



LANCASTER COUNTY  
**PLANNING**

**Lancaster County Act 167  
Stormwater Management Plan  
Watershed Plan Advisory Committee  
Survey #1 Results**

August 8, 2024

**53 responses**

- 36 municipalities
- 8 organizations

**Tell Us About Yourself (Optional)**

**1. Municipality or Organization**

- Adamstown Borough
- Akron Borough
- Brecknock & East Cocalico Townships
- Caernarvon Township
- Clay Township
- David Miller Associates, Inc. (2 responses)
- Denver Borough
- East Cocalico Township
- East Donegal Township (2 responses)
- East Hempfield Township
- East Lampeter Township (2 responses)
- East Petersburg Borough (2 responses)
- Elizabethtown Borough
- Ephrata Borough
- Lancaster City
- Lancaster County Conservation District
- Lancaster County Emergency Management Agency (2 responses)
- Lancaster Township
- LandStudies, Inc. (2 responses)
- Leacock Township
- Lititz Borough
- Manor Township
- Millersville Borough
- Mount Joy Borough (2 responses)
- Mount Joy Township
- Mountville Borough
- New Holland Borough
- PA Rural Water Association
- Paradise Township
- Penn Township
- Quarryville Borough

- Rapho Township
- RGS Associates
- Salisbury Township
- SRBC
- Strasburg Borough
- Strasburg Township
- Upper Leacock Township
- Warwick Township (3 responses)
- Water Science Institute
- West Cocalico Township
- West Earl Township
- West Hempfield Township

## **2. Position or Title**

- Administrator
- Assistant Borough Manager
- Assistant Township Manager
- Borough Council
- Borough Council President
- Borough Manager (5 responses)
- Borough Manager/Secretary
- Community Resilience Coordinator
- Deputy Director of Public Works
- Director of Land Use
- Director of Municipal Services
- Director of Planning/Zoning Officer
- Environmental Coordinator
- Executive Director
- Manager (7 responses)
- MS4 Program Manager
- MS4 Supervisor/ Special Projects
- Municipal Engineer
- Planning Director/Stormwater Officer
- Principal
- Project Manager - HydroGeologist
- Public Works Director
- Source Water Protection Specialist
- Supervisor (2 responses)
- Supervisor of Engineering / Associate
- Technological Hazards Planner
- Township Engineer
- Township Manager (4 responses)

- Township Planner
- Water Resources Engineer
- Zoning Officer (2 responses)
- Zoning Officer/Stormwater Coordinator
- Zoning, Codes & Stormwater Administrator

## Stormwater Management in Your Municipality

### 3. Which municipality do you represent?

- Adamstown Borough
- Akron Borough
- Brecknock Township
- Caernarvon Township
- Clay Township
- Denver Borough
- East Cocalico Township
- East Donegal Township (3 responses)
- East Earl Township
- East Hempfield Township
- East Lampeter Township (2 responses)
- East Petersburg Borough (2 responses)
- Elizabethtown Borough
- Ephrata Borough
- Lancaster City
- Lancaster Township
- Leacock Township
- Lititz Borough
- Manor Township
- Millersville Borough
- Mount Joy Borough (2 responses)
- Mount Joy Township
- Mountville Borough
- New Holland Borough
- Paradise Township
- Penn Township
- Quarryville Borough
- Rapho Township
- Salisbury Township
- Strasburg Borough
- Strasburg Township
- Upper Leacock Township
- Warwick Township (3 responses)
- West Cocalico Township

- West Earl Township
- West Hempfield Township
- N/A (9 responses)

**3A. When was the last time your municipality updated their stormwater management ordinance?**

- March 7, 2023 (2 responses)
- December 19, 2022
- December 12, 2022
- November 8, 2022
- September 27, 2022
- September 19, 2022 (2 responses)
- September 15, 2022 (2 responses)
- September 12, 2022
- September 7, 2022
- August 18, 2022
- August 17, 2022 (2 responses)
- August 4, 2022
- August 2, 2022
- July 19, 2022 (2 responses)
- July 20, 2020
- March 26, 2019
- December 11, 2017
- November 1, 2016
- June 30, 2014
- June 17, 2014
- May 14, 2014
- May 7, 2014
- May 6, 2014
- May 5, 2014 (2 responses)
- May 1, 2014
- April 28, 2014
- April 14, 2014
- April 7, 2014
- January 1, 2014

