

## MIT Open Access Articles

*Roles for government and other sectors in the governance of green infrastructure in the U.S.*

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. **Please share** how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

**Citation:** Harrington, Elise and David Hsu. "Roles for government and other sectors in the governance of green infrastructure in the U.S." *Environmental Science & Policy* 88 (October 2018): 104-115 © 2018 Elsevier Ltd

**As Published:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.06.003>

**Publisher:** Elsevier BV

**Persistent URL:** <https://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/128377>

**Version:** Author's final manuscript: final author's manuscript post peer review, without publisher's formatting or copy editing

**Terms of use:** Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License



1 Title:

2  
3 Roles for governments and other sectors in the governance of green infrastructure in the U.S.  
4  
5

6 Authors:

7 Elise Harrington, David Hsu\* (equal authors)  
8  
9

10 Abstract:

11  
12 This paper argues that government leadership both at the federal and local level remains central  
13 to implementing and building green infrastructure for stormwater management. We conducted  
14 interviews with more than forty city, federal, and agency staff on how and why they work to  
15 implement green infrastructure, and then interpreted the results using the literature from  
16 environmental governance and water management. We found that governments and non-  
17 governmental actors tend to act in different ways to support green infrastructure. Governments at  
18 both the federal and local level often take the lead role in driving green infrastructure via policy  
19 and political support, and coordinate measurement of green infrastructure practices, while non-  
20 governmental actors lead in information sharing. We also found that governments and non-  
21 governmental actors work together to build local capacity by providing resources to support local  
22 collaboration and partnerships. This paper concludes by highlighting key areas for collaboration  
23 between federal and local governments and non-governmental actors in order to enhance the  
24 implementation of green infrastructure.  
25  
26

27 Keywords:

28  
29 environmental governance; regulation; green infrastructure; stormwater; policy process; adaptive  
30 governance  
31  
32

33 1. Introduction:

34 The 1972 U.S. Clean Water Act gave the U.S. federal government important new regulatory  
35 powers to govern water pollution. Numerous amendments and court rulings have since modified  
36 the interpretation and exercise of these powers (see, for example, Adler et al., 1993; Boyd, 2000;  
37 Andreen, 2003). Despite gains in water quality, water pollution remains a significant problem,  
38 with more than half of assessed rivers and streams across the country remaining impaired (US  
39 EPA, 2016). Urban stormwater runoff is now recognized as one of the leading sources of water

40 pollution and water quality impairment. Permitting programs for urban stormwater runoff began  
41 in the 1990s and continue today (NRC, 2009).

42 Local governments have long been recognized as important actors in achieving  
43 environmental goals both at local and global scales. The 1992 Rio Summit of national leaders  
44 and environmental ministers stated that:

45 “... the participation and cooperation of local authorities will be a determining factor in  
46 [Agenda 21] fulfilling its objectives. Local authorities construct, operate and maintain  
47 economic, social, and environmental infrastructure, oversee planning processes, establish  
48 local environmental policies and regulations, and assist in implementing national and  
49 subnational environmental policies. As the level of governance closest to the people, they  
50 play a vital role in educating, mobilizing, and responding to the public to promote sustainable  
51 development” (United Nations Environmental Programme, 2000).

52  
53 Current approaches to stormwater management illustrate the wide-ranging roles of local  
54 governments. Local governments can commit to sustained and coordinated stormwater  
55 management through plans that last twenty years or more (see, for example, PWD, 2009; NYC  
56 DEP, 2016). Local governments can bring unique financial resources and capacity to implement  
57 environmental policy and action: the municipal governments of New York, Philadelphia, and  
58 Washington D.C., announced \$5.3, \$2.0, and \$2.6 billion stormwater plans, respectively (NYC,  
59 2010; PWD, 2011; DC Water, 2016). In tandem with local government investments, the U.S.  
60 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provides funding to states via Section 319 funds, often  
61 supplemented by additional state funds (Hardy and Koontz, 2007). Even within a single  
62 municipality, multiple government agencies are often engaged in active partnerships to address  
63 stormwater management.

64 Given the authority, jurisdiction, and financial capacity of governments, examining how  
65 government works with other sectors such as non-profits on stormwater management yields  
66 useful insights for practice and scholarship in two areas. First, how governments and non-

67 governmental actors work together in practice is relevant to the scholarship on adaptive  
68 governance, and on environmental governance more broadly. This literature has recently sought  
69 to incorporate approaches that emphasize the flexibility of legal instruments (Cosens et al.,  
70 2017), recognize how different modes of governance emerge and overlap (Driessen et al., 2012),  
71 and articulate the ways that social organizations can support more effective environmental  
72 management (Allen et al., 2011). Second, how governments and non-governmental actors work  
73 together is relevant to the literature on green infrastructure, which frequently emphasizes the  
74 different roles of multiple actors (Shandas and Messer, 2008; Keeley et al., 2013; Flynn and  
75 Davidson, 2016; Chaffin et al., 2016).

76 To show how governments work with non-profits and other organizations, we interviewed  
77 more than forty city, federal, and agency staff on how and why they implement green  
78 infrastructure. These interviews describe a national view of stormwater management approaches,  
79 which complements the deeper but narrower approach of Keeley et al. (2013) , which is based on  
80 interviews with a range of actors in two cities. Applying the existing literature on governance  
81 and environmental management to the implementation of green infrastructure in the U.S., we  
82 find that government – from the federal to the local level – plays a necessary leadership role in  
83 how stormwater agencies and managers adapt to new ideas and opportunities. In particular, we  
84 focus on three roles for government and other sectors in the governance of green infrastructure in  
85 the U.S.: as driver, as coordinator, and as a capacity-builder. From our interviews, we conclude  
86 that governments and non-governmental actors tend to act in different ways: governments often  
87 take the lead role in driving green infrastructure via policy and political support, as well as  
88 coordinating the measurement of green infrastructure practices, while non-governmental actors  
89 often lead in information sharing. Governments and non-governmental actors often work

90 together to build local capacity by providing resources to support local collaboration and  
91 partnerships. Throughout this paper, we show how governments and non-governmental actors  
92 take different roles in leading and supporting the governance of green infrastructure for urban  
93 stormwater management. Where previous scholarship on adaptive governance emphasizes non-  
94 governmental actors, we show that governments continues to play multiple important roles in the  
95 governance of green infrastructure for stormwater management.

96 In the next section we examine the literature on environmental governance, with a focus on  
97 adaptive governance. We then discuss our research methods, analysis, and results. We conclude  
98 by highlighting key areas of collaboration between federal and local governments and non-  
99 governmental actors on green infrastructure.

100

## 101 2. Literature Review:

102 In this section we first describe the importance of local governments in concepts of governance,  
103 and then examine the ways in which governments and non-governmental actors work together to  
104 achieve environmental and water quality goals. Finally, we discuss adaptive governance and  
105 illustrate the link between social factors and the effective implementation of green infrastructure.

106 Local governments play a critical role in implementing environmental goals, with  
107 responsibility ranging from infrastructure development to planning processes to implementing  
108 national and state environmental policies (United Nations Environmental Programme, 2000).  
109 Scholars use the concept of environmental governance to identify more effective ways to manage  
110 environmental problems by emphasizing the networks of, and partnerships between,  
111 governments and non-governmental organizations. The definition of governance continues to be  
112 refined and applied to new areas, but the term governance has historically been used in three

113 ways: first, in referring to international cooperation managed by organizations other than formal  
114 states; second, as policy implementation (such as “good governance”); and third, as domestic  
115 networks of actors tasked with achieving public goals (Fukuyama, 2016). Such governance  
116 networks include governments and non-governmental actors, or in some cases, can be networks  
117 between governments, such as municipal networks aimed at addressing climate change  
118 (Bulkeley, 2005). Given our domestic focus, we use the third definition of governance, that  
119 “‘governance’ is about establishing, promoting and supporting a specific type of relationship  
120 between governmental and nongovernmental actors in the governing process” (Howlett and  
121 Ramesh, 2014, p. 318, italics in the original).

122 Embedded in the concept of governance is a normative argument about the most effective  
123 way to achieve public goals: “such as ‘network governance’ or ‘collaborative governance’  
124 combin[e] the best of both governmental and market-based arrangements by bringing together  
125 key public and private actors in a policy sector in a constructive and inexpensive way” (Howlett  
126 and Ramesh, 2014, p. 318). Gunningham and Holley (2016) chart out the recent history of  
127 Anglo-Saxon environmental governance – and its relationship to regulation and law – by  
128 providing context for how government and non-governmental organizations, such as business  
129 and NGOs, can work together. For complex environmental challenges, “New Environmental  
130 Governance” emphasizes “flexibility, participation, collaboration, learning, and adaptation”  
131 (Gunningham and Holley, 2016, p. 283). These approaches range from pragmatism to adaptive  
132 management (Holling, 1978; Walters and Holling, 1990) and aim to bridge the gap between  
133 traditional approaches to regulation and implementation, to enable “problem solving that is  
134 inclusive of local circumstances and able to capitalize on the unique local and other knowledges  
135 and capacities of multiple public and private actors” (Gunningham and Holley, 2016, p. 284).

136 Among these multiple definitions and approaches, scholars highlight the challenge of  
 137 differentiating between different types of governance especially when “modes of governance  
 138 tend to build on rather than completely replace one another” (Driessen et al., 2012, p. 157).  
 139 Scholars are beginning to examine the layering of governance mechanisms, such as  
 140 incorporating legal tools in adaptive approaches (Cosens et al., 2017; Craig et al., 2017).

