

Meeting Minutes: Stormwater Utility Focus Group Meeting 1

Time/Date: January 23, 2024 7:00-9:00 PM
Project: Lambertville Stormwater Utility Feasibility Study
Location: Pittore Justice Center

Attendees:

Chris Oberlink	Tony Suozzo
Pete Golden	Bart Thurber
Janine McGregor	Jennifer Davis
Dan Connolly	Julia Taylor
Vince Uhl	Monique Purcell
Bob McCaffrey	Liz Peer
Bob Jordan	Mary Anne Borge
Matt Larkin	Andrew Harris

Lambertville Staff:

Andrew Nowick
Lieutenant Brown
Lester Myers
Cindy Ege

Consultant Team:

Dr. Clay Emerson, PE, CFM
Dana Patterson-Grear
Jamie Feinstein, RLA

Discussion:

After a welcome and thanking of the group by Andrew Nowick of Lambertville, introductions were made by each attendee identifying interests and community representation as appropriate. The study team provided an overview of the Lambertville Stormwater Utility Focus Group role and basic ground rules (slides 2 and 3) for the meetings. The Project Team was introduced (slide 6) noting that Elizabeth Treadway (WSP) would not be attending. The mayor also noted that the funding source for the study was the New Jersey League of Conservation Voters and that funds from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection were awarded, but not used.

The mayor noted that the city has three creeks, over 540 inlets and outfalls, and that major challenges include cross-jurisdictional issues with stormwater infrastructure, new requirements from the Tier A MS4 permit, lessons learned from Tropical Storm Ida and Hurricane Irene, and localized flooding. The mayor closed this introduction by stating that the challenges set against current resources were not equal and the goal is moving forward in a responsible way.

The intention of a stormwater utility was summarized as a fee collected from the public for a dedicated use, proportional to the cost to provide a service that directly benefits the fee-paying public (slide 8). The benefits provided to users from the revenue collected from the stormwater utility was reviewed, indicating that municipalities will have the opportunity to proactively plan and implement maintenance and improvement projects for stormwater infrastructure in order to enhance water quality, address flooding, and improve public safety (slide 9), which were some concerns mentioned by the meeting attendees.

Background on stormwater utility financing was reviewed, noting that nationally, the history of utility financing for stormwater began in the early 1970s and continues today with utilities in over 40 states

(slide 21). New Jersey local agencies were empowered to establish a stormwater utility through legislation enacted in 2019 (slide 13) known as the New Jersey Clean Stormwater and Flood Reduction Act (the Act). To date, several local agencies are evaluating the opportunity, but a stormwater utility has not yet been adopted in New Jersey. It was mentioned that the approach has been successfully implemented in municipalities locally throughout Pennsylvania.

It was pointed out that the Act identifies who may adopt utility financing, the type of land use that is exempt from charges (i.e., agricultural or horticultural use), and the mandate that a system of credits be included in the financing structure (slide 14). The credit system acts as an incentive for property owners to make improvements on their properties, such as removing legacy impervious cover, to yield a partial reduction in their fee. It was noted that stormwater utilities are one of few regulatory mechanisms which could promote proactive improvements to water quality and flooding as opposed to reactionary stormwater management implementations required by compliance with the NJ Stormwater Management Rules. The revenue collected can only be expended for the services dedicated towards stormwater and drainage management. The services that can be funded by a stormwater utility may include capital projects, public education, administration, matching funds for grants and loans, and overall drainage system operation and maintenance (slide 15).

The standard for establishing the stormwater utility rate structure is impervious surface as the “meter” for equitable distribution of costs to property owners and is legally defensible based on historical use as best practice. Impervious cover is easily quantified with a desktop analysis of aerial photographs and a driving factor in stormwater management deficiencies throughout the state of New Jersey (slide 17). The required revenue and the distribution of impervious areas are the two primary elements used in the calculation of rates.