**3B. If we don't move forward with Phase 2 and draft a new model ordinance, when do you plan on updating your stormwater management ordinance again?**

- May 30, 2025
- June 1, 2025
- June 30, 2025
- July 1, 2025

- July 31, 2025
- August 30, 2025
- December 31, 2025 (2 responses)
- January 1, 2026
- January 2, 2026
- August 4, 2026
- January 1, 2027
- June 1, 2028
- April 14, 2029
- June 26, 2029
- September 27, 2032

**4. Of the following stormwater issues, which impacts your municipality the most? Which would you would like to resolve or improve?**

Rank	Response	Number of Responses (Per Rank)						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Stream flooding	9	18	6	6	6	3	3
2	Soil erosion and stream bank loss	18	5	3	13	5	5	3
3	Damage to public infrastructure (bridges, water and sewer, parks, buildings)	5	7	15	12	3	5	3
4	Street flooding	9	8	14	4	4	7	3
5	Stormwater pollution	5	6	6	7	17	9	2
6	Obstructions in waterways and at bridges and culverts	1	4	5	5	4	4	18
7	Impacts from upstream sources	3	2	0	2	9	14	14
8	Improved aquifer recharge	2	2	3	3	4	5	6

**5. Are you interested in working on stormwater management and flood control at a regional or watershed scale with your neighbors?**

- Yes (29 responses)
- Depends on the circumstances (21 responses)
- No (1 response)

## Potential Phase 2 Study

**6. IF we proceed with a Phase 2 study, which of the following outcomes would be most beneficial?**

Rank	Response	Number of Responses (Per Rank)					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	A prioritized list of flood mitigation and stormwater runoff control projects	11	18	15	7	0	2
2	Work that helps offset or reduce work for your MS4 permit or PRP	21	8	9	6	2	4
3	Updated Stormwater Management Ordinance	12	9	7	10	7	8
4	A list of suitable locations for regional stormwater management	6	10	9	8	8	12
5	Hydrologic modeling including new release rates	2	5	5	16	17	8
6	Improved cooperation with your neighbors	1	3	8	6	16	19

**7. After Phase 1 is complete, IF we decide to move forward with Phase 2, we will need to secure a 25% local match to leverage DEP grant funds. What size local match seems to be a reasonable amount to address the stormwater planning challenges we face in our community?**

- \$50,000 (would leverage \$150,000 in DEP funds, for a \$200,000 project) (21 responses)
- \$100,000 (would leverage \$300,000 in DEP funds, for a \$400,000 project) (13 responses)
- \$500,000 (would leverage \$1,500,000 in DEP funds for a \$2 million dollar project) (8 responses)
- \$250,000 (would leverage \$750,000 in DEP funds, for a \$1 million project) (8 responses)
- \$300,000 (would leverage \$900,000,000 in DEP funds, for a \$1.2 million dollar project) (2 responses)

**8. What is the fairest way to determine how a local match is split?**

- Based on several factors listed above (34 responses)
- Based on the population of the municipality, per capita (6 responses)
- Based on the impervious area of municipality (5 responses)
- Based on amount of work needed in each municipality (3 responses)
- Based on the assessed value of taxable land in a municipality (2 responses)
- Based on the total stream miles in a municipality (2 responses)

**9. IF we decide to proceed to Phase 2, and considering that we will probably have limited funds to fully study and conduct hydrologic modeling on all recommendations, would you still be supportive of selecting the highest priority areas, even if that is in a watershed not located in your municipality (with the understanding we would address the others when funds are available later)?**

- Maybe, depending on the circumstances (27 responses)
- Not in a position to make that decision (13 responses)
- Yes (11 responses)
- No (1 response)

**9A. Would you be willing to contribute more to the local match to address all areas identified as a priority?**

- Maybe, depending on the circumstances (18 responses)
- Not in a position to make that decision (5 responses)
- No (4 responses)
- Yes (1 response)

