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Overall Views

“Exemplary”

“Got the Job Done”

“This Worked”

“A Standard for the State”

“Definitely Worthwhile”

“A Model”

“Super”

“Big Bang for the Buck”
Guiding Principles

- Problem-based
- Neutral Help
- Funding
“The End”...
...Not Really!!
How Did We Get There?
Converging Processes

Interlocal Stormwater Working Group

NPDES Phase II
History

- Phase II/Environmental Protection Agency Mandate (December 1999)
History (Continued)

- In 2000, Three Agencies Initiatives Converged:
  - CBEP – Casco Bay Plan
  - CCEMA – Flooding
  - CCSWCD – Soil and Water Protection
History (Continued)

- Problem-based:
  - Cross-boundary issue
  - Lot-by-lot SW management has shortcomings
  - Limited history of municipalities working together
History (Continued)

- 2001 – Grant Funds Approved
  - Funders: EPA and Cumberland County Commissioner
  - Recipient: CBEP/CCSWCD (partner)
  - Purpose: Develop Inter-municipal Stormwater Management
History (Continued)

- In November 2001, MeDEP Began Statewide Stakeholder Process to Develop Phase II Permits
In January 2002, CCSWCD Began Process with 6 Communities

- Brought facilitator onto team
- Conducted One-on-One Interviews
- Began Meetings
History (Continued)

- Through August 2002, Initial Group of Six Worked On:
  - FEMA Hazard Mitigation
  - National Flood Insurance Program/Flood Plain Management
  - NPDES Phase II
History (Continued)

- August 2002, Five Additional Casco Bay MS4’s Identified By 2000 Census Data
- DEP ramps up Phase II outreach to municipalities
History (Continued)

- October 2002:
  - Eleven Casco Bay Communities
  - CCSWCD develops a scope of services to create a Five-Year Work Plan
  - Joint Letter of Agreement
November 2002: Group Begins Five-Year Work Plan

Group Works With MeDEP on MS4 Permit Language
History
(Continued)

➢ Group ‘Solved’ Its First Problem

➢ June 2003, Completed Five-Year Work Plan

➢ June-September, Formal Local Approval Process

➢ September 2003, Submitted Work Plans to MeDEP
Guiding Principles

- Problem-based
- Neutral Help
- Funding
Challenges Ahead

- Implementation (Variety of Needs)
- Regional Coordination
- Funding
Regional Coordination

- Coordinator Job Description
- Accepting Resumes
- Guiding Work Plan Actions
- Balance Needs
Funding

- CBEP
- Conference
- Intern
- Grants
- Municipalities
- Governor's Office

- DEP
- Bond Issue
- Media Strategy
- PACTS
- CCEMA
Regional Boundary- Setting

- Saco Bay Working Group
- Statewide Education
“How Does This Help Me?”
Or
“So What?”
Research Findings

- Confidential Interviews Conducted with Cross-Section of Group
Participant Benefits

- Cost-sharing
- Group Problem Solving
- Building Relationships Beyond SWII
- Direct Group Interaction with DEP
Participant Benefits
(Continued)

- Sense of Not Being Alone With An Overwhelming Task
- Creating A Learning Process For Everyone
- A Chance For Equal Voices At the Table
- Removal of Municipal Boundaries
- Each Got Something Different Out of This
Group Challenges

- Not Knowing the State Rules Initially and Trying to Respond Individually and As A Group
- Breaking Down Municipal Barriers
- Work Speed is Slower As A Group
- Different Needs From Different Communities
- Funding Breakdown and Sustainability
Group Challenges
(Continued)

- Need a Coordinator to Stay on Track As Move Forwards
- Lack of Clarity About Origins and Goals
- Whether or Not to Formalize the Organization/Process
Unique Factors

- Completely New Effort, Not Changing Anything Existing Already
- Not Political Actors At the Table
- Dealing with “Mind-boggling” Regulations
- Started with Funding in Place
- Initiated by a Third Party, But Not Government
Unique Factors
(Continued)

- Started With A Facilitator in Place
- Everyone Asked Personally to Join the Group
- Willing Partners (Voluntary Participation)
- Not Yet Challenged As A Group
- Facilitator Who is Also A Leader/Coordinator
Lessons Learned

“Survey Says…”

- Base it on a Real, Not Perceived Need
- Don’t Impose This on People, Has to be Voluntary
- Incentives Would Not Be A Bad Thing
Lessons Learned
(Continued)

- Start Early
- Start with Funding in Hand (and a cushion)
- Have a Facilitator At the First Meeting and Throughout
- Formalize Group Only As Necessary
Lessons Learned (Continued)

- Get the Right People At the Table From the Start
- Invite People in Face-to-Face or By Phone
- Involve the Regulatory Agency
Guiding Principles

- Problem-based
- Neutral Help
- Funding