
 - Comprised of groupings of similar scorecard questions
- GILLAC met to discuss the draft gap list, and to determine which of the 14 they would select for the project deliverables
- All members of GILLAC determined that they wanted to consider the gaps more thoroughly and discuss them with relevant MS4 staff before committing to a set of deliverables
- Each MS4 ranked the 14 gaps in order of 1-14 (1 being the gap they feel most relevant and 14 being the gap they feel least relevant) and provided this to the GILLAC Chairs
- GILLAC Co-Chairs produced a summary ranking of all gaps which they then provided to the Consultant Team
- Top 8 became the selected gaps

TIP

Consider grouping your scorecard in ways that make for easy determination of "gap" subject matter. We originally said we would address 8 questions, but it made more sense to address 8 similarly themed groups of questions.

IE OF MS4:		N/A		<u> </u>	TOTAL	TOTAL	Overall											
GAP ID	Sub Cat	Questions	CATEGORY	C/Alb	C/Coh	C/Wvlt	V/Col	V/GI	V/Men	V/Vor	T/Beth	T/Col	T/NS	SUNYA	AlbCn	(Cumulative of Ind MS4 Rankings)	(Average of Ind MS4 Rankings)	8 in bold and gray)
	Parking Ratios	18, 19																
	Parking Lot Design	27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32	5															
	Shared Parking	23,24,25	Cov															
I-A		skip #'s 20, 22, 26	vion		2	2	1	1	9	6	3	7	1	- 4	7	43	3.91	1
I-B	Street width and length	1,2,3,	Imper		14	10	14	4	8	8	10	13	2	6	10	99	9.00	12
	Sidewalks and Curbs	9,11,12	an of															
1-C		skip # 10	Suctio		13	9	13	2	7	7	6	12	3	8	13	93	8.45	8
I-D	Cul-de-Sacs	6,7,8	I: Rec		12	14	11	8	6	1	7	4	5	5	12	85	7.73	,
I-E	Driveways	13, 14, 15, 16, 17	tegory		11	4	10	3	5	12	12	311	-11	7	14	100	9.09	13
ŀF	Model Local Law Language for County, GI Matrix; Guidelines SUNY		8		10	8	12	7	3	14	14	8	6	1	1	B4	7,64	6
	Locating Site In Less Sensitive Areas	37*, 38, 39 (*50% Q)	esign														·	
	Clearing and Grading		D NO															
II-A		Skip # 36 FEMA allows development in flood plain, if follow flood plain requirements; 64; 65	I Conservat		3	7	7	6	1	13	1	6	7	9	4	64	5.82	4
	Open Space Management - 85D angle	60*, 61, 62 (*40% Q	Areas and															
II-B		skip #63	tural		4	5	6	12	4	5	11	5	8	10	11	81	7.36	5
II-C	Stream Buffers	42,43,44,45,49,50,51	of N.		9	13	3	11	11	2	2	9	13	13	8	94	8.55	9 or 10 (Tie)
II-D	Wetland Buffers	46,47,48,49,50,51	vation		8	12	4	9	12	4	8	14	14	14	9	108	9.82	14
II-E	Tree and Forest Conservation	67. 68. 69	Preset		7	3	5	14	14	10	9	10	9	11	5	97	B.82	
	Conservation Incentives- financial	70, 71	egory II:															
11-F	Preservation of Undisturbed Areas	40* (*40% Q)	ð		1	11	9	10	13	11	13	1	10	12	3	94	8.55	9 or 10 (Tie)
III-A	Rooftop Runoff	77,78	gory III: Mgmt esign ments		6	1	2	5	2	9	4	2	12	2	6	51	6.64	2
10-8	Vegetated Open Channels	76* (*40% Q)	S S S		5	6	8	13	10	3	5	1	1	3	2		5.64	3

Selected Gaps, in order of ranking

- Gap 1: Parking (Parking Ratios, Parking Lot Design, Shared Parking)
- Gap 2: Rooftop Runoff
- Gap 3: Vegetated Open Channels
- Gap 4: Locating Sites in Less Sensitive Areas & Clearing and Grading
- Gap 5: Open Space Management
- Gap 6: Model Local Law Language/Guidance for Albany County and University at Albany
- Gap 7: Cul-de-Sacs
- Gap 8: Sidewalks and Curbs

PDH Question 3:

In your experience, what is the most common "green infrastructure gap" you encounter?

***TIP**

Take time to understand the needs of all members. In this case, special questionnaires were developed with input from the GILLAC Co-chairs and B&L. The responses to these questionnaires helped shape the final product for University at Albany and Albany County.

Gap Research

- B&L began to research relevant guidance, laws, and design standards throughout the state, as well as to document those learned or developed through industry experience
- GILLAC Chairs provided documents they felt were useful and relevant to the process as well

TIP^{*}

Ask others for input on resources!

Understand that research can go on, literally, forever. Set reasonable expectations and deadlines, but be sure to have a thorough list of existing documents and examples to include in your review.