141 We identified three different roles that governments and non-governmental actors play in  
 142 achieving local stormwater goals (going forward, we use the terms “roles” and “modes of action”  
 143 interchangeably to describe how different actors pursue their goals). We focus on  
 144 implementation and the perceptions of those actors responsible for translating stormwater and  
 145 water quality policy goals into local green stormwater infrastructure programs. In Table 1, we  
 146 show three modes of action for governments and non-governmental actors, and how they relate  
 147 to examples in implementing green infrastructure.

148

<b>Water Governance Actions</b>	<b>Implementing Green Infrastructure</b>
Driver: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More recent modes of environmental governance are built on previous governance approaches (Driessen et al., 2012), therefore early water regulations and subsequent policies and programs continue to influence flexible, adaptive governance approaches.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differing perspectives on implementing stormwater management programs reflect the continuation of different approaches to governance (e.g. for stricter laws vs. integrated management, see Cousins, 2017).</li> <li>• Including green infrastructure in legal requirements can encourage agencies to incorporate more learning and experimentation, although the time limitations can constrain adaptive management approaches (Chaffin et al., 2016).</li> </ul>
Coordination: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Along with cooperation and collaboration, coordination plays an important role in solving environmental problems, with an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing regionally salient definitions and approaches aid in complying with requirements while establishing locally relevant standards.</li> </ul>

<p>emphasis on information exchange, resource exchange, and integration of activities (Margerum and Robinson, 2015).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourages individuals and organizations to shift existing engineering practices toward more flexible solutions (Carlet, 2015; Cettner et al., 2013; Chaffin et al., 2016).</li> </ul>
<p>Capacity-building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both governmental and non-governmental actors allocate resources to build capacity to carry out policies and program, such as enforcement (monitoring and sanctions) or increases in efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given resource limitations for implementing environmental solutions, federal and state funds can support such partnerships and provide technical assistance (Hardy and Koontz, 2007).</li> <li>• The multiple benefits of green infrastructure can provide additional resources (financial, social, organizational) to address stormwater challenges to achieve multiple policy goals.</li> </ul>

149 **Table 1** *Three modes of action and related examples from implementing green infrastructure for*  
150 *stormwater management*

151  
152 2.1. Achieving water quality goals: government and non-governmental actors:

153 Scholars have discussed the actors and actions involved in environmental policy and  
154 management for decades (Driessen et al., 2012). Environmental governance in a broad sense  
155 emphasizes “interventions aiming at changes in environment-related incentives” (Lemos and  
156 Agrawal, 2006, p. 298), although more specific formulations focus on processes, mechanisms,  
157 organizations, and networks that influence environmental outcomes. This broadening of actors  
158 and responsibilities plays an important role in how scholars assess the processes and mechanisms  
159 related to achieving environmental goals, such as in the ways that global environmental goals are  
160 rooted in key local and subnational actors and networks (Betsill and Bulkeley, 2006; Bulkeley  
161 and Betsill, 2005). Governance of water goals – water quality and quantity goals – relies on  
162 actions at different scales given that challenges may be appropriate to examine at a project,  
163 catchment, basin, or even, global scale (Moss and Newig, 2010).

164 Collaborative partnerships help address the complexity within environmental policymaking  
165 and management. This complexity can stem from multiplicity and mix of institutions governing  
166 resource management, mixed motivations, and the interconnected nature of many environmental  
167 problems (Lubell, 2015). The number, duration, and type of organizations involved in solving  
168 environmental problems can vary substantially by location, but such processes require learning,  
169 cooperation, and distribution (Lubell, 2013). Scholars continue to refine the distinctions between  
170 cooperation, coordination, and collaboration: for example, to Margerum and Robinson,  
171 coordination “implies a process of joint decision making that places greater demands on  
172 partnership activities...due to high expectations for information exchange, more significant  
173 integration of activities and more exchange of resources” (Margerum and Robinson, 2015, p.  
174 54). Other scholars propose cooperation, coordination, and collaboration as a continuum of  
175 interaction, yet in practice water management often has a mix of interactions and institutional  
176 arrangements (McNamara, 2012).

177 Previous scholarship emphasizes the outcomes of such partnerships, highlighting key actions  
178 related to more successful outcomes. Scholars are just beginning to test empirically whether and  
179 how certain group responsibilities can enhance collaboration, such as: “planning, management,  
180 outreach, monitoring, coordination, projects, and education” (Scott, 2015, p. 549). While these  
181 responsibilities are not always easily distinguishable since a single activity may meet multiple  
182 responsibilities (e.g. both outreach and education), Scott (2015) finds that watershed groups that  
183 include management responsibilities are associated with better water quality outcomes.

184 Collaborative watershed management is utilized by policymakers to enhance outcomes, but  
185 “the role of government in initiating and supporting collaborative groups” (Scott, 2015, p. 538) is  
186 understudied. The “good government” definition of governance that focuses on implementation

187 also highlights that governments have multiple priorities that require implementation capacity.  
188 Policy enforcement is often related to government capacity to monitor and sanction, and capacity  
189 to provide services is associated with increases in efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness  
190 (Grindle, 1997). In the more flexible, polycentric paradigm of governance, this type of capacity  
191 does not just sit with government, but the capacity to measure, monitor, and enhance compliance  
192 may come from watershed partnerships or from non-governmental actors.

193 For stormwater management, federal and state funds are used to encourage such partnerships  
194 and provide technical assistance to build local capacity (Hardy and Koontz, 2007). While  
195 scholars studying adaptive governance have “address[ed] the broader social contexts that enable  
196 ecosystem-based management” (Folke et al., 2005, p. 444), they also increasingly recognize that  
197 the legal requirements used in more stringent, earlier approaches to environmental policymaking  
198 can be flexible and evolve over time (Cosens et al., 2017). This understanding reflects, what  
199 Hacker et al. (2015) call “drift” and “conversion” – drift occurs when “institutions or policies  
200 are deliberately held in place while their context shifts in ways that alter their effects” (2015, p.  
201 180) and conversion “occurs when political actors are able to redirect institutions or policies  
202 toward purposes beyond their original intent” (2015, p. 180). Such opportunities reflect the  
203 growing recognition that there are opportunities to design more formal governance tools, such as  
204 law, in ways that encourage the coordination and collaboration needed for adaptive governance  
205 (DeCaro et al., 2017).

206

## 207 2.2. Adaptive governance and managing green infrastructure:

208 Allen and Gunderson define adaptive governance as “the institutional framework that deals  
209 with social and political dimensions of resource management and that allows adaptive

210 management to function” (2011, p. 1379). Adaptive governance also aims to address the  
211 uncertainty and complexity inherent in managing environmental problems (Chaffin et al., 2014).  
212 This emphasis on uncertainty and complexity links adaptive governance to existing policy  
213 mechanisms, which “may require that some imprecision and ambiguity of formal regulatory  
214 standards and definitions be maintained, as an adaptive arena in which the contending parties can  
215 interact, negotiate, and settle and renegotiate the practical meanings as they go along” (Gupta,  
216 2004, p. 142).

217 In addition to the flexibility of these formal mechanisms, adaptive governance “is dependent  
218 on adaptive co-management, and adaptive co-management is most effective when there is:  
219 leadership with vision for the system of interest; legislation favoring adaptive management;  
220 funds for adaptive management; monitoring of the ecological system; information flow (i.e.,  
221 cross-scale linkages); a variety of sources of knowledge; and a venue for collaboration...” (Allen  
222 et al., 2011, p. 1343). The multiple actors that facilitate effective co-management comprise the  
223 adaptive governance framework for managing green infrastructure. Our findings parallel the  
224 features that contribute to effective management by both governments and non-governmental  
225 actors, such as political leadership for green infrastructure, flexibility in regulations that allow  
226 for adaptive management, resources from public and private funds that support green  
227 infrastructure, responsibilities for measurement and monitoring, and information transfer across  
228 networks, municipalities, and within regions.

229 The implementation of green infrastructure projects and programs therefore illustrates how  
230 the adaptive governance framework can be applied to environmental problem-solving. Green  
231 stormwater infrastructure allows local applications of stormwater management practices that  
232 allow for “a high degree of flexibility that can be tailored to the needs of particular communities”

233 (Stoner, 2007, p. 9). The concept of flexibility for policy is rooted in allowing for increased  
234 choice (Benbear and Coglianesse, 2012) and “the capacity of both regulators and regulated  
235 entities to adapt their behavior in response to new opportunities” (Fiorino, 2004, p. 395).  
236 Recently, scholars have emphasized the link between adaptive management and green  
237 infrastructure, reiterating the ways that regulatory compliance and legally established targets  
238 such as consent decrees can both constrain and encourage adaptive management (Chaffin et al.,  
239 2016). Inertia from decades of institutional know-how and accepted engineering practices is a  
240 recognized challenge of green infrastructure programs (Carlet, 2015; Cettner et al., 2013). Green  
241 infrastructure requirements for stormwater management, however, as compared to gray  
242 infrastructure, can spur “cultural shifts” (Chaffin et al., 2016, p. 437) that encourage the legally  
243 responsible parties to think beyond engineered solutions.

244 Implementation of green infrastructure is constrained not just by management approaches,  
245 but access to resources, public perception, politics and technical expertise (Keeley et al., 2013).  
246 Emphasizing how green infrastructure also enables other co-benefits can build stronger  
247 coalitions and support for green infrastructure projects. Additional co-benefits include recreation  
248 or physical activity, mental health benefits from access to green space, public health benefits  
249 related to disease control, carbon sequestration, economic benefits, increases in property values  
250 and the development of social capital (Coutts and Hahn, 2015; Mekala et al., 2015). This  
251 growing emphasis on co-benefits does not replace the need for water quality and ecological  
252 benefits but provides new opportunities to address multiple public priorities, such as jointly  
253 addressing water quality and economic revitalization (Keeley et al., 2013).

