



Discussion Items

A. Meeting Attendance and Support of iSWM

Four public meetings were held in the month of March, with the attendance totaling approximately 250. The purpose of these meetings was to gain public opinion, comments and perspective on the existing iSWM program and updates that may be needed to improve it.

Overall, there was good distribution and representation of all sectors that would use iSWM, including engineers, planners, developers, public administrators, and environmental stakeholders. Also there was a broad range of familiarity with iSWM represented at the meetings.

The public generally supports the iSWM program, and recognizes the benefits it provides. Furthermore, over 85% of the public would most likely support the program in the community where they general work. However 60% of the communities are not using iSWM at this time.

B. Four Major Areas of Focus

Based on the keypad polling, small group discussions, and individual comment forms, there are four major areas of focus that have been identified. Focusing on these areas may include changes to the individual iSWM Manuals, education and training programs, or additional tools or services in support of the Program.

1. Local Criteria

- A strength of iSWM is that it provides consistency in how the region addresses storm water.
- Need a better local criteria template and/or other tools that help communities develop and customize guidance in iSWM to make it their own criteria.
- A default set of Local Criteria standards would give regional guidance but also allow flexibility on varying criteria (mix of opinion as to whether standards should be defined or more flexible in the Local Criteria to allow for uniqueness of each community).

2. Adoption/Implementation

- Manual is too large and complex for most communities.
- For a City to implement iSWM, they want it to be simple and user friendly.
- Need tools to make it easier to customize iSWM (adoption roadmap or “user manual”)
- Organize/clarify Chapter 1 information.
- Address coordination with other city departments & regulations.
- Allow flexibility for various levels of storm water design.
- Needs to be adopted widely to have an equal playing field for development in cities.

3. City and County Development Process & Review

- A concern is that the iSWM does not fit into the way NCT cities currently do things.
- Allow flexibility for varying complexity of City development & review processes.
- Requires coordination with other city departments – zoning, planning, development, etc.
- Smaller communities may not have resources for additional review.
- Redevelopment situations need to be addressed.
- Local examples of green design are necessary from a developers' perspective.
- Better list of possible incentives and how to implement them. Incorporate the incentives with zoning/ landscaping and other related requirements.
- There is a need to coordinate with LEED ND requirements and incentives.

4. Broadening Support & Education

- More education was identified as a key component of the success of iSWM.
- Training & workshops that target all audiences (development community, city staff, and elected officials)
- More examples/case studies that emphasize benefits of iSWM (actual developments using iSWM, local examples of BMP's and green design, testimonials, use of incentives)
- More cost info (upfront for developer, maintenance, implementation and review for Cities)
- Show how iSWM fits with TCEQ/EPA requirements and future direction.
- NCTCOG future expectations with respect to cost sharing for Cities for the iSWM Program
- People generally felt that iSWM promoted sustainability, but we need to emphasize that connection in the manual.

C. Minor Areas of Focus

- Technical aspects of the manual, such as design criteria, storm water controls, and site design practices.
- Construction. Comments indicated the Construction Manual is used frequently, but most weren't aware it was related to iSWM. Most did not want to combine the two manuals.
- General discussion on addressing water quality, streambank erosion, and flood control at a watershed level versus a site level.