



MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: 510 Floodplain Management Plan
NAME OF MEETING: Stakeholder Planning Meeting #3
RECORDED BY: Freese and Nichols, Inc.
DATE: October 6, 2015
LOCATION: Hazel Harvey Peace center for Neighborhoods
ATTENDEES:

City Staff Clair Davis – CFW SW Cindy Robinson - CFW SW Jennifer Dyke – CFW SW Mary Hanna – CFW SW Art Basher – CFW Legal Steve Eubanks – CFW SW	Committee Members Joe Schneider – Hillwood Mike Dellies - Dunaway Mikel Wilkins - Verdunity Kent A. Loyd – Cordell & Co. Rick Kubes – BSI	Other Attendees Jannibah Coleman – OCG PR Scott Hubley, Katie Hogan – FNI
---	---	--

The following reflects our understanding of the items discussed during the subject meeting. If you do not notify us within five working days, we will assume that you are in agreement with our understanding.

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PRESENTER
1.	Introductions of committee members and City Staff	All
2.	Clair and Scott gave a recap of the first two stakeholder meeting discussions and went over the agenda items. This meeting focused on Steps 8-10 of the plan and went through the each action item in the plan for discussion.	Clair/Scott
3.	The action plan is available for public comment until October 30, 2015.	Clair
4.	<p>The Stakeholder Planning Group discussed each action listed in the FMP and had the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A member expressed concern that the plan is more stormwater focused than floodplain management focused. It was discussed that since approximately 66% of the flood insurance claims are located outside of the floodplain, stormwater actions to reduce flooding would still be needed. 2. A member mentioned that the Stormwater Utility Fee budget is not enough funding for all actions. The group discussed that actions will be completed as funding becomes available and a statement will be added to the report. The City would like to identify as many actions as possible to relay that they need additional funds and to have record of what they would like to accomplish. The City also mentioned that it is easier to obtain funding and grants if projects are already identified in the plans. 3. A committee member asked if FEMA could include areas outside of riverine flooding (such as stormwater flooding) on their maps. It was discussed that this is a possibility; however, there would be an 	All

	<p>increase in flood insurance premiums for those properties where floodplain was added. The City is still working to determine the best procedure for communicating and reducing flood risk in these areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. A member suggested using traffic cameras at intersections for stormwater use to assess flooding concerns. 5. Determination of the cost of each project was discussed. Some costs will be annual and others a one-time cost. Costs of projects were estimated based on past costs and perceived future costs. 6. The number of crossings completed each year should be removed from action 5.4.b. 7. The printed mailers to the entire City are costly and deemed not as effective as other methods of public outreach. The City would like to assess using more electronic methods of communicating with the public for CRS points. The City would also like to evaluate the cost of the mailers versus the overall benefit to the City with CRS points and insurance rates. 8. The neighborhood outreach emails were discussed as one of the better methods of communication within the City. 9. A member suggested using more TV and radio announcements to address the public during flood events and for flood risk awareness. 10. The group discussed the possibility of developing more storage areas and diversions to agricultural areas when there are large events (such as May 2015) to store water for use rather than send downstream. 	
--	---	--

ACTION ITEMS			
WHAT	WHO	WHEN	STATUS
1. Receive Public and Stakeholder Input	City/FNI	October 30	On Going
2. Finalize FMP document	City/FNI	November	Pending
3. Council Adoption	City/FNI	Nov/Dec	Pending