254

255 3. Research Design

256 We conducted qualitative, semi-structured interviews with 35 municipal and water agency  
257 staff and seven officials from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), at both the  
258 regional and federal levels. To select interviewees, we corresponded with each regional EPA  
259 office (ten total) to identify a set of municipal departments or water agencies actively pursuing  
260 green infrastructure in response to stormwater issues. Additionally, regional offices suggested  
261 appropriate individuals in each locality that would be knowledgeable about green infrastructure  
262 policies and programs. This strategy helped us identify a broad sample of individuals active in  
263 green infrastructure projects and programs. In total, our sample was comprised of twenty-five  
264 individuals working in municipal departments, ten in regional planning agencies or regional  
265 sewer authorities, five EPA regional employees, and two EPA headquarters employees.

266 All interviews were conducted by phone and lasted from 44 minutes to 1 hour and 37  
267 minutes with 1 to 3 interviewees. Interview questions covered location-specific policy details  
268 and information on the implementation of green infrastructure, with questions: on the definition  
269 of green infrastructure, regulations and requirements; drivers of and motivation for using green  
270 infrastructure; and key actors and departments. Additional questions covered financing of green  
271 infrastructure, long-term maintenance, co-benefits of green infrastructure, and public  
272 engagement. The first round of analysis examined the motivations for, challenges in  
273 implementing, and perceived benefits of green infrastructure. Next, we examined the responses  
274 within each of these areas to identify key similarities and differences across interviewees.  
275 Finally, we grouped the responses into those that illustrated governments as driver, coordinator,  
276 and capacity-builder. We analyzed the data by quantifying the frequency of key concepts  
277 mentioned in the interviews and then identifying quotes that represent issues mentioned by  
278 multiple interviewees. We use both frequency counts and representative quotes in our findings

279 section. Our interviews sampled individuals working in local governments and water agencies  
280 across the U.S., rather than comparing the experiences of governments to non-governmental  
281 actors or multiple actors in a given jurisdiction. While our sample represents the perspective of  
282 governments in the implementation of green infrastructure, future research is needed to compare  
283 and contrast the perspective of governments with non-governmental actors and community  
284 organizations.

285

#### 286 4. Findings

287 The growing literature on adaptive governance focuses on the ad hoc and temporary partnerships  
288 that assist in ongoing environmental management. We found that governments – from the federal  
289 to local level – plays a necessary leadership role in how stormwater agencies and staff implement  
290 green infrastructure. We highlight three modes of action that underpin green infrastructure  
291 implementation in the U.S.: as driver, as coordinator, and as capacity-builder. Our findings  
292 suggest that these three modes of action include the following roles for governments:

- 293 • *Governments as drivers*: regulatory requirements and local political support for green  
294 infrastructure;
- 295 • *Governments as coordinators*: support from governments in providing common  
296 definitions and best practices (filling an information gap) and assisting in measurement of  
297 impact an effectiveness of green infrastructure;
- 298 • *Governments as capacity-builders*: support for local collaboration and partnerships.

299 The illustrative quotations used to support our findings are *italicized*, followed by parentheses  
300 with a de-identified description of the interviewee (for example, “local stormwater manager”). In  
301 these quotations, we find greater emphasis on the role of governments in encouraging adaptive

302 management for green infrastructure projects. Assessing the role of governments, compared to  
 303 non-governmental actors, highlights the important role that governments play in motivating  
 304 green infrastructure and sustaining measurable work toward water quality goals. For practitioners  
 305 and policymakers, we argue that funding and management strategies should strengthen, not  
 306 separate, the relationship between non-governmental actors and government, both of which are  
 307 essential to adaptive governance frameworks for green infrastructure.

308

#### 309 4.1. Governments as drivers

310 Governments as a driver of green infrastructure highlights the importance of regulations and  
 311 local political leadership in supporting the implementation of green infrastructure programs.  
 312 Green infrastructure, as a “*tool in the toolbox*,” (local stormwater manager) for stormwater  
 313 management, has built on decades of experimentation with watershed planning in response to the  
 314 Clean Water Act and is increasingly tied to other local sustainability and environmental planning  
 315 initiatives. This section examines the distribution of drivers for green infrastructure mentioned  
 316 by interviewees and the role of local politics and political champions in encouraging green  
 317 infrastructure. In Table 2, we present frequency counts of the first and second drivers of green  
 318 infrastructure as referenced by interviewees.<sup>1</sup>

<b>Driver 1</b>	Frequency	Percent	<b>Driver 2</b>	Frequency	Percent
Regulation	20	57.14%	Co-benefits	13	37.14%
Public Advocacy	6	17.14%	Cost	6	17.14%
Stewardship	4	11.43%	Regulation	5	14.29%
Co-benefits	2	5.71%	Sustainability	5	14.29%
Climate Change	1	2.86%	Public Advocacy	4	11.43%
Cost	1	2.86%	Future Regulation	1	2.86%
Sustainability	1	2.86%	Land-use	1	2.86%
	35	100%	Total	35	100%

<sup>1</sup> Exemplar quotations for all cited motivations are provided in Appendix 1.

319 **Table 2** *Summary of Drivers of Green Infrastructure (35 interviewees)*

320 4.1.1. Regulation as a driver of green infrastructure implementation

321 Among the interviewees, 20 of 35 cited regulation as a key driver for green infrastructure,  
322 meaning they emphasized regulatory compliance, permitting, or mandatory planning before other  
323 motivations for green infrastructure. An additional five interviewees mentioned regulation as a  
324 secondary driver, with one interviewee highlighting future regulations as an impetus for green  
325 infrastructure:

326 *“We just keep hearing how it’s something that EPA is really pushing and pushing more*  
327 *and more, and we know that there will be a point where there is an absolute requirement.*  
328 *So, we are really wanting to understand [green infrastructure] more and get some*  
329 *demonstration projects”* (local government employee).

330  
331 The push from the EPA was cited by multiple interviewees and is tied to compliance with  
332 permitting requirements, such that:

333 *“...we make sure that we are in compliance with that permit... so that’s why we have an*  
334 *interest in low-impact development. In addition to our stormwater group, development*  
335 *services have an interest in low-impact development because we have done some pretty*  
336 *extensive education and outreach with them on the importance of it and why they should*  
337 *care about low-impact development – because EPA is really pushing it, it’s not going*  
338 *away. This is something we need to pay attention to, and it just makes sense – cleaner,*  
339 *greener cities”* (local government employee).

340  
341 Or as another interviewee explained: *“the origin of green infrastructure for watershed protection*  
342 *was regulatory compliance”* (local watershed program manager).

343 Additionally, we show in Table 2 that regulation is not the only driver of green  
344 infrastructure, with the additional drivers of public advocacy, co-benefits, cost, and sustainability  
345 also frequently cited. Yet it is also difficult to completely disentangle regulatory motivations  
346 from other drivers, finding that regulation underlies other motivations as well. For example,  
347 while the quotation below focuses on cost reductions, the requirements to spend capital on  
348 combined sewer overflows stems from the Clean Water Act:

349           *“One thing people shouldn’t be thinking about is that this [is a] question of gray*  
350 *infrastructure or green infrastructure. It’s really gray and green. There’s no way that a*  
351 *city could solve its combined sewer problems with just green infrastructure.... My sense*  
352 *is that if you put green infrastructure in; you’re probably shaving 10 to 20-percent of*  
353 *your capital cost. So right off the bat, green infrastructure is more cost effective”* (county  
354 water authority manager).

355  
356 Additionally, the regulatory requirements for planning and permitting provided organizations  
357 with opportunities to push for a new mode of stormwater planning. Similar to references to cost-  
358 effectiveness, collaboration among advocacy organizations and public participation in  
359 stormwater matters are, at times, linked to regulatory requirements. An interviewee in Pittsburgh  
360 emphasized that plans can provide organizations with helpful guideposts for further discussion  
361 and planning:

362           *“Initially, the motivating factor was a grassroots campaign by an organization called the*  
363 *Clean Rivers Campaign. They were looking at the consent decree and consent order, wet*  
364 *weather feasibility, and long-term control plans from Alcosan and other folks in the*  
365 *region that were going to be strictly gray plans. The [initial] plan was, we got nine*  
366 *billion gallons of water overflowing into the rivers; we’re going to build giant tunnels,*  
367 *and, then, pump it and treat it so that we don’t have sewage going into the rivers”* (local  
368 water authority manager).

369  
370 While in some cases interviewees emphasized cost-effectiveness or stewardship before  
371 direct regulatory compliance, our interviews and analysis show that government regulation and  
372 acceptance of green infrastructure as a solution for stormwater management also play critical  
373 roles in motivating the use of green infrastructure. Stormwater management has shifted from  
374 only gray (e.g., strictly engineering) solutions to both green and gray solutions which require  
375 engagement with the community to achieve other co-benefits:

376           *“Putting in another pipe is not always the best solution...when you can do things with*  
377 *green infrastructure, such [as] the permeable pavers that enhance the community,*  
378 *increase the property value, and spur redevelopment in an area. It also allows us,*  
379 *especially in some of the areas that have been more disenfranchised over a long period of*  
380 *time, for us to do things that can help enhance the community and improve the quality of*  
381 *life. We want to be able to improve the quality of life of our ratepayers and our*  
382 *constituents with our projects”* (local stormwater manager).

383  
384 Regulation and the promise of future requirements continues to guide the adoption and  
385 implementation of green infrastructure, not only as a solution to stormwater problems, but as a  
386 way to develop co-benefits such as beautification, air quality, and flooding.

387

#### 388 4.1.2. Local political support for green infrastructure

389 In addition to regulatory action, governments drive green infrastructure through local  
390 leadership and political will. Interviewees emphasized that support for green infrastructure for  
391 stormwater is highly political, from references to broader political cultures to specific moments  
392 of government leadership. As one interviewee said:

393 *“...that two tiers, committed staff and the high-level political support, is the only way to*  
394 *get green infrastructure. You need both, that's the take home of my last 15 years”* (local  
395 green infrastructure specialist).