The purpose of the Stormwater Utility Feasibility Study was described with respect to its applicability to Lambertville (slide 20), and the unique characteristics of the municipality that require local and specific fact-finding and analysis to inform decision making. It was noted that digitization of impervious area coverage is currently underway as an element of the framework that will define the stormwater utility fee structure. The focus group was presented with the expectations of the outcome of the feasibility study, including stakeholder feedback, basic fee-structure, and outline of the next steps (slide 21). It was emphasized that the due diligence taken throughout the feasibility study is required to establish the legal foundation for a stormwater utility (slide 22).

The timeline of the feasibility study was presented, highlighting that the ordinance introduction is planned to occur in June 2024 (slide 24), at which time the council will vote whether to put the ordinance to referendum for the voters of Lambertville to decide on the implementation of a stormwater utility in November 2024. Efforts for education and community engagement will continue in the summer if the council votes to advance the ordinance to referendum, otherwise all efforts relating to this study will halt.

The goals of the current and future focus group meetings were identified (slide 25), noting that future meetings will include more specifics in terms of impervious surface mapping and options for utility fee structures to ensure any possible stormwater utility implementation is as equitable as possible.

Question: What would be covered by the utility? Would factors such as flood zones affect the equity of the rate?

Response: *The funds from the utility can be used to address any need that has to do with flooding. The equity of the fee is not influenced by the proportion of properties that are impacted by flooding (i.e.,*

in a flood zone or not in a flood zone), but by the properties which generate the runoff that causes the flooding. People would be paying into the fee proportionally to the runoff generated by the impervious surfaces on their properties.

Currently, money to address stormwater management issues comes from the general fund, meaning taxpayers already contribute towards maintenance and improvements efforts. Part of the feasibility study will include an analysis of the existing fee structure, based on property value, compared to what they might pay under a separate, dedicated stormwater utility based on impervious coverage. The Act prohibits stormwater utilities from using flood zones as a means to justify fees.

Question: Are porous pavements considered as impervious surfaces or able to be differentiated on an aerial?

No, but porous pavement would be considered a credit that could be applied to reduce your fee contribution. There are approximately 1,500 residential parcels in Lambertville, each of which would need to be manually delineated to determine the site-specific impervious coverage. Rather, a representative sample of residences will be selected to develop an equivalent residential unit (ERU) assigned to a given subset. Other examples of practices that could be counted as credits on residential properties could include rain gardens or rain barrels. On the non-residential side, retrofits could be implemented to apply for credits, but are often driven by other reasons.

Question: Is the focus group being asked to provide a consensus recommendation?

No vote, we want to know opinions on all things as they relate to stormwater management, stormwater management financing, and other concerns as this group represents some component of the City of Lambertville.

Question: Is there an advantage to leveraging regional resources when managing stormwater?

It is very difficult and comes with high levels of uncertainty when trying to implement ordinances on a multi-jurisdictional level.

Question/Comment:

1) Impervious cover must be defined very clearly in order to base the fee on those criteria; it is defined differently throughout various NJDEP regulations.

2) If tax dollars are already allocated towards stormwater maintenance under the general fund, how will it be ensured that implementation of the separate stormwater utility does not result in a double fee?

3) The credit system must be written in a way such that it is reasonable for a homeowner to be able to negate the fee entirely to properly incentivize active but attainable stormwater management at residences.

Response: *These considerations are important and incredibly valuable feedback that will help us inform decisions as we advance throughout this process but are a bit ahead of where we are at currently.*

Question:

1) The Resilience Committee has talked about coming up with demonstration projects and guidelines for homeowners to implement straightforward, stormwater management measures.

2) It is important that the report compares what we are currently paying for against what we would be paying, but also equally important to assess what we are not paying for now or things that are not getting done that could be paid for with the stormwater utility, i.e., deferred maintenance and what that looks like.

