HDR | ONE COMPANY *Many Solutions*℠

Meeting Notes

Subject:	Public Meeting #1		
Client:	City of Charlotte Storm Water Services		
Project:	Princeton-Somerset Minor CIP	Project No:	10433-165251-018
Meeting Date:	October 20, 2011	Meeting Location:	Mahlon Adams Pavilion
Notes by:	Jennie Gende-Casanova, Patrick Blandford		

Attendees:

Susan Tolan	CSWS
Doug Lozner	CSWS
Steven McCraney	CSWS
Patrick Blandford	HDR
Ron Geiger	HDR
Jennie Gende-Casanova	HDR

Topics Discussed:

1. Welcome
    a. *Ms. Tolan welcomed the attendees to the meeting and provided introductions of her and the project team present at the meeting. About 14 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 results of the existing conditions analysis and gather additional citizen input regarding those results and any other issues. She prefaced that the public meeting would likely be the last public effort to gather information prior to the design of the proposed improvement however, she would be able to individually meet with residents if necessary. She mentioned the various means of communication (e.g. reverse 911, mailers, signs, and project website) used in order to solicit for the public meeting and requested any preferences for future meetings.*
3. Background Information
    • Charlotte Mecklenburg Storm Water Services
        a. *Ms. Tolan explained the purpose and general operation of the CMSWS. She mentioned that that the government entity is focused on improving public drainage issues (i.e. issues caused by drainage from the public right-of-way) but that CMSWS is also committed to customer service in responding to individual property issues where possible. She explained the priority of storm water requests and the role they play towards addressing problems either through Maintenance or Engineering Team projects.*
    • Project History
        a. *Ms. Tolan discussed how a Maintenance Team project was developed from past customer services requests from the inception of the program and that the CMSWS continued to investigate this project as a Maintenance Project up through 2009. The efforts of the Maintenance Team included the acquisition of storm drainage easements, survey, and some preliminary analysis and design. She explained how CMSWS determined that the project needed to be elevated to a Minor Capital Improvement Project for the Engineering Team to*

implement and that the CIP process would allow for an evaluation of more comprehensive issues in the entire project area and not just along the primary conveyance system.

- Citizen Involvement
    a. *For citizen involvement, Ms. Tolan explained the CharMeck 311 hotline and the questionnaire process and how it yielded the citizen input beneficial to the project. She encouraged citizens to continue to call 311 or contact her with any additional feedback. Nine individuals present at the meeting had completed the questionnaire. The citizen input map was projected on the screen during this discussion.*

4. Existing Conditions Analysis
    - Project Scope
        a. *Mr. Blandford presented the existing conditions analysis portion of the meeting. He explained that the existing conditions analysis provides a baseline assessment for which all subsequent planning efforts (City Design Standard, Alternative 1, etc) would be evaluated. Mr. Blandford provided an overview of the existing system, its critical components, the observed conditions of these components and the desired performance standards, at which the City desires these components to operate. This information was presented illustrating the drainage area and pipe and channel system.*
    - Results
        a. *Mr. Blandford presented the results of the existing conditions analysis. First, he explained that there were not enough catchbasin inlets to limit spread of roadway runoff to acceptable widths on all streets except on the upper side of Somerset Drive. Additional inlets would be needed along these streets.*
        b. *Second, he explained that the majority of the conveyance system from downstream of Somerset Drive was inadequate to pass 10-year flows without surcharging the system.*
        c. *Next, he explained that pipes across two of the three cross streets were inadequate to pass the design storm without overtopping. The exception being Somerset Drive.*
        d. *Finally, he explained that several structures were potentially impacted by flooding (i.e. structural flooding) perhaps as probable as a 2-year design storm. This information was presented with a figure of the project area with a floodplain map.*