396

397 Interviewees referenced politicians and political support in a number of ways, with the most  
398 frequent references to political support as: first, providing the momentum for green infrastructure  
399 and, second, integrating green infrastructure and stormwater management into other critical  
400 municipal initiatives. Influential elected officials were mentioned by 16 interviewees, with an  
401 emphasis on mayoral influence and leadership in garnering broader support for green  
402 infrastructure, which was mentioned by 8 interviewees. Furthermore, four interviewees  
403 mentioned the importance of appointed officials such as municipal commissioners, three other  
404 interviewees mentioned the role of city council, and one mentioned a congressional champion.

405 Support from political leadership was described as a key factor in *“making a successful*  
406 *program”* (local director of public works) and that it is not just one-time support, but *“continued*  
407 *public pressure and political support to keep trying this path because it is the less certain path. It*  
408 *is a new technology and a whole new comfort zone”* (local water utility employee). In cases

409 where local political champions aligned with green infrastructure, interviewees described this  
410 way:

411 *“critical to the success of [a green infrastructure program] because he supports the*  
412 *ordinance changes and all of that...the way that we did that was doing the demonstration*  
413 *projects, and then making sure that the mayor and city council got out there to see the*  
414 *demonstration projects and heard from the community about how they want more*  
415 *projects like that done and I feel it’s a smarter way of doing it. I think that that political*  
416 *leadership really needs to be established early on”* (local director of public works).  
417

418 Conversely, locations without strong champions have more difficulty in pursuing green  
419 infrastructure programs:

420 *“I think the other thing that comes into play is the political climate. We’ve never really*  
421 *had any kind of politician who has led a charge for infrastructure and used it to [create]*  
422 *a positive spin in the community, kind of like Philadelphia recognizing that they needed*  
423 *to revamp some of their neighborhoods and utilize one program with another. We just*  
424 *don’t have that political climate here. It tends to be very conservative, and it’s very much*  
425 *focused around not raising taxes and not having any adverse financial impact on the*  
426 *community”* (local public works employee).  
427

428 Additionally, interviewees highlighted the importance of ongoing political leadership for long-  
429 term support and allocation of resources.

430 *“The local champion was the local councilman...he wanted to find a way to use green*  
431 *infrastructure to manage the smaller rain events and we got going to do a pilot and then*  
432 *he left, and everything just stopped. The elected officials there just didn’t understand it,*  
433 *didn’t believe it, didn’t want to spend money, didn’t want to spend time. So, we never*  
434 *went any further than just beginning to design a pilot program for them* (regional EPA  
435 employee).”  
436

437 As this quote from an EPA interviewee illustrates, political support is not a silver bullet and  
438 political support for green infrastructure can result in different on-the-ground outcomes. Even  
439 when local leaders translate ideas into organized action, such as the creation of the Anacostia  
440 Waterfront Corporation in Washington D.C., which *“was dissolved when that mayor’s term*  
441 *ended”* (local stormwater manager) it was nevertheless an *“impetus for green infrastructure and*

442 *policy moving forward*” (local stormwater manager) and formed an objective pursued later by  
443 other municipal departments in Washington D.C.

444 Local political leaders are powerful allies for stormwater management because they “*are*  
445 *interested not just in solving the combined overflow problem but also in making a greener city.*  
446 *That’s where green infrastructure starts to come into the picture*” (regional sewer district  
447 manager). They help translate and integrate stormwater initiatives into broader city efforts on  
448 sustainability and complete streets.

449 “*The previous mayor and this [current] mayor created and embraced a sustainable DC*  
450 *plan that includes restoring our rivers to the fishable and swimmable conditions...green*  
451 *infrastructure is absolutely a critical piece to achieving that goal...DC has really*  
452 *embraced the role of trying to be a leader in sustainability and being [at] the forefront in*  
453 *a lot of ways. We’ve got buy-ins from the highest levels, and I think that helps a lot*”  
454 (local stormwater manager).

455  
456 Regulatory motivation can provide the long-time horizons needed to achieve water quality goals,  
457 but local politicians can link broader regulatory goals to ongoing initiatives that resonate with  
458 local communities. As presented in Table 2, regulation is not the only driver of green  
459 infrastructure, public advocacy, and co-benefits play important roles in garnering support green  
460 infrastructure projects and programs. This requires not only a top-down push from government,  
461 but coordination with bottom-up actors. As an interviewee from Pittsburgh noted,

462 “*The current new mayor is very keen on green infrastructure... [so] we’ve got pretty*  
463 *good top-down as well as bottom-up support for this as we’re moving forward now. Until*  
464 *just recently, within the last year or so with the new mayor, we really didn’t have a good*  
465 *working relationship with the city offices in the sense that we could call on them and talk*  
466 *to them openly about the policy initiatives that they did as the city.... Now, there’s some*  
467 *synergy and a lot more cooperation on this issue. I think people are beginning to*  
468 *understand that stormwater crosses a lot more boundaries politically and departmentally*  
469 *than they had thought*” (local water authority manager).

#### 471 **4.2. Sharing Coordination: Information and Measurement**

472 Understanding governments as coordinators builds on the relationships established via  
473 political leverage and policies that, as described above, create “*some synergy and a lot more*

474 *cooperation*” (local water authority manager). While governments as drivers focus on (1)  
475 translating federal policies to local priorities and (2) the role of local political actors as  
476 champions for green infrastructure, the role of governments as coordinators examines how  
477 governments can help coordinate opportunities for, and understanding of, green infrastructure  
478 across national, state, and local levels. We identified two key areas for the role of coordinator:  
479 information sharing and measurement. In this case, we find that the EPA, municipal networks to  
480 share best practices, and regional organizational all play important roles in coordinating  
481 information on, and measurement of, green infrastructure.

#### 482 4.2.1. Information sharing

483 Information sharing about green infrastructure policies, programs, and designs occurs in  
484 both vertical and horizontal directions – from federal down to local governments and  
485 horizontally, typically, between local governments. A critical transfer of knowledge and  
486 information is occurring at the regional level, with organizations partnering with their regional  
487 network of cities to establish design standards appropriate for regional ecological and  
488 hydrological characteristics. First, this section will examine the ways which EPA helps  
489 coordinate across localities. Second, we highlight how information is being shared horizontally,  
490 which supports the active role of governments in adaptive governance. Third, we discuss the  
491 ways that regions are propagating best practices and regionally relevant design strategies.

##### 492 4.2.1.1. EPA Coordination: definitions and information

493 The EPA, both at the federal and regional level, plays a critical role in helping local  
494 agencies and organizations understand what it means to establish a green infrastructure program.  
495 EPA’s role in this form of coordination does not mean that they always initiate the idea of green  
496 infrastructure, for example, the origin of low impact development and then green infrastructure is  
497 often attributed to local actors in Maryland. However, EPA efforts to coordinate among localities

498 help establish basic definitions and encourage regions to adapt the meaning of green  
499 infrastructure to their local conditions. For example, the EPA Region 6 office deals with  
500 localities with “*significant climate zone concerns and in how they all have to deal with green*  
501 *infrastructure and what green infrastructure means to them is completely different than it means*  
502 *to others*” (regional EPA employee) and so Region 6 aims to help “*them understand what green*  
503 *infrastructure meant to them...that green doesn’t necessarily mean green vegetation because in*  
504 *[the] New Mexico area and in more arid areas....we had to help them understand that*  
505 *xeriscaping could be and is green infrastructure [and that] all we are trying to do with*  
506 *stormwater, if you were to implement more green infrastructure in the stormwater realm, it was*  
507 *designed to be able to treat what we are looking for it to treat*” (regional EPA employee).

508           Across non-EPA interviewees, five attributed their definition of green infrastructure as  
509 stemming from or associated with EPA’s definition, one connected it to U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
510 Service, and two mention BMPs (best management practices). Yet like the use of BMP – a term  
511 used in the Clean Water Act – 17 interviewees also used language that parallel’s EPA’s  
512 definition of green infrastructure, such as “*mimick[ing] natural processes*” (local engineer) or  
513 “*hydrological processes*” (regional flood control district employee) or capturing “*where it falls*”  
514 (regional sewerage district employee). Table 3 provides examples of three EPA definitions of  
515 green infrastructure and three parallel interviewee definitions. Government agencies help both to  
516 customize and standardize what it means to use green infrastructure to manage stormwater.