Response:

1) *The stormwater utility will necessitate a credit system that will likely be accompanied by a manual that will include project guidelines that don't require an engineer.*

2) *Yes, the study will include an overview of existing needs and an analysis of what is being done now compared to what needs to be done. On top of that, there are changing requirements under the State's new MS4 Permit (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) that will affect what will need to be addressed at the municipal-level.*

The mayor discussed that there are both known challenges, such as climate change and increased flooding events, and unknown challenges faced by the City that would be able to be addressed more efficiently with dedicated funding. An example of an unknown challenge discussed is the culvert under Arnett Ave which has multiple owners, is partially exposed, and previously had not been adequately maintained due to lack of resources. Hurricane Ida revealed that much of the culvert was entirely filled with debris, which caused failure during the storm, resulting in severe flooding impacting several homeowners surrounding it. Another example provided was the storm sewer system on Delevan Street that was presumed to be nicked during construction work. The City ordered CTV inspection of the pipe, which then revealed further compromises to the infrastructure due to illegal connections and deterioration of pipe segments, resulting in stormwater leaching into the ground. The feasibility study will be able to highlight what work is currently being done, what additional, proactive work can be done (such as diagnostics of underground infrastructure), and provide mechanisms to address NJDEP requirements.

Question: The cost of flood insurance seems to be rising, is it possible for flood zones to be reclassified with the implementation of a stormwater utility? How will property value be affected?

Response: *FEMA has a rating system called a community rating score (CRS). The stormwater utility can improve the CRS, which is used to encourage participating communities like Lambertville to do credit-gaining activities, such as limiting development in the flood zone or providing public education, to trade for discounted flood insurance rates. However, the floodplain cannot be remapped.*

Lambertville currently has a CRS of 7, which means that the City is currently 15% below other established rates from premium due to ordinances and other actions from the Floodplain Administrator and Resilience Committee. The qualifications for a 6 are met, but there is ongoing dispute between FEMA and the State of New Jersey. It was also found that after Hurricane Ida, there were 130 homes that were not in the FEMA-mapped floodplain but still suffered damage. Home insurance companies react to this as a risk.

It was noted that the Resilience Committee has discussed the need for additional public education and outreach regarding flood insurance because there is a lot of misinformation and misunderstanding surrounding the topic. Flood insurance through the NFIP vs. private market insurance are very different.

A trend observed in New Jersey stemming from the effects of climate change include increased frequency of short-duration, high-intensity storms (slide 28). A waterway such as the Delaware River is relatively stable under these conditions, however, flooding occurs higher up the floodplain from taxed

swales, creeks, and drainage systems. Traditional stormwater management often focuses on long-duration rainfall events, such as an 8-inch, 24-hour storm. However, increased occurrences of storms that yield 3 inches of rain in 45 minutes results in a different type of flooding that stresses smaller drainage systems that are outside of the flood zones defined by the 24-hour duration rainfall events. Changes to the regulations in New Jersey have started to trend reflecting the changing rainfall, though they have only just recently begun to update rainfall data that was 20 years out-of-date.

Some requirements of the new MS4 Tier A Permit, such as watershed inventory, assessment reports, and improvement plans and detailed infrastructure mapping, were briefly discussed (slide 29). It was mentioned that the State has not allocated much funding in order to help municipalities meet these requirements, so the responsibility for the funding is at the local level. A watershed map of Lambertville and surrounding area was shared, citing the major tributaries and built environment that has led to flooding issues and impaired waterways (slides 31 and 32).

Question: Will we map other places other than the creeks where flooding occurs? Would the mapping cover both surface and subsurface flows?

Response: *In order to establish the utility, it's not necessary to do that level of mapping. However, the funds generated by the utility could be used to do detailed mapping if that's a local priority for planning.*

Question/Comment:

1) The level of service needs to differentiate and prioritize what the utility will do if established and what some goals for the program are after a few years once some capital is built up.

2) Flood insurance costs are a major factor that people will consider in relation to the stormwater utility, so it needs to be made clear in the study and addressed in public engagement how and when the utility could affect the credit for flood insurance rates.

We need to elevate how the potential utility could influence the flood insurance in the City. In the long-term, the utility could be used to do additional studies, refine the flood mapping, and evaluate whether residents are eligible for flood insurance.

Question: A focus of the study could include how the utility could potentially lessen future costs associated with flooding and mitigate future losses by proactive management.