5. Next Steps
    - Finalize Existing Conditions Report
        a. *Ms. Tolan explained that HDR will use the information collected at the public meeting to finalize the existing conditions analysis before moving onto any design tasks.*
    - Alternative Solutions – Preferred Option
        a. *Ms. Tolan reiterated that the City will step through a process that addresses the issues in place, including improving the current system up to the City Standard, and then evaluate other alternatives with various performance differences (i.e. alignment, storage, etc). A preferred option will be selected that addresses the issues with a cost-effective solution. This option will be reported back to the residents at the next public meeting.*
    - Design and Construction
        a. *Ms. Tolan relayed to the residents that construction would probably occur in 2015 but that the City would be back in front of them next winter (2012) at a public meeting with the proposed design.*

6. General Questions & Comments
        a. *Q: Residents asked what the project was for and why are you doing all this? A: Ms. Tolan and Mr. Blandford explained that reports and concerns of drainage issues were obtained through the City's 311 information center, questionnaires and the problems were confirmed through engineering models.*
        b. *Q: Residents followed up asking how issues would be addressed? A: 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.*

c. *Q: Residents asked if better or more curb could also help? A: Installing curb and gutter could help keep the storm water runoff in the street and the street drainage system, versus overflowing into yards.*
d. *Q: Can a new drainage system be extended to get behind houses? A: Ms. Tolan explained that a qualifying drainage issue must receive runoff from a public right-of-way. CMSWS can work to help private issues when possible.*
e. *Q: Is there adequate funding for the construction of the proposed improvements? A: Ms. Tolan explained that there is adequate funding for planning, design and construction of the proposed improvements.*
f. *Residents expressed desire to have larger pipes and possibly rerouting of the system*
g. *Major flooding in front of homes at 3017, 3023, and 3029 Somerset Drive but drains in 24 hours. The water either travels from the backs of the houses, adjacent yards, and the road but the road is higher than the front yards trapping the water away from the road.*
h. *Similar conditions exist along 2921 and 3001 Idlewood Drive where roadway runoff enters low yards and does not continue.*
i. *3017 Somerset Drive suggested a pipe to the back yard in order to capture runoff before traveling across adjacent yards.*
j. *Between Somerset and Idlewood Drives major flooding occurs, blockage is caused by fences across the small channel*
k. *Residents would like a pipe to run down the back yards, that would replace the ditch, to collect the water between Somerset and Idlewood Drives*
l. *Residents on Princeton Avenue state the runoff from Somerset Drive comes down Princeton Avenue and crosses the road and onto their land off the streets. This occurs roughly along 1220, 1228, 1216, and 1214 Princeton Avenue*
m. *3029 Somerset Drive does not have any yard flooding but states the ditch runs full during each rain event. This ditch travels to the back yards at 1219 and 1227 Princeton Avenue but transitions into a wide swale. Some of the blockages have caused a second ditch to from and direct storm water in another direction.*
n. *There is a 6 inch PVC pipe that drains the back yard at 1227 Princeton Avenue that connects to A29-DI*
o. *Between the homes at 1227 and 1231 Princeton Avenue residents have seen the depths of water to be 2.5 feet. HDR modeling has confirmed some crawl space flooding of these homes.*
p. *Residents at 1227 and 1231 Princeton Avenue have observed the sinks holes at the pipe joints along the Idlewood system.*
q. *Residents at 3028 Forest Park Drive mentioned that the neighboring 3020 Forest Park Drive structure may be demolished and a new structure built in its place. There may be an opportunity to identify easements prior to the reconstruction.*
r. *Residents at 3024 Forest Park Drive explained that when Little Sugar Creek rises, issues at 3025 Forest Park Drive occur as well.*

Action/Notes:

- HDR will redefine the existing conditions based upon the resident's responses as needed.
- HDR and CMSWS to perform a site visit to 3045 Idlewood Drive (The Nutty's).
- CMSWS to coordinate with the owners at 3020 Forest Park Drive regarding potential easement acquisition given the potential for a rebuild.