517

EPA Definitions
-----------------

<p>Green infrastructure uses natural systems and/or engineered systems <b>designed to mimic natural processes</b> to more effectively manage urban stormwater and reduce receiving water impacts. These systems are often soil or vegetation-based and <b>include planning approaches such as tree preservation and impervious cover reduction</b>, as well as structural interventions such as rain gardens and permeable pavements. By maintaining or restoring the <b>hydrologic function</b> of urban areas, green infrastructure treats precipitation as a resource rather than waste, and can play a critical role in achieving community development as well as water quality goals (US EPA, 2013).</p>	<p>Green infrastructure practices <b>mimic natural hydrologic processes</b> to reduce the quantity and/or rate of stormwater flows into the combined sewer system (CSS). By controlling stormwater runoff through the <b>processes of infiltration, evapotranspiration, and capture</b> and use (rainwater harvesting), green infrastructure can help keep stormwater out of the CSS. (US EPA, 2014).</p>	<p>Green infrastructure includes a range of approaches for <b>managing stormwater near where it falls</b>. Most green infrastructure uses the natural processes of soils and vegetation to <b>capture, slow down, and filter runoff</b>, often allowing it to recharge ground water, but some practices <b>collect and store</b> rain water for future use (Kramer, 2014).</p>
<p>Interviewee Definitions</p>		
<p>“We define green infrastructure as small-scale stormwater management practices, non-structural techniques, and better site planning to mimic natural hydrologic runoff characteristics and minimize the impact of development on water resources” (local director of public works).</p>	<p>“Well, we define green infrastructure as really anything that is managing stormwater in a way that more closely mimics the natural hydrological cycle. That can be through stormwater management practices that retain and infiltrate water or stormwater practices that capture water for reuse. But, any type of practice that holds on to stormwater and does not release it back to our sewer system is really what we’re considering green infrastructure. Anything that reduces runoff” (local stormwater manager).</p>	<p>“The way that we define it...is that we will capture rainwater and treat it – if it’s stored, treat it where it falls using natural solutions – natural techniques versus letting it run off and get into either a combined sewer system or into our MS4 – our streams, rivers. And, basically, within the combined sewer system, we have green infrastructure that is focused more on quantity and volume, and in the MS4 [Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems] area, it’s focused more on water quality and treatment” (local MS4 program manager).</p>

518 **Table 3** Example EPA Definitions and Interviewee Definitions

519 EPA’s influential role in stormwater management was mentioned by individuals working  
520 in agencies and organizations across the country. While information from EPA to regulated  
521 entities is available online, in presentations, and workshops, the challenge is making that  
522 information locally meaningful and easily available. In some cases, such as integrated planning,  
523 EPA’s planning model is transferred to local agents. For example,

524 *“[the] 83-municipality area is split up into seven watersheds, and we have one of them*  
525 *that we are focusing on first to use an integrated watershed management approach,*  
526 *which is an EPA model for addressing many regulatory issues with water quality*  
527 *altogether and in a more cost-effective way than doing it one-by-one. This watershed has*  
528 *– half of it is in the City of Pittsburgh, and the other half of it is 11 other municipalities.*  
529 *This is kind of a test case for how we can collaborate. We’ve had a number of meetings*  
530 *with the municipal engineers in those communities, and we try to share data about their*  
531 *sewer systems and do water quality testing in that area, and we’ll be developing a plan*  
532 *for that area”* (local water authority manager).  
533

534 Additionally, EPA and state environmental agencies play a role in providing guidance and  
535 information to permitted entities as they continue to incorporate green infrastructure into their  
536 plans and programs. Here, EPA plays an important role in coordinating and then synthesizing  
537 information across jurisdictions. EPA is positioned to gather specific information and relate it to  
538 the broader set of activities occurring in an area or particular watershed. For example, for the  
539 Metropolitan Sewer District of Greater Cincinnati, *“all of [the] reports on our website and those*  
540 *are done in a way that Ohio EPA can use that information and feed that information into their*  
541 *assessment of the waterways”* (regional sewerage district employee). This is particularly salient  
542 as places look to one another for best practices and lessons learned but also recognize that  
543 approaches to green infrastructure and local conditions may differ. For example:

544 *“the more this continues to be utilized by larger communities; then we will continue to*  
545 *see the field adjust. And, I think also direction from the EPA and the DEC. I know [that]*  
546 *for our consent decree, or our administrative order, is very different from Cleveland in*  
547 *the fact that we analyze for green infrastructure first”* (local sewer authority employee).  
548

549 4.2.1.2. Horizontal information sharing: best practices and policy options

550 Knowledge development and information sharing about green infrastructure and  
551 watershed planning has occurred from EPA to permittees, but there is also substantial horizontal  
552 sharing of information. Interviewees indicated there is a balance between sharing best practices  
553 from national and regional green infrastructure leaders and customizing green infrastructure  
554 solutions to local conditions (ecological, political, and cultural).

555 *“There’s so much good EPA information, and even Oklahoma State here is one of the*  
556 *leading places that has a good environmental program that really touts low-impact*  
557 *development. There’s a lot of good resources to draw from, both nationally and in*  
558 *Oklahoma. It’s kind of really more networking with our peer cities to really try to get*  
559 *some things rolling...I think we all really have a lot of the resources, and probably more*  
560 *information on LID and green infrastructure than we can ever read. But, really, just kind*  
561 *of directly implementing it and getting it localized to really take hold in your specific*  
562 *areas is the challenge I think that we’re facing specifically here, anyway”* (local  
563 stormwater manager).  
564

565 As discussed earlier, government agencies help coordinated and summarize information across  
566 localities, and then local jurisdictions translate elements of what works in other places into  
567 meaningful local solutions.

568 *“I think just generally speaking, we always look at, in a way, what other cities are doing.*  
569 *And particular cities that are kind of our same size, have kind of the same permit, drivers*  
570 *that have somewhat of the same climate, and that kind of stuff...I appreciate looking at*  
571 *and gleaning information and knowledge from all the very successful programs out there.*  
572 *But, sometimes it is hard when you’re translating that to your policymaker when they’re*  
573 *like, but you’re not comparing apples and apples, so to speak”* (local water quality  
574 project manager).  
575

576 Despite the challenges of direct comparisons, cities actively learn from one another, such as,  
577 *“bringing in folks from the East Coast [to Missouri] to talk about green infrastructure and look*  
578 *at what Maryland had done in particular”* (senior manager regional planning council).

579 Interviewees described horizontal information sharing as opportunities to learn from  
580 places that have already used and tested new technologies, such as porous pavement, and then

581 using those experiences to make modifications to practices in their own jurisdictions. For  
582 example,

583 *“The City of Austin had only allowed porous pavement for water quality purposes in*  
584 *pedestrian land uses.... After a significant benchmarking effort on other municipalities*  
585 *and jurisdictions, we got a consensus that the folks who had been early adopters of that*  
586 *technology really had not found these worst case scenarios of stormwater hot spots in*  
587 *certain applications. And, so, what we did is we increased the allowable use for water*  
588 *quality purposes to include vehicular uses like parking lots, like interior roadways”*  
589 (local engineer).

590  
591 As more places implement green infrastructure, interviewees described a desire to learn from  
592 other places, *“that are implementing these strategies and for us to have guidance from the EPA*  
593 *and put us all together and where we can share our knowledge and exchange information”*  
594 (local engineer). The key task now is moving beyond the more common examples:

595 *“like Philadelphia or Seattle... [since developers are] interested in making a living doing*  
596 *development and trying to change their point has been difficult for them to accept. But,*  
597 *we have some success stories that we've tried to share, but they want another city in the*  
598 *South that's had no problems at all with this before they're willing to conceive that it*  
599 *might a good idea”* (local public works engineer).

600 These quotes indicate that places have the desire and need to learn from the experience of many  
601 other places.

#### 602 4.2.1.3. Regional organizations: design specifics and knowledge sharing

603 At a regional level, design manuals play an important role in communicating standards  
604 and green infrastructure options to developers and municipalities. An interviewee from EPA  
605 Region 7 highlighted that, *“the [places] that share information have regional planning agencies*  
606 *that, I think, try to be the ones to teach these smaller cities some of the more progressive – not*  
607 *just for stormwater but a lot of different things – and they've been, I think, fairly successful in at*  
608 *least providing technical assistance and training to some of the smaller cities”* (regional EPA

609 employee). At the regional scale, therefore, there is a critical area of collaboration between  
610 regional planning entities, inter-governmental organizations, and local governments, all of which  
611 act to translate between governance and government rules. Like local jurisdictions, the process of  
612 developing a manual is transferred laterally between places interested in developing green  
613 infrastructure in their area.

614 *“We have a manual. It is called The Mid-America Regional Council, APWA BMP*  
615 *Manual. Our whole region has adopted this manual in some form, generally, so different*  
616 *cities, counties adopt it on their own terms. Mid-America Regional Council is our nine-*  
617 *county governmental planning body. If there is something that Mid-America Regional*  
618 *Council has available, then the more of us that can adopt things that they have*  
619 *developed, the more it brings consistency to our region... For private development, we*  
620 *have the BMP Manual that is required to be followed; it’s a series of calculations they go*  
621 *through. My understanding is that it’s based on the system that...Prince George’s*  
622 *County, Maryland did”* (local landscape architect).

623  
624 Design manuals play an important role in communicating with the private sector, a key player in  
625 achieving the scale needed to manage stormwater with green infrastructure. This is not a new  
626 concept but gaining traction in multiple regions:

627 *“As we invest all the money in many EPA regulations for combined sewer overflows, and*  
628 *clean water, and all those things that we can't keep adding burden to the system over and*  
629 *over again. So, back in 1999, the council adopted a stormwater management manual. It*  
630 *basically says you do new or redevelopment then you need to start managing as much*  
631 *water as you can at the source as opposed to passing it downstream into the system”*  
632 (local stormwater manager).

633  
634 Manuals vary from regional networks, like the Mid-America Regional Council to *“the New York*  
635 *State Stormwater Management Design Manual”* (local sewer authority employee) to Arkansas’  
636 *“Evaluating and Conserving Green Infrastructure Across the Landscape”* to Chattanooga’s *“Rain*  
637 *Water Management Guide.”* Manuals help local governments coordinate with developers, as well  
638 as to transfer lessons within regions and to support the calls for more locally specific practices  
639 and information. Manuals can be updated iteratively and with public participation to  
640 *“provid[e]more detail, lessons learned – on what we’ve seen on the construction side, what*

641 *we've seen on the design side –in order to help make those projects more effective going*  
642 *forward”* (local MS4 program manager).

