
MEETING MINUTES



720 Corporate Center Drive, Raleigh, North Carolina 27607 919.782.0495

**City of Charlotte
Meadowridge
City Project No. 672-10-001
WKD Project # 20110103.00.RA (Meadowridge)
July 16, 2013**

The meeting started at 6:00 p.m. at the Living Saviour Lutheran Church. Adrian Cardenas, Scott Sigmon and Steve Frey delivered the presentation to the attendees. Billy Royal and Rob Normandy served in support roles during and following the presentation. The presentation followed the outline below:

I. Welcome & Introductions

Adrian welcomed attendees to the third public meeting for the Meadowridge Storm Drainage Improvement Project. Next, he introduced the project team in attendance:

- Project Manager: Adrian Cardenas, Charlotte Mecklenburg Storm Water Services
- Watershed Manager: Doug Lozner, Charlotte Mecklenburg Storm Water Services
- Project Manager: Scott Sigmon, WK Dickson
- Project Engineer: Billy Royal, WK Dickson
- Project Engineer: Rob Normandy, WK Dickson
- Real Estate Senior Project Manager: Steve Frey, City of Charlotte Real Estate Services
- Real Estate Consultant: Amy Parish, THC Inc.

Adrian reminded attendees to:

- Make sure everyone has an agenda/handouts.
- Sign the sign-in sheet.
- Fill out a Customer Service Comment Card.
- Ask general questions throughout, but ask specific questions in the small group discussions at the end of the meeting.

II. Meeting and Project Purpose

Adrian gave an overview of the items that would be covered in this meeting.

III. Project Phases

Adrian reviewed the tasks completed during the planning phase, then proceeded to analyze the current phase and remaining phases of the project. Adrian reiterated the steps of the project that would occur to finalize the design phase and begin construction. Adrian transitioned the presentation to Scott Sigmon.

IV. Proposed Improvements

Scott recapped the existing conditions findings and the proposed alternative discussed in the previous two Meadowridge public meetings. It was explained that the plans are now at a 70% design level and we now have specific pipe sizes, locations and planned channel improvements. Scott reviewed the areas not meeting City Standards and discussed the proposed solutions for each location. Scott transitioned the presentation to Adrian.

V. Easements

Adrian introduced Steve Frey with the City of Charlotte Real Estate. Steve discussed the different types of easements that would be required to construct the proposed improvements. The Temporary Construction Easement (TCE) is a temporary easement that allows access to the project site during construction and will be removed after the project is completed. The Storm Drainage Easement (SDE) is a document executed by a property owner and recorded with the Register of Deeds conveying to Charlotte Mecklenburg Storm Water Services the right to access a specific portion of the property for the purpose of repairing and maintaining a storm drainage system including creeks.

General Questions & Comments

Adrian wrapped up the presentation with remaining tasks and time estimates to finish this project. He opened the floor up for general questions.

General Q&A: *(additional information provided after the public meeting in italics)*

- What are the general time lines for each phase?
 - A slide from the presentation was shown that provided general time frames for various phases. It was reiterated that the times shown were not cumulative since many phases can be completed simultaneously. The audience was also informed that this information is on the City's website and mailer.
(<http://charmec.org/stormwater/Projects/Pages/MeadowridgeDrive.aspx>)
- What is the easement acquisition process for non-donated easements?
 - Steve clarified that the City hopes to have easement areas donated to keep project costs low and have more funds for other projects. Easement areas can be appraised if an agreement for a donation cannot be achieved. Condemnation by eminent domain may be required if an agreement could not be reached.
- Will there be disturbance to adjacent property next to proposed construction?
 - There should be no disturbance outside of the proposed easement areas or right of way. The City and its representatives cannot access property without an easement.
- What will be the order of construction?
 - Generally, the construction progresses from the downstream areas to the upstream areas; however, certain project locations may be constructed at the same time.
- Will the City replace shrubs, trees, and fences on my property that are affected by construction?
 - Items, such as fences, removed during the construction process will be replaced. Fences may need to be slightly relocated if they are located where channel banks may change. Fences will not be relocated in streams or channels. If fences are in good condition, the contractor may be asked to remove and reset the fence following construction. The City will work with the property owner during the

easement process to come to an agreement on trees and landscaping *that will not impact drainage system or future maintenance.*