Research Resources

- Cleveland Heights, OH Parking Code
- City of Boston Parking Ratio Guidelines for their ZBA
- New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual
- Alexandra, VA Shared Parking Fact Sheet
- LEED for Neighborhood Development
- Victoria, BC, Canada Shared Parking Code
- Stormwater Center Open Space Model Ordinance
- Zoning Ordinance, Calvert County, MD
- Land Preservation District Model Zoning, Montgomery County, PA
- Zoning Ordinance: Open Space Community, Hamburg Township, MI
- New York City Green Council Task Force proposed laws
- City of Portland, OR "Green Streets"
- City of Chicago, IL "Green Alleys"

TIP

Don't be afraid to get your ideas on paper! It doesn't matter at first if they're feasible or not. It's what I call a "Data Dump". Write first, refine later. This is the best way to ensure you're thinking out of the box and not limiting your creative and professional potential!

Before finalizing, try to get a peer review by others with varying levels of industry-specific experience!

B&L Gap Language Reviewers

- The panel of professionals included the following designations and certifications: CPESC, CPSWQ, CESSWI, LEED AP, PE, RLA, and AICP
 - Environmental Scientist
 - Civil Engineer
 - Environmental Engineer
 - Highway Engineer
 - Landscape Architect
 - Land Use Planners
 - Town Designated Engineers
- Draft gap language was distributed to the GILLAC Chairs

GILLAC Gap Review

- GILLAC members were asked to review the draft gap language
- Comments and questions were provided verbally during a series of two meetings
- Comments were provided to the Consultant Team
- Consultant Team was then tasked with reviewing and addressing the comments
- Consultant Team addressed those that were feasible within the scope and not best address by clarifying the project intent
- Consultant Team provided feedback to GILLAC

Drafting of Laws

- After addressing GILLAC's comments, Consultant Team organized the language to ensure that the tiered approach
- Included separating the various requirements identified in each local law into one of three categories
 - Minimum Action Level: Majority of MS4 communities incorporated, either by regulation or by unwritten policy of a local board, the topic area within the gap category.
 - Best Management Action Level: Language was included or considered in the review process by a few MS4s with newer code language. In this category, very few municipalities identified equivalent language in their policies and, in several cases, the existing language could better serve green infrastructure if strengthened or added to. This level assumes that MS4s have adopted the Minimum Action Level language.
 - Model Community Action Level: Language was regarding topics that are relatively new to be incorporated to municipal code based on new information in engineering design for stormwater or more recent land use planning ideas, or if it represents ideas that have traditionally been considered incentives within zoning ordinance language. This level assumes that MS4s have adopted each of the preceding levels.

Drafting of Laws

- Several numbers (dimensions, ratios, percentages, etc) within the local law language are bolded
 - Indicates that the number represents the gold standard
 - Can be modified to best suit the MS4
- Local law language represents a collection of codes that can be pulled from as deemed applicable, or used as a whole
- Sections can be relaxed or made more stringent, and not all sections are necessary to use if not pertinent
- Each section represents a stand-alone suggested practice/language, and MS4s can decide which to implement

TIP

THIS IS NOT ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL! Flexibility may be needed, and at the very least will help remove real of perceived barriers to implementation. Be clear on where your suggested guidance/language can be relaxed and help people to understand your baseline in terms of reasonably expected level of action.

Project Implementation

Implementation

- Coalition members had the opportunity to take the language back to their governing boards
- A decision matrix was provided to each Coalition member to solicit feedback as to whether they intended to adopt the local law language
- Separate matrix for Albany County and University at Albany

Traditional MS4s (T/V/C)

Stormwater Coalition of Albany County NYSDEC Grant Contract C304384 Round 10 Decision Matrix Form: Green Infrastructure Model Local Laws Towns, Villages, Cities Gap 1 Parking Lot Design

Name of MS4:	Decision: Will begin the process of including this in our local code. Name/Title of Decision Makers:																		
				Minimum /	Action Leve	el			Best	: Managem	ent Actior	Level			Mode	No Action Level			
Gap 1 Parking Lot Design	Yes	No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Comments	Yes No Maybe Convert to Guideline(s) Start when? Comments							No	Maybe	Convert to Guideline(s)	Start when?	Comments	Comments
1.0 Purpose and Objectives																			
2.0 Parking Ratios.																			
2.1 Determination of Required Off-Street Parking.																			
Schedule A Required Off Street Parking Spaces																			
55 Gr	eei	n In	fra	struc	ture	Model Lo	oca	l La	w F	Proje	ect								

TIP

It's also a good idea to determine metrics that help you track the impact of laws that your municipality decides to adopt. For example, increase in acres of green space, # of bike racks installed, increase in # of street trees, etc.

QUESTIONS?

Nadine Medina, P.E., CPESC, LEED AP

Barton and Loguidice 10 Airline Drive Suite 200 Albany, NY 12205 (518) 218-1801 nmedina@bartonandloguidice.com