

**Stormwater Master Plan Update
Summary of Stakeholder Feedback
Meeting 3 – August 3, 2017**

Meeting Purpose: Discuss proposed future actions for Local floodplains, Private Property Channel Erosion, Voluntary Buyout Program, and Development Services. Review the Master Plan Topics Overview and additional program elements.

Stakeholders in Attendance

Gary Havener	Rick Kubes	Aric Head
Bill Schur	Joe Schneider	Bo Cung
David Motheral	Lee Nicol	Si Rowlett

City of Fort Worth Staff, Master Plan Consultant, Halff Associates, and Public- sign in sheets available

Questions/Comments brought up by stakeholders during the presentation and discussed at the meeting:

Local Floodplains

1. Generally, I think we are headed in the right direction.
2. Most people know they are already in a floodplain. Would like to know how we move forward. What are the next steps? What are the implications? Need education to understand how local floodplains impact me.
3. To what level is the city going? Will there be a base flood elevation determined? What is the liability of the city with adding a floodplain? How does this affect existing floodplains? What do we as the City need to communicate?
4. The written policy would also establish what information is communicated externally and internally.

Private Property Channel Erosion

5. From past meetings, we understand we need to do something. Concerned that if the City does something for one property owner that we have to do it for all.
6. Cautious of buffer zone. We need to recognize that it's very difficult to accurately estimate channel erosion and horizontal/vertical shifting of the channel.
7. Is there something we can do besides creating buffer zones?
8. There is a development issue? Maybe we should consider whether development oversight should try to prevent causes of erosion.

Voluntary Buyout Program

9. If we complete a buyout, what is the chance we could do mitigation to benefit the rest of the neighborhood? That should be an important factor.
10. Two years ago, the city showed rendering of buyouts with amenities and ponds. Very impressive and recommend that you show these pictures in the future.
11. There are two perceptions: 1) We are buying the property because the owner is in trouble. 2) We are buying the property because there is an opportunity to construct improvements for the public benefit. Stakeholder in favor of the second and opposed to the first.
12. Availability of grant funding was relatively unimportant in the polling but it is something that we need to keep looking at it.
13. Historical flooding is not always well documented in some areas. Voluntary buyout could take years to become a high priority if there is not already good documentation.
14. Note that everything with the voluntary buyout program is assumed to apply to businesses too.
15. We foresee a situation where city would need a lot that homeowners won't sell. Voluntary buyout does not prevent City from using other powers/authority.
16. Best thing is internal and external communication and coordination. It is great that City is coming up with a game plan. In the Zoo Creek watershed near Berry Street there are empty lots (with The T) that we have an opportunity to plan before we pave.

Development Oversight

17. The City needs to identify potential development centers. Any incentives should be vetted with public before they are provided. The preferred incentives need to be acceptable to the public. In the Berry/University Development Plan, I disagree with allowing parking reduction and building height increase as an incentive for providing stormwater improvements.
18. It is my opinion that changing the development review threshold to look at lots less than 1 acre would not be very effective. If you start reviewing lots that are too small it could negatively impact ability to redevelop.
19. Need to understand what is established as existing condition. An intermediate condition when a lot is redeveloping should not be held as the existing conditions.
20. For TCU area, the stealth dorms cumulatively have a stormwater impact. I think it is important that the City is aware of what is going on.
21. The 1 acre review threshold is defined by platted lot. Three consecutive lots that are redeveloped at the same time would not be looked at unless each lot is greater than 1 acre.
22. Concerned with 2nd bullet and the consideration of reducing the 1 acre review threshold in areas of known flood risk. City should not do anything that will slow down development.

23. Would like to see stated that we want vetted policy with resident feedback.
24. Agree with the future actions regarding Cumulative Impacts.

Water Quality

25. Lake Worth example demonstrates there are some areas where more stringent requirements make sense. Would like process to identify targeted areas. Especially in areas where stormwater is resulting in flow leaving a polluted site.
26. Drinkable, swimmable, etc. – there are different levels that need to be defined. Multiple aspects of water quality that need to be considered.
27. Very low priority for environmental improvement. Turning dirt as part of development is a small issue compared to historical and industrial impacts. There are more stringent standards now. Most of the problem is caused by a few.
28. Long term O&M issue is important. TCEQ & USACE are already requiring some water quality improvements. The City removed the inlet protection around downtown that was constructed as part of the pilot evaluation. Why was it removed? Was it determined that the trash removal benefit was not worth the cost and effort to maintain these devices?
29. In Austin, every development has 2 ponds essentially. Not good for Fort Worth. BMPs (silt fences, etc.) should be considered only if they are actually affective. Practical solutions are good for Fort Worth.
30. Lake Worth watershed mostly uncontrolled because it is outside of the Fort Worth City limits. Need NCTCOG or someone to help program to coordinate adjacent communities.
31. Pollution control has issues in existing neighborhoods because of used car oil, etc. Agrilife Texas Watershed Stewards has an educational program to help inform existing residents about stormwater pollution. We need more education.

Mitigate

32. Do we limit voluntary buyouts to residential properties? That will be decided as part of the future policy development but the residential voluntary buyouts are typically more controversial and that is why it was a focus of the stakeholder meetings.

Warn & Inform

33. Agree with Warn & Inform program elements and like the title of the category.

Oversee Development

34. Do it faster in order to keep development moving along.

Questions/Comments brought up by general public during the presentation and discussed at the meeting:

35. Based on voluntary buyouts, what is next step if no grant funds are awarded? Personally I am already mired in federal red tape and now local red tape that prevents me from moving forward.
36. If buyouts do not occur for low lying areas we are left with very few option. Neighbors are angry if we elevate a flood prone property. Can the property owner get tax abatements if we do not receive service from the City? Would City support us against neighbor's opposition in raising houses?
37. Warn & Inform can be controversial – Flood insurance doesn't cover erosion.

Comment Cards from Stakeholders and Public:

38. After an area has been named/labeled a floodplain, can it be reversed after it no longer applies? Like, if it's been determined that it no longer floods here.
39. I believe after 5 years of being on the Stormwater Citizen Committee and the FEMA Stormwater Committee that the City needs to raise financial support and awareness of these issues.
40. Interested in community involvement aspect of voluntary buyout program development.
41. Meeting was very well planned and well conducted. Stakeholder's input is obviously valued. Good job!

Meeting Conclusions:

It is the City's understanding that the Stakeholder Group is in agreement with the proposed action plan so we will be moving forward to refine that action plan for inclusion in the master plan update.

The City discussed the proposed budget changes and shifting funding from the mitigate flooding and erosion category to the maintenance category to focus more effort in the future on storm drain rehab. The purpose of storm drain rehab is to make sure the existing storm drain infrastructure continues to function as designed. It is not to increase the system's existing capacity. The storm drain rehabilitation budget category will be included with the maintenance category in the future. Mitigate flooding and erosion will continue to be its own category, however there will be less funding available for this effort even though the needs remain high.