

Plan Interrelationships

Introduction

Chapter 11 provides the complete text of each of the twenty goals and seventy supporting objectives established by this plan. While each objective has been established in pursuit of one particular goal, we note that the effect of implementing any particular objective cannot be limited to that goal alone. The purpose of this chapter is to show how the various objectives are expected to effect the *other* goals. This will help us to identify what actions are naturally complementary, enabling us to promote multiple goals with a single action, and which are in conflict with each other, requiring special attention to be sure that resources are not wasted by executing actions whose effects cancel each other.

Given the extent of goal and objective statements, a written analysis of these interrelationships would be lengthy and tedious. Instead, a graphic representation is more efficient. Figure 12.1 presents a matrix with each of the goals across the top (the “x” axis) and the objectives listed down the side. In each case, the statements are grouped according to general area of interest. Note that each of the goals is numbered 1 through 20 and each of the objective statements has an alphanumeric designation where the initial number corresponds to the goal statement that it most directly supports. Be aware that the goal and objective statements shown here have been edited for brevity to fit into the space provided: the full, complete goal and objective statements are found in Chapter 11 as well as within the plan chapters for each topic.

The matrix can be read in two ways. Read vertically, the matrix shows the effect upon a given goal by each of the objectives. Read horizontally, the matrix indicates how a given objective affects each goal. It should be noted that - except for the goals directly supported by each objective - the strength of the effects is subjective. Hence, we show only five types of relationship.

- A *strong, positive* relationship indicates that an objective will significantly promote achievement of the indicated goal. The chart shows this kind of relationship between each objective and the goal it is specifically intended to implement, but note that a number of the objectives strongly support other goals as well.
- A *weak, positive* relationship indicates that an objective supports the indicated goal, but that it is a peripheral effect and that it is not the primary intent of the objective.
- A *neutral* relationship indicates that the implementation of an objective will have no effect upon the indicated goal. One could argue that there will invariably be *some* effect, if only because resources expended in pursuit of one objective will not be available for other actions. While this is undeniably true, it is not a particularly useful argument for our purposes here as it would be true of every relationship.
- A *weak, negative* relationship indicates that the objective is likely to impede or delay the success of achieving the indicated goal, or that side effects of this objective should be addressed in the implementation process to mitigate the negative effects.
- A *strong, negative* relationship indicates that the objective runs directly counter to the

indicated goal and that implementation should be executed with great care in order to avoid wasted effort.

Analysis

In general, the objectives are mutually supportive with few conflicts. We note that *no* strong conflicts have been identified, which bodes well for the success of the implementation process. We particularly note the following aspects.

- Many of the objectives support Goal 1 relative to the appropriate use of land. This assumes that the implementation of these objectives will be guided by the policies already stated in this document.
- Objective 1E promotes the fiscal soundness of the Township by accommodating a range of land uses. We note a few weak conflicts between this objective and those goals which require significant expenditures. This does not relate to the “land use” aspect of this objective as much as “fiscal soundness” and has been identified simply because significant capital expenditures may have adverse effects upon the financial health of the community. Wise budgeting and utilization of outside funding for the capital projects would minimize (or may even eliminate) these conflicts.
- A conflict is shown between Objective 2B and Goal 6. This is less a conflict than a concern that relations between public agencies and public officials be done with diplomacy to assure a sense of cooperation rather than the impression of coercion.
- Conflicts appear among Objectives 3B, 3C, and 3D (regarding structural improvements to different road segments) and Goals 16 and 18, which address protection of historic and natural resources. As with the preceding point, this is due to a concern that structural improvements be designed and executed to mitigate adverse impacts upon these resources. We note that such impacts may not always be avoidable, and that public safety must take precedence when such conflicts arise.
- The conflict between Objective 8B and Goal 2 is based upon the observation that if municipal offices are ever dispersed among several sites it is likely that additional traffic will result among the sites. Such additional traffic would exacerbate congestion issues, but would not be a significant contributor to the overall volume of traffic.
- Similar to the preceding point, Objective 10C may conflict with Goal 2 in that Township police serving other municipalities would unavoidably add to traffic as they travel to outside communities. Again, the increase would be negligible.
- Objective 15C conflicts slightly with Goals 13 and 19 in that limiting the extension of public sewerage may be detrimental to the natural environment and the quality of groundwater if no sewerage is made available to replace malfunctioning on-lot disposal systems. We note that this would be addressed fully in an Act 537 (Sewage Facilities) Plan, including options to address malfunctioning systems other than connection to a public or community disposal system.
- Objectives 16D, 17A, and 18C (preservation of natural resources) are shown to have a minor conflict with Goal 3 (road improvements). This is essentially a “mirror image” of the conflict discussed above in the third bullet point.

In conclusion, we have determined that there are few areas of this Comprehensive Plan that conflict with each other, that each of these conflicts is minor, and that they may be surmounted with careful planning. This analysis has not caused us to alter any of the basic

policies, goals, or objectives of this Comprehensive Plan.