643 4.2.2. Measuring green infrastructure impacts

644 Interviewees highlighted ongoing challenges in measuring the impact of green infrastructure,  
645 but that EPA policy and assistance plays a critical role in coordinating data collection. In  
646 particular, measuring the efficacy and co-benefits of green infrastructure are key areas for  
647 coordination. From the seven EPA interviews, with both regional representatives and the federal  
648 headquarters, two primary themes emerged related to the EPA’s challenges and role in  
649 measurement: (1) balancing the needs of different communities and (2) uncertainty. Just as local  
650 entities are interested in seeking information that is more specific and relevant to local  
651 conditions, the EPA recognizes that coordinating across localities requires attentiveness to what  
652 different communities need:

653 *“Now we’re looking at how do we try to compare apples-to-apples? When other*  
654 *communities are putting in central performance standards or identifying that this*  
655 *particular installation meets their 80<sup>th</sup> percentile, or the 90<sup>th</sup>, whatever they choose to do*  
656 *because there’s not a performance standard in their permit yet. So, that’s where we are*  
657 *now, how do we get that support out there, how do we fund something like that type of*  
658 *research, and how do we come up with something, an easy potential tool or model to be*  
659 *able to help them do that”* (regional EPA employee).

660 Variation is not just associated with permits, but the capacity to monitor and manage varies  
661 with other characteristics such as size. It is *“the cities that are really thinking about it have the*  
662 *wherewithal – DC and Philadelphia and Seattle and Portland –the smaller cities usually just put*  
663 *in, they have some requirement and they put it in and they can’t step back and see a signal yet”*  
664 (federal EPA employee). Such patterns reinforce the importance of coordinating knowledge  
665 within a region and horizontally across many cities.

666 Uncertainty in measuring the performance of green infrastructure is a critical challenge to  
667 effective implementation and the EPA is working with cities to address these concerns.

668 *“One of the reasons that there has been pushback on green infrastructure is because if*  
669 *you think about it, you’re taking a decentralized approach to stormwater*  
670 *management.... With green infrastructure you have potentially tens of thousands of*  
671 *practices all across the landscape, so the question is how do you maintain those, how do*  
672 *you account for them, how do you ensure their practicing as designed, how do you even*  
673 *know they’re there.... The other thing is, how the systems perform, this is a longstanding*  
674 *issue, even with gray infrastructure... how do you understand how to optimize it? How do*  
675 *you create these systems to be resilient, to help ensure that you’re meeting your*  
676 *performance goals, as they work together – in synergy if you will. We are still trying to*  
677 *work out those sorts of things”* (federal EPA employee).

678  
679 In practice, measuring how much stormwater green infrastructure will capture and how to  
680 effectively operate a decentralized system remains a challenge:

681 *“Accounting-wise, your gray is big, it’s massive and you can account for how much*  
682 *stormwater you are going to accumulate in your holding tank. Whereas, the green is*  
683 *pretty dispersed throughout the communities and I think some concern as to how they*  
684 *keep track of it, how they account for it, how they are sure these things are operating the*  
685 *way that they are supposed to”* (regional EPA employee).

686  
687 Over time, with more projects implemented and information shared across localities, *“people are*  
688 *starting to weigh the benefits... and make more informed decisions”* (federal EPA employee).

689 Paralleling EPA’s concerns, non-EPA interviewees highlighted their ongoing efforts to  
690 measure the impacts of green infrastructure and enhance their understanding about the co-  
691 benefits of green infrastructure. Measurement varies across localities, from interviewees with  
692 *“monitoring capabilities at every single site we construct”* (local stormwater director) to *“not*  
693 *individual site monitoring any of our projects, [rather they are] designed to generally accepted*  
694 *engineering standards in the state stormwater design manual”* (local sewer authority employee),  
695 to *“common sense engineering green design”* (local stormwater manager), but there was a  
696 consistent recognition that understanding and measuring impacts requires *“a long-term outlook”*  
697 (local public works engineer). Additionally, measuring the impacts of green infrastructure was  
698 highlighted as a key area for partnerships between local jurisdictions and the EPA; from  
699 *“work[ing] jointly with the USGS and EPA and some universities to measure individual BMP*

700 *effectiveness*” (regional sewerage district employee) to 319 grants and university partnerships,  
701 monitoring and measuring green infrastructure requires long-term commitment. Coordinating  
702 relevant information networks and meaningful measurements illustrate the role that governments  
703 plays in structuring information sharing and measuring of green infrastructure across the country.

704  
705 **4.3. Governments as capacity-builders**

706 Critical partnerships with and funding from the EPA enhance local capacity across the  
707 country. Furthermore, EPA devotes resources to encourage local collaborations critical to an  
708 adaptive governance paradigm. As articulated by the interviewee from Fort Collins, CO:

709 *“...if we’re going to reduce non-point source pollution we all have to work together. It’s*  
710 *important that we don’t each do our own thing but work cooperatively across sectors. So, it*  
711 *could be academic research, industry, private you know, and then public officials, like me,*  
712 *and the federal government, and the state government. All of us working together on*  
713 *improving the state of the art would be really – is very important. The EPA is funding a*  
714 *program here at CSU, at Colorado State University, it’s called the CLEAN Center, and*  
715 *that’s what it’s trying to do is bring in all these officials together”* (local engineer).  
716

717 Similarly, the interviewee from San Mateo County cited:

718 *“grant funding from EPA to convene a stakeholder roundtable process to try to really push*  
719 *that issue and say, what do we need to do to get green infrastructure integrated into all these*  
720 *issues [climate change and drought] and identify what the barriers are and come up with*  
721 *what are the solutions to overcome those barriers”* (county program coordinator).  
722

723 Of the 35 non-EPA interviewees, 17 cited funding from either the EPA or state environmental  
724 agency, with 3 of the 17 indicating funding from both federal and state sources. Comments about  
725 funding sources highlight the joint effort between government agencies and non-profit  
726 organizations to support green infrastructure financially, 6 interviewees noted funding from  
727 foundations, conservation organizations, or environmental trusts.

728 Interviewees suggest that EPA funds projects or programs – as mentioned by Fort Collins  
729 and San Mateo County – which build local capacity by supporting local collaboration and  
730 partnerships. Additionally, interviewees highlighted partnerships between the EPA and local

730 jurisdictions in order to understand and assess the performance of green infrastructure projects.  
731 Adaptive management for green infrastructure at the project-level engages both governments and  
732 non-profits. For example, the City of Tulsa “*monitor[s] of some of the specific BMPs with our*  
733 *partners – with USGS, US EPA, various universities*” (local government employee). Other  
734 project-level experimentation between EPA and municipalities resulted in building more  
735 modular and flexible systems. As one federal EPA interviewee shared, “*we’ve seen in*  
736 *Cincinnati, our Office of Research and Development had put in some section, what you get is*  
737 *initial clogging in the first quadrant...but then the water runs off into the other sections and still*  
738 *infiltrates, so you’re still achieving your water quality goals. And so, you design the system to*  
739 *partially fail but still perform as you need it to.*” The EPA also partners with local agencies to  
740 build capacity to move project designs towards more adaptive practices, such that “*you don’t*  
741 *want to design with stasis in mind, you don’t want to just put the thing in the ground and say*  
742 *‘we’re done’...you can design it with modularity in place. You can put inserts into them, there*  
743 *are all kinds of things you can do. You can change your media mix, change your maintenance*  
744 *frequency. There are lots of solutions. You can use systems to reduce the risk of failure*” (federal  
745 EPA employee).

746 Both as capacity-builders and as drivers of green infrastructure projects, governments  
747 encourage structured (and mandatory) opportunities for regulated entities to experiment via  
748 regulatory permitting and planning processes. While some of government’s capacity-building  
749 stems from grants and EPA-to-local entity partnerships, the federal government is also building  
750 capacity within regional and federal offices in order to practice “*adaptive management between*  
751 *permit terms, because there’s not a one size fits all sort of mindset that we can establish in the*  
752 *regulations themselves, just by its very nature we have to take the on the ground lessons that*

753 *come in through the annual reports, through the information that's gleaned in that one permit*  
 754 *term and use it to write more targeted and accurate provisions in the next permit"* (regional EPA  
 755 employee). The funding and partnership opportunities, combined with coordination efforts on  
 756 information sharing and measurement, illustrate the government's role in insuring that solutions  
 757 are adaptable and locally specific in addition to aiming towards long-term goals.

758  
 759 5. Discussion

760 The role of governments in coordinating and capacity-building supports the regulatory efforts  
 761 driving green infrastructure deeper into the planning and development processes of jurisdictions,  
 762 such that there is *"a good feedback mechanism and a way to assess and change midstream, not*  
 763 *[to] set 20 to 30-year vectors that you can't deviate from to improve performance and reduce*  
 764 *cost"* (federal EPA employee). As researchers and practitioners consider adaptive management,  
 765 not just as a strategy for natural areas, but as a strategy for managing urban, socio-environmental  
 766 impacts, government agencies play critical roles in enabling capacity and information-transfer  
 767 that encourages adaptive management practices. Governments and non-governmental  
 768 organizations both play important roles in adaptive governance, but at times one may function  
 769 more effectively as a lead, and the other may function more effectively in a support role.  
 770 Governments may be positioned to take the lead or encourage certain practices that allow for  
 771 more adaptive approaches on-the-ground, while other situations are more suited for leadership  
 772 from non-profits and the private sector. We summarize these findings in Table 4.

