

Springfield – Greene County, Mo Integrated Plan for the Environment



Task Force Meeting Notes July 8, 2014

Attendees

Task Force members present were:

Dan Hoy	Miles Ross	Clay Dodson
Ken McClure	Matt Pierson	Jason Hainline
King Coltrin	Brad Erwin	Charley Burwick
Bridget Dierks	Fred Palmerton	Janet Hicks
Bob McCartney	Skip Jansen	Zach Miller
Terry Whaley	Joe Pitts	Jared Rasmussen
Kara Tvedt	Natasha Longpine	John Twitty
Emily Denniston	Luke Westerman	

Absent with prior notice: Janet Dankert and Jim Peterson.

Absent: Loring Bullard, Doug Neidigh, Debra Dorshost, Jennifer Wilson, and Michelle Garand.

Technical Committee members present were: Brian Adams (City Environmental Services), Kevin Barnes (Greene County Resource Management), Tim Davis (Greene County Resource Management), Jessica Peebles (City Environmental Services), Barbara Lucks (City Environmental Services), Jan Millington (City Law), Randy Lyman (City Environmental Services), Todd Brewer (City Utilities), Erick Roberts (City Environmental Services), Steve Meyer (City Environmental Services), Errin Kemper (City Environmental Services), Dave Fraley (City Environmental Services), and Todd Wagner (City Public Works)

Springfield /Greene County staff present included: Kimberly White (City Environmental Services) and Tim Smith (City)

Missouri DNR or EPA staff present: Yvonne Franklin (MDNR)

Others present were: Mike Pessina, Milton Dickensheet, Eric Dove, Gary Pendergrass, Keith Ray Mackie (30th Sen. District-Sen. Bob Dixon), and Sheila Shockey (Shockey Consulting)

Environmental Priorities Task Force Meeting #5

Jan Millington, City Attorney, made a presentation regarding environmental regulations. She reviewed the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and federal regulations regarding land. Environmental protection laws started in the 1970s- each has a federal law, regulations developed by the US EPA, and the states developed their own regulations. Laws and regulations are implemented through the use of tools including permits, inspections and enforcement, grant programs, voluntary measures, and technical assistance. She said the regulations are very complex and provided a tip of the iceberg overview of the law, regulations, and tools and how our local community complies.

Ms. Millington presented the challenges for each of the environmental areas in terms of regulatory compliance. The focus of enforcement initially in air and water was on point sources or easily identifiable sources of pollution. The regulators use a permitting process to manage pollution from point sources. The regulators are now moving more toward nonpoint sources. Compliance is through voluntary measures and less reliant on permits.

Land regulations have moved from locating and cleaning pollution and proper disposal of waste to regulating potential sources of land pollution from cradle to grave. This includes waste reduction strategies.

Challenges for all three areas (water, air, and land) are:

- Affordability - Silos of money with little flexibility for local government due to the Hancock amendment to the Missouri constitution.
- Changing regulations and reevaluating existing ones
- Aging infrastructure
- Third-party lawsuits driving enforcement
- Local politics

Errin Kemper, Assistant Director Environmental Services, gave a presentation updating the task force members on the regulatory timeline and affordability. A comparison of the regulatory implementation costs for water, air, land, and drinking water were discussed as well as the limitations facing the community.

Sheila Shockey, Shockey Consulting Services, led the Task Force through a selection of priority choices to guide the decision process. Topics included community goals for overall environmental quality and air quality. (Water quality and land resources will be addressed at the next meeting.)

The group discussed priorities to consider in the areas of environmental protection, financial investment, and implementation strategies. Values selected by the task force included:

- Quality of life
- Environmental stewardship
- Economic development/redevelopment
- Knowledge is power – base decisions on sound science
- Return on investment (financial+social+environment)
- Protect the public
- Be a good neighbor – Golden Rule – Do unto others

The task forces reviewed and discussed draft policy statements to help focus the community's Integrated Planning process. These are summarized below.

Draft Policy Statement: Learn more about the overall sources of pollution before investing financially in new programs or large-scale infrastructure improvements.

Pros: Spend wisely, fix the right thing. Makes large-scale more manageable. Public awareness.

Cons: Takes time – make sure well spent. Problem could get worse in the meantime. If known – take action.

Draft Policy Statement: Don't invest only in programs/projects where existing funds are available, but rather reallocate and align our existing financial resources where we can achieve multiple benefits.

Multiple benefits desired by the task force included: human health, wildlife protection, economic development, improved safety (property/person).

Pros: Efficient use of resources. Public buy-in. Flexibility.

Cons: Silo funding and Hancock could limit ability to solve multiple problems with funds available.

Draft Policy Statement: Don't invest only in programs/projects where existing funds are available, but rather reallocate and align our existing financial resources where the most benefit can be achieved in terms of overall improvement to the environment regardless of cost.

Pros: Major environmental improvement. May be politically attractive.

Cons: Don't have unlimited resources. May not be visible to public. May not fix enough things.

OR

Draft Policy Statement: Don't invest only in programs/projects where existing funds are available, but rather reallocate and align our existing financial resources where the least amount can be spent to achieve the desired outcome(s).

Pros: Stretches dollars. Good stewardship. May be politically attractive.

Cons: May not meet regulations. Ambiguous goals – what is desired outcome. Overtime, issues could compound & become more expensive later.

The Task Force then discussed policy questions.

Policy Question:

1. Should we let the Integrated Plan (which is guided by the community's priorities) drive our investment decisions?

OR

2. Do we let the regulatory framework guide how we invest in environmental protection?

Policy Question:

1. Should we let the IP drive our investment decisions?
2. Do we let the regulatory framework guide how we invest in environmental protection?

Response:

An alternative could be to use regulatory framework to the extent they fit with community priorities.

A different response was- Another challenge - lots of regulations are about outcomes, but some of the regulations don't have identified outcomes.