

Subject:	Public Meeting #2		
Client:	City of Charlotte Storm Water Services		
Project:	Princeton-Somerset Minor SDIP	Project No:	10433-165251-018
Meeting Date:	May 24, 2012	Meeting Location:	Mahlon Adams Pavilion
Notes by:	Jennie Gende-Casanova, Patrick Blandford		

**Attendees:**

Susan Tolan	CSWS
Patrick Blandford	HDR
Ron Geiger	HDR
Jennie Gende-Casanova	HDR

**Topics Discussed:**

1. *Welcome*

a. *Ms. Tolan welcomed the attendees and provided introductions of the project team present at the meeting. Seven (7) residents were present for the meeting. Meeting agenda and sign-in sheet attached.*

2. *Purpose*

a. *Ms. Tolan explained that the purpose of the public meeting was to present the Preferred Alternative and answer citizen questions regarding the design and any other issues. She recalled that a favorable project ought to make hydraulic sense, be cost-effective, and publicly accepted. This meeting was to gain the public's acceptability of the project. She prefaced that the public meeting would likely be the last public effort prior to the design of the Preferred Alternative.*

3. *Project to Date*

a. *Ms. Tolan provided a summary of the project efforts to date, detailing the timing of the last public meeting in reference to the conclusion of the Existing Conditions analysis.*

• *Citizen Input*

a. *Ms. Tolan summarized the citizen input process and the importance of sharing information at the public meetings in order for it to be incorporated into the design and planning study documentation. She referenced the citizen input map that was compiled from the questionnaires distributed prior to the project and 311 requests to the City.*

• *Existing Conditions*

a. *Ms. Tolan reviewed some of the key findings from the Existing Conditions Analysis referencing a map of the 100-year flood inundation limits map for future conditions. She mentioned that 100-year flooding of structures is one of several metrics the City evaluates in identifying and evaluating improvements. She mentioned that the Existing Conditions analysis showed 7 structures to be flooding during the 100-year storm and some of those flooding as frequent as the 2-year storm. She mentioned 3 other non-habitable structures also flooded. She also referenced street flooding and pipe surcharging throughout the project area to be other concerns of the City and how they impacted vehicular safety.*

- Alternatives

- a. Ms. Tolan explained that two alternatives were evaluated. One alternative looked at improving the drainage system where it currently exists but incorporating improvements that would meet the City Design Standards. The second alternative looked at relocating the system to the public right-of-way and complying with those same City Design Standards. She demonstrated the key variations of the two alternatives.

#### 4. Preferred Alternative

- Proposed Improvements

- a. Mr. Blandford presented the proposed improvements of the Preferred Alternative. First, he explained Somerset Drive's proposed design. The placement of inlets starting at 3001 Somerset Drive and continuing along the street to Princeton Avenue to reduce spread widths and allow for multiple points of runoff capture. He explained that the captured stormwater will be redirected to Princeton Avenue.
- b. Second, he explained the proposed design for Idlewood Circle. Similar to Somerset Drive, the placement of inlets starting at 3001 Idlewood will continue along the street and the stormwater will be redirected to Princeton Avenue. The pipe that travels under 3045 Idlewood will be abandoned. The pipe system that travels across 1231 to 1241 Princeton Avenue will be abandoned, and that a City standard drop inlet may be installed between 1227 and 1231 Princeton Avenue and the pipe will be connected to Princeton Avenue.
- c. Next, he explained the proposed design for Forest Park Drive. The placement of inlets starting at 3001 Forest Park Drive along the street and the redirection of pipe flow behind the private residence at 3025 Forest Park and the new outfall of the system on Freedom Park property.
- d. Finally, he explained the proposed design for Princeton Avenue, that inlets will be placed along the street to maintain acceptable spread widths and provide locations for discharge into the proposed pipe.
- e. This information was presented referencing both an overall system layout and individual project component figures.
- f. Ms. Tolan explained that the Preferred Alternative eliminates City drainage to all existing private systems (except on 3025 Forest Park Drive) rendering them as non-qualifying and that the City will perform some select improvements to the non-qualifying pipes and inlets where issues currently exists and to provide a good conditioned system prior to abandonment of storm drainage easements.

#### 5. Next Steps

- Finalize Planning Report

- a. Ms. Tolan explained that HDR will incorporate the information collected at the public meeting into the final section of the planning report to conclude the Planning phase and that the input from the meeting barring significant deviations from the current design will be applied later during the upcoming Design phase.

- Design and Construction

- a. Ms. Tolan relayed to the residents that construction would probably occur in 2015 based on average project durations for design, real estate and bidding however, she mentioned that this proposed design is straight forward with few real estate needs, and may be performed ahead of typical design and real estate planning durations.

- Real Estate: Easements

- a. Ms. Tolan mentioned the next and final Public Meeting will be held when the design is about 70% completed. The purpose of the meeting will be to address temporary and permanent easements required for construction. Ms. Tolan explained what easements were, how they are different, and the potential abandonment of permanent easements between Somerset and Forest Park Drives that were acquired by the City for potential replacement on the current alignment. However, these easements would be kept during construction phase to perform any necessary improvements.

