

CPAC Meeting Comments on Element 11 of the City's Initial Stormwater Management Plan



Meeting Date: April 6, 2010

Comments about Stormwater Mission Statement

1. A participant noted that the mission statement says “effects of pollution, erosion, and flooding,” but the primary concern of the permit seems to be just pollution.
2. A participant was concerned that not focusing on flooding with the City’s stormwater management may be a problem, especially since most of the public will be most concerned about flooding.
3. City staff responded that a lot of people underestimate how much the post-construction portion of the permit helps deal with flooding issues – the stormwater program can deal with flooding by dealing with post-construction maintenance.
4. City staff also responded that perhaps we should think about emphasizing flooding and how stormwater management can mitigate flooding problems when talking about stormwater management in some contexts.
5. A participant noted that there is a perception that it is difficult to redevelop land within the City of Columbia – the City needs to be business friendly (for attracting a tax base and jobs), and this perception means some people hesitate to build in or deal with the City
6. A participant noted that during the Richland County Roundtable, they found that many approaches that help manage stormwater can also reduce the cost to developers – some developers had an “Ah ha” moment when they realized this – this could be another matter of how the City presents this information.
7. A participant noted that the City needs to involve stakeholders, especially those who have been unhappy, in the public input process.
8. A participant noted that it might be a good idea to bring in stakeholders who have tried to deal with problems to talk about what worked/ didn’t work for them.
9. A participant suggested that it is important to educate (especially developers) during the early stages of developing regulations/ ordinances.
10. A participant offered to help identify people to be brought to the table.

Comments about Element 11 – Public Education and Outreach on Storm Water Impacts and Public Involvement/ Participation

1. A participant said the City and two counties need to cooperate on their outreach and suggested there may be overlap in the types of outreach they need to do.
2. A participant responded that the outreach will likely need to be tailored to the local area – while some problems may be similar on the surface, what the audiences will need to hear would be different enough that no single approach might work for all three.
3. A participant suggested City Stormwater work with Neighborhood Associations (NAs).
4. A participant noted that CPAC had better success working with churches – NAs were more concerned about crime and code violations and members often had too much on their plate.
5. A participant suggested that while outreach messages may need to be tailored, the City and two counties could at least work together on crafting a common theme.

6. A participant suggested there be a Midland's area branding approach.
7. A participant suggested that without a Midland's area approach, like the cigarette smoking ban, you could get mixed messages.
8. A participant commented about people with private pools who have overflow pipes that are hidden under pine straw and who let the pools drain into the streets.
9. A participant suggested using children to reach parents.
10. City staff cautioned against only using children – this approach will miss people who do not have children or nieces/nephews; it can also put the burden of a parent's action on the child, which is not fair to the child.
11. A participant commented that any message one expected children to carry to parents would have to be extremely short (3-5 seconds) otherwise it would never work.
12. A participant suggested using tailored outreach approaches. For example, people in Columbia are more likely to care about Finlay Park than people in Lexington; people in Lexington are more likely to care about Lake Murray. DHEC is also emphasizing getting behavior change, not in going to as many NA meetings as possible. The best way to do this is by being targeted to the population you want to reach and using messages they care about.
13. A participant commented that if DHEC wants to see behavior change, the City needs a baseline to show that change. The participant asked how one would track behavior change.
14. City staff responded that it is based on the behavior itself and gave an example of pet waste and ways you might track behavior change.
15. A participant said that Lexington County has done a survey using Clemson University. That survey is publicly available.
16. A participant commented that to get behavior change, the City will need to get people to try new things. That will take incentives. People will buy what is one sale. That might also require buy-in from places like Lowe's.