773

<b>Governance Actions</b>	<b>Mechanisms</b>	<b>Government Role</b>	<b>Non-Governmental Role</b>
<i>Driver</i>	<i>Regulation</i>	Lead	Supportive
	<i>Local Political Support</i>	Lead	Supportive
<i>Coordinator</i>	<i>Information Sharing</i>	Supportive	Lead
	<i>Measurement</i>	Lead	Supportive
<i>Capacity Building</i>	<i>Project Funding</i>	Shared	Shared

	<i>Project-level experimentation</i>	Shared	Shared
--	--------------------------------------	--------	--------

774 **Table 4** *Sharing of responsibilities between governments and non-governmental entities*

775 First, we find that within regulatory and local policy drivers for green infrastructure,  
776 governments – often at the state level for regulation and at the local level for policy – takes on  
777 the leadership role over long periods of time. Local organizations that comprise the broader  
778 governance structure can support governments by better orienting regulatory drivers to local  
779 conditions or encouraging the integration of green infrastructure into other planning initiatives,  
780 such as sustainability efforts. Second, coordination activities, which organize relevant  
781 information and standards, require that governments and non-governmental actors work together  
782 to implement policies and programs (e.g. design manuals and standards) that account for change  
783 and flexibility. For example, information manuals are often encouraged by government, but  
784 regional partnership takes primary responsibility since they can more effectively establish a  
785 process to continually update design manuals to account for conditions across the region and new  
786 technologies. In turn, regulatory permits can cite standards set in manuals, allowing for more  
787 flexible, regionally-specific design specifications that can be modified outside of the permitting  
788 process. This evidence supports the notion that flexibility can be associated with coordination  
789 processes, not just collaborative processes, and can work across layers of governance (e.g. both  
790 centralized regulation and more polycentric regional partnerships). Third, funding and  
791 experimentation that build capacity for improving and implementing green infrastructure projects  
792 can fall to both governments and non-governmental actors, we see funding streams coming from  
793 both governments and non-profits in collaborative efforts across sectors. The interviews  
794 conducted for this research represent a range of local experiences and EPA perspectives, we find  
795 that implementation of green infrastructure is often shared between actors. Policy development

796 and planning perspectives can take advantage of moments where either governments or non-  
797 governmental actors, or a mix, can respond effectively.

798  
799 6. Conclusion

800 We find that the governments – from the federal to local level – plays an important role in how  
801 stormwater agencies and managers adapt to new ideas and opportunities. We highlight three  
802 modes of action that underpin green infrastructure implementation in the U.S.: driver,  
803 coordinator, and capacity-builder. We find that,

- 804 1. policy drivers play a critical role in encouraging green infrastructure: regulatory drivers  
805 tie local programs and projects to long-term water quality goals and local political efforts  
806 craft stormwater programs that resonate with local communities;
- 807 2. governments coordinate information and measurement across jurisdictions, and supports  
808 opportunities for local non-governmental actors to enhance regional information  
809 dissemination and revision;
- 810 3. governments and non-profit organizations, together, provide the funding needed to  
811 establish key collaborations and project-based experimentation with green infrastructure  
812 technologies.

813 While adaptive management emerged to address ecological challenges such as the Florida  
814 Everglades, which has been, “governed by rules and procedures that are no longer fitting and  
815 appropriate to accomplish a highly complex and multi-objective mission” (Gunderson and Light,  
816 2006, p. 329). It has sense been applied to other ecological management problems at a variety of  
817 scales, such as the Great Barrier Reef, river basin management, and international fisheries  
818 management (Schultz et al., 2015). Adaptive management – and the associated political and

819 social institutions and organizations – is now being applied to urban and regional problems that  
820 involve socio-environmental systems, such as urban stormwater (Chaffin et al., 2016).

821         Green infrastructure provides opportunities for governments and non-governmental  
822 actors to associate water quality goals with other public priorities, such as urban livability  
823 concerns, ecosystem services, and climate change. Our findings show that for adaptive  
824 governance, the focus on specific partnerships and cases of full-fledged collaboration may  
825 overlook some of the ways that governments and non-governmental actors are introducing  
826 flexibility and learning into existing policy requirements. As McNamara (2012) describes a  
827 continuum of cooperation to collaboration, this paper provides support for looking at the diverse  
828 ways that governments can support non-profits, regional organizations, and networks of actors to  
829 achieve environmental goals. One of the most useful findings from our paper, in our opinion, is  
830 for practitioners in both governments and non-governmental sectors to see that many cities are  
831 trying to collaborate in different ways.

832         While our research focused on the perspective of governmental and agency staff, future  
833 research should examine the nature of interactions between governments and non-governmental  
834 organizations to better understand the conditions under which these actors either takes the lead or  
835 supports the other. Additionally, our emphasis on governments reinforces the notion that policy  
836 is not static but evolving in concert with internal and external pressures. Future research should  
837 examine the relationship between federal and local policy initiatives to better understand how  
838 local jurisdictions and policy entrepreneurs “convert” key federal policies, like the Clean Water  
839 Act, into locally salient environmental programs (Hacker et al., 2015). We encourage future  
840 research to focus on how governments and non-governmental actors can work together to  
841 achieve urban water quality goals.

842 References

- 843
- 844 Adler, R.W., Landman, J.C., Cameron, D.M., 1993. *The Clean Water Act 20 Years Later*. Island  
845 Pr.
- 846 Allen, C.R., Fontaine, J.J., Pope, K.L., Garmestani, A.S., 2011. Adaptive management for a  
847 turbulent future. *J. Environ. Manage., Adaptive management for Natural Resources* 92,  
848 1339–1345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.11.019>
- 849 Allen, C.R., Gunderson, L.H., 2011. Pathology and failure in the design and implementation of  
850 adaptive management. *J. Environ. Manage., Adaptive management for Natural Resources*  
851 92, 1379–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.10.063>
- 852 Andreen, W.L., 2003. *Water Quality Today - Has the Clean Water Act Been a Success?* *Ala.*  
853 *Law Rev.* 55, 537.
- 854 Benneer, L.S., Coglianesi, C., 2012. *Flexible Environmental Regulation* (SSRN Scholarly Paper  
855 No. ID 1998849). Social Science Research Network, Rochester, NY.
- 856 Betsill, M.M., Bulkeley, H., 2006. Cities and the Multilevel Governance of Global Climate  
857 Change. *Glob. Gov. Rev. Multilateralism Int. Organ.* 12, 141–159.  
858 <https://doi.org/10.5555/ggov.2006.12.2.141>
- 859 Boyd, J., 2000. *New Face of the Clean Water Act: A Critical Review of the EPA's New TMDL*  
860 *Rules*, *The. Duke Envtl Pol F* 11, 39.
- 861 Bulkeley, H., 2005. Reconfiguring environmental governance: Towards a politics of scales and  
862 networks. *Polit. Geogr.* 24, 875–902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2005.07.002>
- 863 Bulkeley, H., Betsill, M., 2005. Rethinking Sustainable Cities: Multilevel Governance and the  
864 “Urban” Politics of Climate Change. *Environ. Polit.* 14, 42–63.  
865 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0964401042000310178>
- 866 Carlet, F., 2015. Understanding attitudes toward adoption of green infrastructure: A case study of  
867 US municipal officials. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 51, 65–76.  
868 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.03.007>
- 869 Cettner, A., Ashley, R., Viklander, M., Nilsson, K., 2013. Stormwater management and urban  
870 planning: Lessons from 40 years of innovation. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.* 56, 786–801.  
871 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2012.706216>
- 872 Chaffin, B., Gosnell, H., Cosens, B., 2014. A decade of adaptive governance scholarship:  
873 synthesis and future directions. *Ecol. Soc.* 19. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-06824-190356>
- 874 Chaffin, B.C., Shuster, W.D., Garmestani, A.S., Furio, B., Albro, S.L., Gardiner, M., Spring, M.,  
875 Green, O.O., 2016. A tale of two rain gardens: Barriers and bridges to adaptive  
876 management of urban stormwater in Cleveland, Ohio. *J. Environ. Manage., Adaptive*  
877 *Management for Ecosystem Services* 183, Part 2, 431–441.  
878 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.06.025>
- 879 Cosens, B., Craig, R., Hirsch, S.L., Arnold, C.A., Benson, M., DeCaro, D., Garmestani, A.,  
880 Gosnell, H., Ruhl, J.B., Schlager, E., 2017. The role of law in adaptive governance. *Ecol.*  
881 *Soc.* 22. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08731-220130>
- 882 Cousins, J.J., 2017. Infrastructure and institutions: Stakeholder perspectives of stormwater  
883 governance in Chicago. *Cities* 66, 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2017.03.005>
- 884 Coutts, C., Hahn, M., 2015. Green Infrastructure, Ecosystem Services, and Human Health. *Int. J.*  
885 *Environ. Res. Public Health* 12, 9768–9798. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120809768>
- 886 Craig, R., Garmestani, A., Allen, C., Arnold, C., Birgé, H., DeCaro, D., Fremier, A., Gosnell, H.,  
887 Schlager, E., 2017. Balancing stability and flexibility in adaptive governance: an analysis

888 of tools available in U.S. environmental law. *Ecol. Soc.* 22. [https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-](https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08983-220203)  
889 08983-220203

890 DC Water, 2016. DC Water Green Infrastructure Plan [WWW Document]. URL  
891 <https://www.dewater.com/green-infrastructure> (accessed 10.20.17).

892 DeCaro, D., Chaffin, B., Schlager, E., Garmestani, A., Ruhl, J.B., 2017. Legal and institutional  
893 foundations of adaptive environmental governance. *Ecol. Soc.* 22.  
894 <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09036-220132>

895 Driessen, P.P.J., Dieperink, C., Laerhoven, F., Runhaar, H.A.C., Vermeulen, W.J.V., 2012.  
896 Towards a Conceptual Framework for The Study of Shifts in Modes of Environmental  
897 Governance - Experiences From The Netherlands. *Environ. Policy Gov.* 22, 143–160.  
898 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1580>

899 Fiorino, D.J., 2004. Flexibility, in: *Environmental Governance Reconsidered: Challenges,*  
900 *Choices, and Opportunities.* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

901 Flynn, C., Davidson, C., 2016. Adapting the social-ecological system framework for urban  
902 stormwater management: the case of green infrastructure adoption. *Ecol. Soc.* 21.  
903 <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08756-210419>

904 Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., Norberg, J., 2005. Adaptive Governance of Social-Ecological  
905 Systems. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 30, 441–473.  
906 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511>

907 Fukuyama, F., 2016. Governance: What Do We Know, and How Do We Know It? *Annu. Rev.*  
908 *Polit. Sci.* 19, 89–105. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-042214-044240>

909 Grindle, M.S. (Ed.), 1997. *Getting Good Government: Capacity Building in the Public Sectors of*  
910 *Developing Countries.* Harvard Kennedy School, Cambridge, MA.