It was shared that many residents have to a certain extent gotten used to flooding impacts on their properties, but observations of overloaded systems and increased frequency of major rainfall events were noted.

Question: Will any part of the study consider flooding impacts resulting from subsurface sources (i.e., springs), or focused primarily on surface water?

In Lambertville, there are influences from the Delaware River, flash floods from small tributaries with steep slopes, and groundwater intrusion issues, all of which result in flooding issues. The utility can be used to address or improve impacts from flooding independent of its source.

Question: Have stormwater utilities established in some of the Pennsylvania communities mentioned (Philly) been successful?

Response: Yes, to the extent that some communities are having issues finding projects to spend the money on. We have observed 20 or 30 communities in PA that have all been successful.

Question: What has stopped NJ communities from enacting stormwater utilities?

Response: The Act was established in 2019, so influences from the COVID-19 pandemic certainly contributed to the halt in momentum to a degree. NJDEP is trying to shepherd establishment of utilities as best they can because they are needed in many communities, but it's still early in the regulatory lifespan.

Question: Will the Focus Group be provided with FAQs or bullet points to clearly and concisely convey the progress of this study to peers?

The City will begin to post information on its website, and the website established by New Jersey Future on the topic was referenced as an additional resource (<https://stormwaterutilities.njfuture.org>). The website offers a broad range of information on utility financing, planning, implementation, and other key topics.

Question/Comment: It must be made clear that the Focus Group is not politically affiliated and is simply providing feedback for the study.

Question/Comment: Education will be essential for the establishment of the utility. There may be reluctance on the part of many communities, and providing optional resources to reference may not elicit enough education. Information needs to be pushed out that clearly states what is being paid for at the most basic level, identifies potential projects, and answers the question, "why should we be doing anything?"

Response: To answer the question of "why," the mayor noted that the decision of a fee establishment is often made by the governing body. The City intends to have the decision be made by the residents, and plans to engage in community engagement, outreach, and education will occur if the council votes to put the ordinance to referendum to ensure an informed decision is made.

Question: What lessons from other communities in NJ can be learned for the establishment of the utility?

Response: Every community is different, so it's important to understand what Lambertville values because what may influence one community may not have the same impact on another. Next meeting, more specific numbers will be discussed and we will look at a financial forecast, rate structure, equity, etc. We are still collecting facts from this meeting to reflect in future meetings.

Question: Who decides where the money is spent and what prioritization the projects receive? How is it equitably managed?

Response: The mayor stated that the Council will be responsible to enact the stormwater utility should it be established, including setting rates and the initial scope. The scope would inform what the first five years of the utility look like and highlight particular, significant problems that require more immediate attention. In terms of equity and setting priorities; it would be great to remove that decision from the political arena.

Prioritization may also consider factors such as what resources are shared by the community (i.e., roads), safety concerns, some common sources etc. The utility would give a mechanism to be able to quantitatively prioritize the needs.

Question: Would there be an appointed board that would service the utility?

Response: *Yes, similar to the MUA.*

Question: How can the group convey feedback or other concerns voiced by community members outside of the Focus Group? Having answers to some specific questions would be helpful moving forward.

Response: *An open line of communication with the mayor is welcomed and encouraged. Any answers can be distributed amongst the group or communicated at the next meeting.*

Question: Could the Focus Group be provided with examples from other states? Are there any public-private partnerships in stormwater that you're aware of?

Response: *Not particularly, but real-world examples can be provided and will be discussed in the next meeting.*

Question/Comment: Some commonly cited concerns in the community include flooding, taxes, development, and parking. It would be beneficial to use lessons learned regarding what worked and what didn't work for members of the community on past referendums, such as improvements to the school, etc. to inform how to approach a possible vote in November.

The meeting was concluded with a look ahead at the next meeting (slide 39), and a statement that another memo will be sent ahead of the meeting date. The meeting concluded at 9:00 PM.

