

Pierson-Greenhaven Storm Drainage Improvement Project
Public Meeting
January 10, 2013
6:30 P.M.

Harold Smith, the City Stormwater Services Project Manager, welcomed the attendees and introduced Matt Gustis (City Stormwater Services, Engineering Team Manager) and Karl Dauber and Rob Green (Parsons Brinckerhoff, consultant for the City).

Harold described the City's 311 call system, and how the City identifies and prioritizes needed projects. He further explained that the number of roads being flooded in the Pierson-Greenhaven project area, and the fact that the City had completed a previous drainage project in the area, gave this project a relatively high priority.

Karl Dauber, the Project Manager for Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB), then described the project in detail, providing an overview of the project area, a description of the various drainage systems, and an explanation of the engineering analyses that were completed as part of the study. He then described the drainage and flooding problems that were identified by the study, as well as the causes of these problems. The causes were mostly related to an insufficient number of inlets to collect road runoff, as well as undersized ditches and pipe systems.

Karl then explained that after the Existing Conditions Analysis phase of the project is complete, the next phase would be to develop a City Design Standard alternative which would solve all identified drainage problems by upgrading all existing systems in their current location so that all systems would meet current City standards. Karl explained that since this alternative is often expensive, or requires significant easements and construction impacts, or extensive environmental impacts, there will be a third phase called Alternatives Analysis which will explore other options to address flooding problems that may be more effective, less costly, less intrusive, and/or have less environmental impact.

Harold then explained that after an alternative was selected for the project, there would be a second public meeting for the community to present the selected alternative. This will complete the Planning Phase of the project and kick-off the Design Phase. During this phase, detailed engineering design will be completed, construction plans prepared, and permits and easements obtained. Upon completion of the Design Phase, there will be a third public meeting so that community members can see the detailed construction plans as well as all easements needed for the project. The project will then be advertised and awarded, and then constructed. Harold explained that the City will provide inspectors during the construction process to ensure that the project is constructed according to the approved plans.

The attendees were then invited to ask questions or provide input regarding the existing drainage problems and/or any concerns/suggestions they may have regarding potential solutions. The following summarizes the discussion:

1. There was a request to put the Public Meeting exhibit on the City website so that residents could view it.

2. **Grace Wallace (4126 Greenhaven Lane)** – Commented that she has not seen standing water to the extent shown on the exhibit and she has lived at the residence for 12 years.
3. **Ryan Botzenmayer (4120 Greenhaven Lane)** – Has seen floodwater up to the edge of his play area which is across the creek from his residence and just beyond the extents of his fence.
4. **Carolyn Millen (President of the Eastway/Sheffield HOA)** – Asked about pricing differences of the different alternatives. Karl and Harold explained that the City Design Standard is the ideal fix. The choice of selected alternative will take into account the repair cost, but that will not be the only deciding factor. Quality of contractor's work does not go into this cost estimate; the cost estimate assumes work will be done correctly and timely.
5. **Ron Schimpf (1026 Pierson Drive)** – Homeowner asked when they would see a concept of what the future improvements would look like. Harold explained that the second public meeting would have a conceptual plan to present. The third public meeting would be for the comprehensive plan.
6. **Sheila Baker (4127 Greenhaven Lane)** – Homeowner asked who is responsible for maintenance of the ditch in her back yard (Ditch "B"). Harold explained that without an easement, the City does not have legal access to maintain it ,and therefore it is up to the property owner.
7. **Sheila Baker** – What is the timetable for repair work? Homeowner expressed interest in constructing a fence and removing the existing railroad ties if work would commence at a date much farther away. Harold explained that the timetable was not set but would be at least a couple of years and they could go ahead and construct a fence and remove ties if they felt they needed too. However, the fence should not obstruct flow, since this could potentially make flooding problems worse on her property or neighboring properties.
8. **Charles Stubbs (Eastern Hills Baptist Church)** – Can we just pipe the systems from Albemarle Road through the neighborhood? Harold explained that the city has a policy of replacing pipes with pipes and ditches with ditches unless it is absolutely necessary to pipe the water and there is a cost sharing agreement with the homeowner. Pipes would have to be significant in size. They would also have to take into account the potential environmental impacts of Creek "A" which are Jurisdictional Waters.
9. **Wallace** - Informed the City that the homeowner's survey from when they bought the property shows an existing easement along Creek "A". Inquired into why the City doesn't keep the creek clean. Harold explained that the City only clears out blockages, and does not provide removal of weeds and trash from drainage creeks.
10. **Wallace** – Existing sinkholes between 4126 and 4120 Greenhaven Lane were repaired with the previous work done on the closed system which runs perpendicular with Greenhaven Lane (between inlet 202 and JB 203). More sinkholes have developed since that work was performed. Matt responded that the City would send out Maintenance staff to complete these kinds of minor repairs.

11. **Schimpf** – Asked when the construction would start. Harold gave a rough estimate of 18-20 months.
12. **Botzenmayer** – Backyard stays wet after all rain events. Some of the high flows have eroded his back yard and caused low spots. Requests that we try to raise the grade of his backyard slightly to ensure positive drainage toward the creek.
13. **Schimpf** – Would like to see terraced stream banks for the creek so that he has creek access for removing debris, etc. He would like to see rip rap gabions (wire baskets) similar to other stream projects in Charlotte. His rear yard has erosion problems, stability problems, and access problems due to the creek. He also mentioned that the fabric which is under the existing rip rap is coming out and periodically blocking the stream/pipe entrance.
14. Karl Dauber asked the residents what their thoughts were on putting a “floodplain bench” in Creek “A” on the side opposite of the residences. The area is mostly woods except for a playground at 4120 Greenhaven and a storage shed at 4126 Greenhaven Lane. The residents were not opposed to the idea, but would want to see the impacts. The owner of the shed would like to keep the shed.
15. **Millen** – Asked about the effects of this project on the downstream flooding of Edward’s Branch. Karl explained that the loss of attenuation within the system was modeled and does not have a great impact on the downstream flows. It will not make downstream flooding worse, but it also will not make it better. The city is aware of downstream flooding and would be very sensitive to any downstream impacts this project might have once the project is constructed.
16. **Stubbs** – Asked about cutting trees at rear of church near Ditch “B”. He was informed that the trees are required by zoning regulations and are not the responsibility of the Storm Water Services Group.
17. **Botzenmayer** – Homeowner has water issues under house and has recently had to have work done in crawl space including installing a drainage ditch and a sump pump.
18. **Schimpf** – Homeowner asked if we are proposing to upgrade the culvert under Pierson Drive. Harold explained that we are not yet proposing that, but it may be one of the upgrades considered in the City Design Standard or the Alternatives Analysis.
19. **Botzenmayer** – Homeowner asked what are some of the other alternatives we may explore during Alt. Analysis. Karl informed him that the team has not sat down to brainstorm many solutions yet as this was just an analysis of the existing problems in the neighborhood, but some of the things we might look at are piping both creeks down Greenhaven Lane or taking Ditch “B” all the way to Pierson Drive.
20. **Eastern Hills Baptist Church Member** – How long until the next meeting and how long until the project is complete? Harold said the next meeting, the conceptual design meeting, would be in 9-12 months and the project might be complete in 2 years. These are very rough estimates.