## 6. General Questions & Comments

- a. Q: Resident expressed his concerns for the debris in the catch basins. He suggested that Solid Waste should pick it up as part of their curbside collection service.  
A: Ms. Tolan suggested that he should call 311 when severe blockages occur and that there is some expectation of residents to clear storm drains resulting from their debris.
- b. Q: Resident asked what is a valley gutter?  
A: Mr. Blandford explained the design is different than a standard curb and gutter in that it is mountable by vehicles and that the valley gutter will be concrete unlike the existing asphalt curbs in the neighborhood. Ms. Tolan shared a photo of the valley gutter with the resident.
- c. Q: Residents asked what was the purpose of the project?  
A: Ms. Tolan and Mr. Blandford explained that reports and concerns of drainage issues were obtained through the City's 311 information center prompting a series of Maintenance Team investigations. The complexity of the project grew beyond the Maintenance Team's scope so it was handed off to the Engineering Team to perform a SDIP.
- d. Q: Residents followed up asking how issues would be addressed?  
A: Ms. Tolan explained that flooding issues could be addressed by installing larger pipes, re-routing the drainage system or a combination of both, as well as extending drainage pipe systems along the roads.
- e. Q: Residents asked if "better" or more curb could also help?  
A: Mr. Blandford explained that installing curb and gutter could help keep the storm water runoff in the street and the street drainage system, versus overflowing into yards for the 10-year design storm or less.
- f. Q: Can a new drainage system be extended to get behind houses (e.g. are the catchbasins deep enough)?  
A: Residents may tie into existing systems but they should inform CSWS prior to doing so.
- g. Q: Will additional water being discharged have a larger impact on Freedom Park?  
A: Mr. Blandford explained that the same amount of water will be discharged. The travel time will be slightly shorter with the proposed improvements making it seem like more water. Currently, the detention area upgrade of the sidewalk in Freedom Park overtops for the 10-year storm in the modeling. Project improvements will not make this significantly worse. The downstream pipes from the detention area exceed their capacity for the 10-year storm, since the detention area overtops, this system will not significantly worsen. Mr. Blandford stated that there needs to be more storage in the detention area to relieve the existing overtopping problem.
- h. Q: Will the additional water being discharged affect Freedom Park's pond?  
A: Mr. Blandford stated the flow of the water does not enter the pond.
- i. Q: Is there a temporary fix for existing issues ahead of construction in 2015?  
A: Ms. Tolan stated that there are no temporary fixes. Mr. Blandford added that the alignment did not have many opportunities for detention to help with downstream flooding.
- j. Q: What are the laws with private property regarding drainage? This question was asked in the context of water running down neighboring driveways and entering adjacent properties.  
A: A resident offered that one resident cannot direct water from their property that adversely affects another. The Project Team concurred with this statement and suggested that he contact Building Standards for compliance with City codes.
- k. Q: What is the Maintenance Team?

A: Ms. Tolan explained the Maintenance Team, and how the project evolved to an Engineering Storm Drainage Improvement Project. Ms. Tolan also explained that residents not in the project area should contact 311 with drainage issues.

- i. Q: What are the priorities for 311's A, B, C codes?  
A: Ms. Tolan explained the coding system.
- m. Q: Resident from Princeton explained that Somerset's flow jumps the crown of Princeton Avenue and travels onto the driveways on Princeton and dumps into his back yard.  
A: Ms. Tolan explained the proposed design provides for more opportunities to capture runoff along Somerset Drive, lessening the impact to homes on Princeton Avenue for the design storms. Ms. Tolan explained that the potential for flooding may still exist due to issues unrelated to Somerset Drive (i.e. south side Princeton Avenue drainage).
- n. Q: Will the trees be impacted during construction?  
A: During this stage of the planning study the impacts have been evaluated at a concept level. There are very few tree impacts along Princeton Avenue, Somerset Drive, and Idlewood Circle. There are tree impacts on Forest Park Drive. The intent is to have the pipes run down the center of the lanes on Princeton Avenue and under curbs everywhere else where existing trees are not located however, utilities have not been thoroughly evaluated. The design will refine the number and extent of tree impacts.
- o. Q: Will the street width be getting larger or smaller with these improvements?  
A: Ms. Tolan stated they should stay the same.
- p. Q: What is the design on Princeton Avenue?  
A: Mr. Blandford explained that a new pipe would be constructed down the middle of the west bound lane on Princeton Avenue. Inlets and junction boxes would be placed along Princeton Avenue intercept flow and maintain spread widths. The alignment is to preserve the sidewalk from disturbance.
- q. Q: Will the pipe junction at Princeton and Forest Park affect the trees on 3034 Forest Park?  
A: Ms. Tolan explained that the intent is to have the pipes run down the center of the lane and not into the vegetated ROW. Furthermore, Mr. Blandford explained that the angle of the turn was a result of utilities.
- r. Q: Does this change the 100 year flood plain?  
A: Ms. Tolan stated yes, and reviewed the proposed floodplain map.
- s. Q: What is the difference between the 10-, 25-, 50-, and 100- year storm events?  
A: Mr. Blandford stated we have not seen an example with the recent series of storms. He asked the residents to remember the August 5, 2011 storm and that was an example of a 25-50 year storm event depending on your location in Charlotte.
- t. Q: Is this the only portion of the neighborhood being addressed? Resident on Princeton explained the impact of runoff from Princeton Avenue on Willow Oak. She explained how flow from Princeton Avenue flows down Willow Oak Drive and dumps into the woods behind 3139 Willow Oak.  
A: Ms. Tolan explained that this project should reduce the amount of stormwater running down Willow Oak Drive coming from Princeton Avenue and Somerset Drive with the new inlets and possible speed bump modifications (openings to be placed in the speed bump to reduce the diversion of flow across Princeton Avenue).

Action/Notes:

- a. No action items