911 Gunderson, L., Light, S.S., 2006. Adaptive Management and Adaptive Governance in the  
912 Everglades Ecosystem. *Policy Sci.* 323.

913 Gunningham, N., Holley, C., 2016. Next-Generation Environmental Regulation: Law,  
914 Regulation, and Governance. *Annu. Rev. Law Soc. Sci.* 12, 273–293.  
915 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110615-084651>

916 Gupta, A., 2004. When Global Is Local: Negotiating Safe Use of Biotechnology, in: Jasanoff, S.,  
917 Martello, M. (Eds.), *Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Governance.*  
918 The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

919 Hacker, J.S., Pierson, P., Thelen, K., 2015. Drift and Conversion: Hidden Faces of Institutional  
920 Change, in: Mahoney, J., Thelen, K. (Eds.), *Advances in Comparative-Historical*  
921 *Analysis.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 180–208.  
922 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316273104.008>

923 Hardy, S.D., Koontz, T.M., 2007. Reducing Nonpoint Source Pollution Through Collaboration:  
924 Policies and Programs Across the U.S. States. *Environ. Manage.* 41, 301–310.  
925 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-007-9038-6>

926 Holling, C.S., 1978. *Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management.* John Wiley & Sons.

927 Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., 2014. The two orders of governance failure: Design mismatches and  
928 policy capacity issues in modern governance. *Policy Soc., Is Governance for Everybody?*  
929 33, 317–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2014.10.002>

930 Keeley, M., Koburger, A., Dolowitz, D.P., Medearis, D., Nickel, D., Shuster, W., 2013.  
931 Perspectives on the Use of Green Infrastructure for Stormwater Management in  
932 Cleveland and Milwaukee. *Environ. Manage.* 51, 1093–1108.  
933 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-013-0032-x>

934 Kramer, M.G., 2014. Enhancing Sustainable Communities with Green Infrastructure (No. EPA  
935 100-R-14-006). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

936 Lemos, M.C., Agrawal, A., 2006. Environmental Governance. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 31,  
937 297–325. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.31.042605.135621>

938 Lubell, M., 2015. Collaborative partnerships in complex institutional systems. *Curr. Opin.*  
939 *Environ. Sustain., Sustainability governance and transformation* 12, 41–47.  
940 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2014.08.011>

941 Lubell, M., 2013. Governing Institutional Complexity: The Ecology of Games Framework.  
942 *Policy Stud. J.* 41, 537–559. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12028>

943 Margerum, R.D., Robinson, C.J., 2015. Collaborative partnerships and the challenges for  
944 sustainable water management. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain., Sustainability governance*  
945 *and transformation* 12, 53–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2014.09.003>

946 McNamara, M., 2012. Starting to Untangle the Web of Cooperation, Coordination, and  
947 Collaboration: A Framework for Public Managers. *Int. J. Public Adm.* 35, 389–401.  
948 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2012.655527>

949 Mekala, G.D., Jones, R.N., MacDonald, D.H., 2015. Valuing the Benefits of Creek  
950 Rehabilitation: Building a Business Case for Public Investments in Urban Green  
951 Infrastructure. *Environ. Manage.* 55, 1354–1365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-015-0471-7>

952

953 Moss, T., Newig, J., 2010. Multilevel Water Governance and Problems of Scale: Setting the  
954 Stage for a Broader Debate. *Environ. Manage.* 46, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-010-9531-1>

955

956 NRC, 2009. *Urban Stormwater Management in the United States*. National Academies Press.

957 NYC, 2010. *NYC Green Infrastructure Plan*.

958 NYC DEP, 2016. *2016 Green Infrastructure Annual Report*. New York City Department of  
959 Environmental Protection.

960 PWD, 2011. *Green City, Clean Waters: Implementation and Adaptive Management Plan,*  
961 *Consent Order & Agreement, Deliverable 1*. Philadelphia Water Department.

962 PWD, 2009. *Green City Clean Waters: The City of Philadelphia’s Program for Combined Sewer*  
963 *Overflow Control, Summary Report*. Philadelphia Water Department, Philadelphia, PA.

964 Schultz, L., Folke, C., Österblom, H., Olsson, P., 2015. Adaptive governance, ecosystem  
965 management, and natural capital. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 112, 7369–7374.  
966 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1406493112>

967 Scott, T., 2015. Does Collaboration Make Any Difference? Linking Collaborative Governance to  
968 Environmental Outcomes. *J. Policy Anal. Manage.* 34, 537–566.  
969 <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21836>

970 Shandas, V., Messer, W.B., 2008. Fostering Green Communities Through Civic Engagement:  
971 Community-Based Environmental Stewardship in the Portland Area. *J. Am. Plann.*  
972 *Assoc.* 74, 408–418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360802291265>

973 Stoner, N., 2007. Green Solutions for Controlling Combined Sewer Overflows. *Nat. Resour.*  
974 *Environ.* 21, 7–11.

975 United Nations Environmental Programme, 2000. Chapter 28: Local Authorities’ Initiatives in  
976 Support of Agenda 21, Earth Summit, 1992, in: *Agenda 21*. United Nations, New York.

977 US EPA, 2016. *National Summary of State Information: Water Quality Assessment and TMDL*  
978 *Information [WWW Document]*. *Natl. Summ. State Inf.* URL

979 [https://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains\\_nation\\_cy.control#prob\\_source](https://ofmpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_nation_cy.control#prob_source) (accessed  
980 5.15.18).  
981 US EPA, 2014. Greening CSO Plans: Planning and Modeling Green Infrastructure Combined  
982 Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control (No. Publication # 832-R-14-001). U.S. Environmental  
983 Protection Agency, Washington, DC.  
984 US EPA, 2013. Green Infrastructure Strategic Agenda. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,  
985 Washington, DC.  
986 Walters, C.J., Holling, C.S., 1990. Large-Scale Management Experiments and Learning by  
987 Doing. *Ecology* 71, 2060–2068. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1938620>  
988  
989

990 Funding and Acknowledgements

991

992 This research was supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Science to  
993 Achieve Results (STAR) program under Assistance Agreement No. EPA-G2012-STAR-G1 to  
994 the University of Pennsylvania and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It has not been  
995 formally reviewed by the EPA. The views expressed in this document are solely those of the  
996 authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Agency. EPA does not endorse any products  
997 or commercial services mentioned in this publication.

998

999 We thank all of the interviewees for taking the time to share their insights.

1000

1001 Appendix 1.

1002

<b>CODE</b>	<b>EXAMPLE QUOTATION</b>
<b>STEWARDSHIP</b>	I would say we've had a long history of this area, first of all, being very conservative and tied to the land. It's a very agricultural area, so I think that we've been very innovative in a lot of things that we've done for a long time, back when we implemented a water system, it was very early on in terms of the formation of a water company here. I think that when you look at stewardship towards our resources, there's been a long history of being good stewards of our environment.
<b>REGULATION</b>	For capital projects, we have a couple of different mechanisms that trigger the projects. Speaking specifically to water services projects, we have two main sources of water quality, green solutions projects. One is through our Overflow Control Program, so we are under a consent decree for combined sewer overflows where it is a 25-year consent decree.
<b>FUTURE REGULATION</b>	We just keep hearing how it's something that EPA is really pushing and pushing more and more, and we know that there will be a point where there is an absolute requirement. So, we are really wanting to understand [green infrastructure] more and get some demonstration projects.
<b>COST</b>	We're finding out that it is a fairly cost-effective measure for us. When you are looking at a lot of these projects, you're looking at we're utilizing either right of way that we already own that putting in another pipe is not always the best solution when you can think about – you can do things with green infrastructure, such the permeable pavers that enhances the community, increases the property value, and spurs redevelopment in an area.
<b>CO-BENEFITS</b>	Higher value to our ratepayers. We have very little space, so it's trying to get the most use of, most use of the space that we are in for multiple goals.

**CLIMATE CHANGE**

In the Plan Cincinnati, a lot of the impetus behind that was a lot of the climate change and the conversations back in 2007. In fact, that was listed in the document as the impetus for city council to embrace that. I think MSD, as a city department pulled into that, but I think it's a little broader for MSD because of stormwater is a natural function and the stormwater has traditionally been managed in natural systems, so, the idea of bringing back a natural management of the water, rather than an engineered tunnel with pumping systems, that there as some interest in pursuing that, and that would seem to be more economical long-term and sustainable for our community.

**PUBLIC ADVOCACY**

My experience has been that the public, by and large, just really likes green infrastructure. First of all, they like green space that is maintained. They like innovation. They really look at piping even though it quite often is the best solution; they look at it as though it's 19th Century kind of stuff. They really like seeing innovation, and they like to see governmental entities cooperating with one another. They particularly like seeing cost savings although that I think is elusive.

**SUSTAINABILITY**

I think it's a broad sustainability vision is one thing. The previous mayor and this mayor have created and embraced a sustainable DC plan that includes restoring our rivers to the fishable and swimmable conditions. And I think green infrastructure is absolutely a critical piece to achieving that goal.

**LAND-USE**

I think the other thing is that we have a lot of vacant properties in Cleveland, Detroit, Cincinnati, and people want these properties permanently repurposed, so, that's another motivator.