

**Stormwater Master Plan Update  
Summary of Stakeholder Feedback  
Meeting 2 – May 16, 2017**

**Meeting Purpose:** Discuss results of peer community reviews and receive feedback from stakeholders on four major topics: Local floodplains, Private Property Channel Erosion, Voluntary Buyout Program, and Development Services.

**Stakeholders in Attendance**

Rusty Fuller	David Motheral	Howard Rattliff
Gary Havener	Rick Kubes	Aric Head
Rafael McDonnell	Joe Schneider	
Bill Schur	Lee Nicol	

*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:**

1. Is it a 1% storm event that is typically the focus of local floodplains?
2. Does Fort Worth have a floodplain regulation for local floodplain? But the City does maintain a general no adverse impact policy. Is that the same thing?
3. What kind of effort would it take to reproduce this local floodplain analysis across the city?
4. Why would the City review local floodplain developments smaller than one acre?
5. Will the local floodplains address the actual problem? Or will the problem be transferred somewhere else once the developed property is elevated? Need to make sure the problem is addressed holistically.
6. How does buying out a house eliminate flood or erosion risks to structures?
7. Where are the grant opportunities coming from?
8. The grants themselves, are they for FEMA floodplain area or are they local?
9. The \$65-100 million is the cost of capital projects, but how many houses would they have to buyout so they wouldn't have to spend \$100 million?
10. Do we really want to establish hardened, fast policies and take the decision away from people? The geography of the City has so many different areas to look at, I think it's almost impossible to set hard standards that the people have to follow. I think you have to give people the discretion that are in charge of these things to make some decisions.
11. Incentivized development – what does that mean?

12. Can cumulative impacts be addressed while not reviewing anything smaller than an acre?
13. Is development paying for their fair share of the cumulative impact for the areas in the City of Fort Worth that are having these problems? Or is that spread out across the city?
14. Are there grants for incentivized developments and local areas?
15. What's the right balance to decide whether a development needs a stormwater permit?

**Questions/Comments brought up by public following the presentation and discussed at the meeting:**

1. Is there any type of stormwater management that looks into the whole development even though each lot is under an acre?
2. When living in Florida, there were impermeability limitations placed on every property which forced owners to make decisions on what types of impervious area could be constructed on their property.
3. The City Planning Department and Stormwater do not always count impervious areas in the same way.
4. Curious what impacts were caused by paving over an empty lot near Walgreens. How much did this cost the City?
5. We would like to see more focus on public safety. Not just property but loss of life and potential threats to people.
6. If we want to have a nice City and a livable community, we all have to pay into that.
7. New development is not necessarily what is causing the issue, it is more about the older developments.
8. Do you anticipate that there would be any stormwater capital project funding in upcoming bonds?

**Summary of feedback received on the hard copy comment cards passed out during the meeting:**

See separate handout

**Summary of feedback received from public on polling questions during the meeting:**

See separate handout

**Summary of feedback from electronic polling questions asked to stakeholders during the meeting:**

See separate handout

**Meeting Conclusions:**

1. Feedback, comments, and polling results from the stakeholder meeting will be compiled and reviewed to inform future direction of the Master Plan.
2. The City will move forward with the implementation planning phase of the Master Plan update.
3. The next stakeholder meeting will be planned for late summer. More information will be sent out prior to the meeting.
4. "Parking lot" questions were identified during the meeting. These were questions brought up by the public and stakeholders that were relevant to the Master Plan update but were not part of the agenda for Stakeholder Meeting 2. These questions will be considered for future Master Plan implementation and coordination:
  1. The stormwater utility funding level is currently inadequate and needs to be addressed.
  2. The City should look into ways to minimize conflicts with impervious surfaces and current City standards such as street widths.