## **Phase 1 Planning Process**

**10. Who from your municipality will be involved with the Phase 1 planning process (not including the plan adoption process by elected officials)?**

*Note: Participants could select more than one option for this question.*

- Municipal staff (42 responses)
- Municipal consultant to the township (Engineer, Solicitor, etc.) (24 responses)
- Elected officials (11 responses)
- Not applicable (8 responses)
- Planning Commission or Zoning Hearing Board (6 responses)

**11. As a municipal official or staff person, do you anticipate engaging with your community members during this planning process to seek input and ideas?**

- Yes (41 responses)
- No (11 responses)

**12. Do you have existing community groups in your municipality, like an environmental council or volunteer watershed group, that could offer ideas for this plan, e.g. help identify areas that flood, contain obstructions, places with severe bank erosion, etc.?**

- No (29 responses)
- Yes (23 responses)

**13. How might you engage these groups or other community members to seek their input as part of this process?**

- We met regularly with both our Agricultural Advisory Board and a group working in the unnamed tributary of the Little Conestoga aka "Hammertown Run". I could also foresee a meeting open to the public held at our local firehall. We did that about 7 or 8 years ago.

- We have advisory groups as part of our LTCP process, various neighborhood groups, tabling events around the City, Engage Lancaster website and social media outlets to foster online participation.
- We already have engaged with these groups on our MS4 projects
- Use of our Planning Commission
- Town Hall meeting
- The Lititz Run Watershed Alliance (LRWA) has regularly scheduled meetings, so we could discuss the Phase 1 planning process and ask for feedback at a meeting. We could also request feedback through email from the members.
- Social media; public meeting; newsletter.
- Present topics to the Watershed group for input
- Present this to the group at one of their meetings.
- Outreach
- newsletter updates
- meetings with groups
- Local newspaper article explaining the process and seeking input.
- Information on website and discussions during public meetings.
- I regularly attend the Chiques Creek watershed Alliance's meetings.
- Continue existing relationships and coordinate thru Clean Water Partners
- As an agenda item during scheduled public meetings
- As agenda items on scheduled public meetings
- 1.)Community Meetings. 2.) Surveys.
- We recently completed a joint, strategic comprehensive plan with our adjacent municipalities and have engaged hundreds of our residents as part of these planning efforts. We have been planning regionally for watershed improvements for over 20 years. Many of our implementation projects are implemented through our local watershed group....the Lititz Run Watershed Alliance.
- We are looking to put an authority together .
- The local watershed association meets monthly. There is also a second group focusing more on preservation and restoration of wetlands and stream restoration which meets regularly.
- Provide regular briefings to SRBC Commissioners
- Meeting attendance and workshop participation

**14. Feel free to leave any comments or questions below. If you'd like us to provide you with more information, please also include your contact information below.**

- The borough has recently added stormwater management to the operating authority that does water and sewer and we are in process of developing how we will manage stormwater issues moving forward.
- Thank you.
- none noted at this time
- I do not think that this survey is focused on the largest & correct problems in Lancaster County for cleanup of watersheds. We need to get the farmers on Board, if we are going to

clean up the water sheds. In addition, we need to address the issues of combined storm water & sanitary sewer in the same collection system. I would like to know what are the real issues that are causing the most pollution in our watersheds in Lancaster County & focus on those issues. Let's not kid ourselves and think the list of issues in this survey are the major issues in Lancaster County. This list will not have a major impact on the Conestoga Water Shed, the Susquehanna River or the Chesapeake Bay. Let's dig into the real issues that have been talked about for the past 20 years & develop a plan to correct those items!!!

- I became a Township Supervisor 8 years ago. At that time storm water was our most contentious issue. We have worked very hard to help our residents understand why it is needed and what has to be done. We are finally at a point where most folks are on board. My biggest concern is that this does not turn into a bureaucratic effort to ratchet down on landowners and move the storm water goal post just for the sake of moving them. That happens all too often in these situations. The single biggest complaint I get from residents is that the roadways are a huge contributor to storm water issues and the townships and PennDOT are not held to the same standard as they are as landowners.
- As all municipalities are at different improvement points, it will be difficult for those ahead of the curve for their municipality to justify participation