

9.16.26 meeting memo

FAQ's are based on answers to the previous memo questions and discussions with Keith.

Knowing that our efforts will not achieve "perfect" management of EPSC and, especially, stormwater control, these proposals represent a compromise with what is practicable, both administratively and politically.

Why is this an improvement over the current regs?

- Addition of Section 6.17 (RZR) introduces important considerations into regulations about protecting water quality and preventing runoff damage. These are necessary to address increased density and increasing storm severity.
- Provides baseline project size below which concern for EPSC and stormwater is "not needed," to exempt small projects that are unlikely to have much impact.
- Provides regulatory authority to ZAO and DRB to require EPSC and stormwater measures.
- Clarifies that all DRB-required site plans must be professionally-designed and meet the EPSC and stormwater requirements – eliminates DRB waivers for site plans.
- Improves applicant-designed site plans by requiring that the strategies for EPSC and stormwater must be shown on the site plan. Still allows applicants to avoid expense of professionally engineered plans.
- Captures projects of ½ the size of state baseline thresholds, and requires even state-permitted projects to meet our requirements, without requiring state permits to be in hand prior to construction (requires state to manage its own permits, which is helpful to applicants, while we still impose requirements and don't depend on the state). Capturing these projects helps prevent cumulative impacts.