Deliverables Timelines - 2023 MS4 Tier A Permit

Permit Citation	Description	New, Modified, or Unchanged from 2018 MS4 Tier A Permit	Included in Tier B	Compliance Schedule for Existing Tier A's	Compliance Schedule for New Tier A's
IV.A.2. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Requirements	Submit an updated SPPP electronically to the Department	Modified	No	EDPA + 3 months	EDPA + 12 months
IV.B.1. Public Involvement, Participation, & Notice	Comply with applicable State and local public notice requirements	Unchanged	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.B.2. Municipal Stormwater Webpage	Develop a dedicated stormwater webpage that contains links to all materials listed in IV.B.2.a. in one place	Modified	No	EDPA + 3 months	EDPA + 12 months
IV.C.1. Local Public Education and Outreach	Implement a Public Education and Outreach Program	Unchanged	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.D.1. Construction Site Stormwater Runoff	Obtain Construction Activity NJPDES Stormwater General Permit or individual permit for construction site stormwater runoff activities	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.E.1. Post Construction Stormwater Management in New Development and Redevelopment	Comply with N.J.A.C. 7:8 - develop, update, implement and enforce the following: a Stormwater Management Program to address post construction stormwater runoff, a Municipal Stormwater Management Plan (MSWMP), a Stormwater Control Ordinance (SCO), and if applicable, a Mitigation Plan; the same individual may not design AND review stormwater management projects	Modified	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.1.a. Community Wide Ordinances (pre-existing)	Adopt and enforce ordinances for proper management of Pet Waste, Wildlife Feeding, Litter Control, Improper Disposal of Waste, Yard Waste, and Private Storm Drain Inlet Retrofitting	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.1.b. Community Wide Ordinances (new)	Adopt and enforce ordinances for proper management of Salt Storage Ordinance and Tree Ordinance	New	No	EDPA + 12 months	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.2.a.i. Triannual Street Sweeping	At least once every 4 months, sweep all segments of roads owned or operated by the permittee and have storm drain inlets that discharge to surface water	Modified	No	EDPA + 12 months	EDPA + 12 months

Deliverables Timelines - 2023 MS4 Tier A Permit

IV.F.2.a.ii. Annual Street Sweeping	At least once per year, sweep all segments of roads owned or operated by the permittee that do not have storm drain inlets that discharge to surface water	Modified	No	EDPA + 12 months	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.2.a.iii. Storm Drain Inlet Labeling	Label all permittee owned or operated storm drain inlets that do not have permanent wording cast into the structure of the inlet if they are adjacent to municipal streets, within plazas, parking areas, maintenance yards or other permittee ancillary activities	Unchanged	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.2.a.iv. Storm Drain Inlet Retrofitting	Retrofit or replace all municipal storm drain inlets within the standards set forth in permit Attachment B	Modified	Yes	EDPA + 59 months	EDPA + 59 months
IV.F.2.a.v. Storm Drain Installation	All storm drain installations must include a catch basin or other BMP designed for solids collection	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.2.a.vi. Herbicide Application Management	Restrict application of herbicides to prevent them from being washed into the waters of the State and to prevent erosion caused by de-vegetation (previously 'Roadside Vegetative Management' in Tier A permit Attachment E)	Modified	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.2.a.vii. Excess De-Icing Material Management	Within 72 hours after the end of storm events, conditions permitting, remove piles of excess salt and de-icing materials that have been deposited during spreading operations on all streets and parking areas owned or operated by the permittee	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.2.a.viii. Roadside Vegetative Waste Management	Ensure proper pickup, handling, storage, and disposal of wood waste and yard trimmings generated by the permittee	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.2.a.ix. Roadside Erosion Control	Detect and repair erosion along roads owned or operated by the permittee and inspect and maintain the stability of shoulders, embankments, ditches, and soils along these roads to ensure that they are not eroding and contributing to the sedimentation of receiving waters	New	No	EDPA + 12 months	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.3.a.i. Storm Drain Inlet Inspection	At least once per year, inspect ALL storm drain inlets owned or operated by the permittee	Modified	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.3.a.ii. Storm Drain Inlet Cleaning and Maintenance	Develop, update, and implement a storm drain inlet cleaning and maintenance program	Modified	Yes	EDPA	EDPA