- What are the existing easements in our neighborhood?
 - Most existing easements are Public Drainage Easements (PDE) designated by the original developer. These easements are not maintained by the City and are the responsibility of the property owner. The City will convert the PDE to SDE where they overlap and the City will assume responsibility for the infrastructure in exchange for access rights. It was also noted that some properties have Sanitary Sewer Easements (SSE) on their property.
- Will the contractor temporarily store materials and equipment on property or in the street?
 - While temporary storage of materials, or staging, is required for construction, it will be limited to the easement areas and/or right of way. Additionally, none of the sub-project areas should be under construction for more than a few months.
- How did the City determine the Meadowridge project area, and are other nearby areas with issues are being addressed?
 - This project area is defined by a watershed drainage boundary. Systems outside of this watershed drainage area would be addressed separate from this project. Residents were asked to notify the project team if there are other known drainage issues not addressed in the proposed plans.

Small Group Discussions

Following the general Q&A session, meeting attendees were invited to ask more specific, property-specific questions. The project area was sub-divided into three separate areas. Each of the three areas had exhibits and design plans set up at different locations in the room.

Property-Specific Questions:

- 5800 Chapel Creek Court – property owner indicated that there is a blueberry bush (indicated as a shrub on the plans) that he would like to keep.
- 5812 Chapel Creek Court – property owner indicated that access to the stream will be along her driveway. Will the driveway be replaced if damaged? This can be discussed with the Real Estate agent during easement acquisition discussions.
- 5905 Winburn Lane – property owner mentioned that water tends to pond in the channel due to some large rocks. Property owner did not want any work done that may result in disturbance or removal of trees.
- 4517 Pendock Court – property owner would like the City to evaluate the existing aerial sewer lateral crossing the stream on his property. The property owner asked about tree removal, it was explained that the tree removal was necessary for construction access. Property owner asked if his shed would need to be moved, and it was explained that it would not need to be moved since construction access was available around the shed. Property owner stated that 5600 & 5601 All Saints Lane had drainage issues. It was noted that these properties were out of the project area, but would be noted in the meeting minutes. *5600 & 5601 All Saints Lane property owners should call 311 to properly document and assess any drainage issues.*
- 4500 Meadowridge Drive – property owner has an existing underground electric pet fence and would like the contractor to install a temporary underground fence during construction.

- 5713 All Saints Lane – property owner requested that the existing outfall be moved to the rear of his property. The property owner is also concerned about the Mecklenburg County and FEMA floodplain located on his property, which are in the process of being revised by Mecklenburg County. The City is not allowed to use the pending lines until they are officially approval by Mecklenburg County. The property owner requested a plan sheet and information including the following:
 - Property limits
 - Existing outlet structure
 - Proposed outlet structure
 - Current FEMA and County floodplains
 - Pending FEMA and County floodplains
 - Photos of outlet structures used at other projects
 - Proposed planting and landscaping around outlet structure
- 4700 Meadowridge Drive – property owner concerned with removal of landscaping along proposed pipe alignment. Property owner was asked to coordinate with real estate consultant. It was also explained to the property owner that the proposed grade along the top of the replaced pipe would redirect overland storm water flow towards the street and away from house. The property owner was pleased with the proposed design.
- 4641 Meadowridge Drive – property owner expressed concerned with removal of landscaping along proposed pipe alignment. The property owner will coordinate with real estate consultant.
- 5618 Ivygate Lane – property owner would like to meet with City to discuss drainage issues within their backyard. Property owner suggested that drainage goes towards the center of the pipe alignment (Sta. 2+50) and may not effectively drain to the current drop inlet. Potential spot grading and addition of drop inlet near Sta. 2+50 were suggested improvements. Property owner to contact Adrian to set up meeting.
- 5624 Ivygate Lane – same concerns as 5618 Ivygate Lane. Indicated that drainage is not directed towards existing / proposed drop inlet location. Property owner was pleased that they would receive a new driveway.
- 4825 Meadowridge Drive – property owner had concerns with erosion to the creek in his backyard. He was directed to contact the project manager as soon as possible to schedule an on-site meeting to evaluate the problem and discuss any possible solutions.
- 5721 Trimmings Court – property owner wanted to know if the “hole” in her back yard caused by the erosion was going to be filled in. The existing erosion in the stream behind her house would be stabilized with a designed rock structure. She also asked how where we going to access her property. We told her construction access was through her rear neighbor at 4517 Pendock Court.