Deliverables Timelines - 2023 MS4 Tier A Permit

IV.F.3.a.iii. Catch Basin Inspection	At least once per year, inspect 1,000 or 20% of the total number of catch basins (whichever is greater) rotating the schedule to ensure all catch basins are inspected at least once every 5 years	Modified	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.3.a.iv. Catch Basin Cleaning	Develop, update, and implement a catch basin cleaning and maintenance program	Modified	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.3.a.v. MS4 Conveyance System Inspection and Cleaning	Develop, update, and implement an MS4 conveyance system inspection, cleaning, and maintenance program, e.g., ditches and pipes	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.3.a.vi. Stormwater Infrastructure Inspection	Inspect all stormwater infrastructure (excluding those in IV.F.3.a.i. through v.) at least 4x per year and after each rainstorm exceeding 1"	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.3.a.vii. Stormwater Infrastructure Maintenance	Perform maintenance on all stormwater infrastructure (excluding those in IV.F.3.a.i. through v.) per approved maintenance plans or more frequently as needed to ensure proper function and operation	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.4. Inspection and Maintenance of Stormwater Facilities Not Owned or Operated by the Permittee	Develop, update, implement, and enforce a program to ensure adequate long-term cleaning, operation, and maintenance of stormwater facilities not owned or operated by the permittee that are not subject to conditions of another NJPDES stormwater permit and constructed after February 7, 1984	Unchanged	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.5.a. BMPs and SPPP forms for each Municipal Maintenance Yard (MMY) and Other Ancillary Operation	Implement applicable BMPs for activities listed in permit section IV.F.5.b. through r at each municipal maintenance yard and ancillary operation site owned or operated by the permittee; include each site and corresponding materials and activities in the SPPP	Modified	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.5.b. Site Inspections	Conduct monthly site inspections and maintain logs	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.5.c. Inventory List	Maintain a list of all materials and machinery which could be a source of pollutants in a stormwater discharge	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.5.d. Container Labels	Properly label all containers	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months

Deliverables Timelines - 2023 MS4 Tier A Permit

IV.F.5.e. Spill Kits	Conduct cleanups of spills immediately after discovery using dry cleaning methods	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.5.f. Bulk Liquid Storage	Provide secondary containment of aboveground storage tanks containing bulk liquid materials	New	No	EDPA + 12 months	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.5.g. Fueling Operations	Establish, maintain, and implement BMPs to address vehicle fueling, receipt of bulk fuel deliveries, and inspection and maintenance of storage tanks	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.5.h. Discharge of Stormwater from Secondary Containment	Discharge stormwater accumulated in a secondary containment area as needed following visual inspection for contaminants	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.5.i. Vehicle/Equipment Maintenance and/or Repair	Maintain vehicles and equipment to prevent exposure of pollutants to stormwater	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.5.j. Wash Wastewater Containment	Manage equipment and vehicle washing activities to prevent unpermitted discharges of wash wastewater to storm sewer inlets or to surface or ground waters of the State	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.5.k. Salt and Other Granular De-icing Material Storage and Handling	Store salt and other solid de-icing materials in a permanent structure; establish, maintain, and implement salt and de-icing material storage and handling BMPs	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 36 months
IV.F.5.l. Aggregate Material, Wood Chips, and Finished Leaf Compost Storage	Store aggregate materials, wood chips, and finished leaf compost in a manner that minimizes stormwater run-on and pollutant run-off	Modified	No	EDPA	EDPA + 6 months
IV.F.5.m. Cold Patch Asphalt Storage	Store cold patch asphalt in a permanent structure or on an impervious surface and covered	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.5.n. Street Sweepings and Storm Sewer Clean-out Material Storage	Store street sweepings, storm sewer and catch basin clean-out materials, stormwater basin clean-out materials and other similar materials up to 6 months in a manner that controls leachate and stormwater run-on or run through	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 6 months

Deliverables Timelines - 2023 MS4 Tier A Permit

IV.F.5.o. Construction and Demolition Waste, Wood Waste, and Yard Trimmings	Store construction and demolition waste, wood waste, and yard trimmings, temporarily in a manner that minimizes stormwater run-on and pollutant run-off	Modified	No	EDPA	EDPA + 6 months
IV.F.5.p. Scrap Tires	Store scrap tires in a covered container or enclosure to prevent exposure to stormwater	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.5.q. Inoperable Vehicles or Equipment	Store inoperable vehicles or equipment temporarily provided drip pans are utilized and monthly inspections are conducted for leaks and filled drip pans	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.5. r. Refuse Containers and Dumpsters	Ensure dumpsters and refuse containers that are exposed to stormwater are covered at all times	New	No	EDPA	EDPA
IV.F.6. SPC Training	SPCs attend mandatory Department training once per permit cycle	New	No	EDPA + 36 months	EDPA + 36 months
IV.F.7. Annual Employee Training	Train individuals responsible for implementation of the stormwater program permit conditions that apply to their job duties	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.8. Stormwater Management Design Review (SWMDR) Training	Ensure that all individuals that review and approve stormwater management designs for major development projects on behalf of the permittee for compliance with the Stormwater Management rules at N.J.A.C. 7:8 complete the training provided by the Department at least once every 5 years	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.F.9. Stormwater Management Rule Amendment Training	Ensure that all individuals that have completed the Department SWMDR course also complete any Department training courses related to Stormwater Management rule amendments	New	No	Within 12 months from adoption of 7:8 rule amendment	Within 12 months from adoption of 7:8 rule amendment
IV.F.10. Municipal Board and Governing Body Member Related Training	Ensure that all individuals serving on the municipal board and governing body watch the Department training videos once per term	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA + 6 months
IV.G.1. MS4 Mapping	Develop, update, and maintain an MS4 Infrastructure Map; review annually, update as needed, post on the permittee's stormwater webpage, and submit electronically to the Department	New	No	EDPA + 36 months	EDPA + 36 months

Deliverables Timelines - 2023 MS4 Tier A Permit

IV.G.2. Stream Scouring	Develop, update, and implement a program to detect, investigate, and control localized stream scouring from stormwater outfalls owned or operated by the permittee via inspections of 100 outfalls per year or 20% of the total number of outfalls (whichever is greater)	Modified	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.G.3. Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination	Develop, update, implement and enforce an ongoing Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination Program via inspections of outfalls owned or operated by the permittee via inspections of 100 outfalls per year or 20% of the total number of outfalls (whichever is greater)	Modified	No	EDPA	EDPA + 12 months
IV.H.1.d. Watershed Improvement Plan - Phase 1	Prepare the Watershed Inventory Report and submit it to the Department; conduct semi-annual public information sessions	New	No	EDPA + 36 months	EDPA + 36 months
IV.H.1.e. Watershed Improvement Plan - Phase 2	Prepare the Watershed Assessment Report and submit it to the Department; conduct public information sessions	New	No	EDPA + 48 months	EDPA + 48 months
IV.H.1.g. Watershed Improvement Plan - Phase 3	Prepare the Watershed Improvement Plan Report and submit it to the Department; conduct public information sessions; implement plan and review it every 2 years	New	No	EDPA + 59 months	EDPA + 59 months
IV.I. Additional Measures	Incorporate measures the Department requires to address TMDLs, regional stormwater management plans, or Water Quality Management Plans	Unchanged	Yes	per NJDEP implementation schedule	per NJDEP implementation schedule
IV.J. Recordkeeping	Retain copies of all records related to the MS4 permit for at least 5 years; make available to the Department upon request	Unchanged	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.K.a. Annual Report	Submit the Annual Report and Certification to the Department via the MSRP Annual Report service through the Regulatory Services Portal by May 1st each year	Unchanged	Yes	EDPA	EDPA
IV.K.b. Supplemental Questionnaire	Submit the Supplemental Questionnaire to the Department by attaching it to the MSRP Annual Report by May 1st each year	Unchanged	No	EDPA	EDPA