



MEETING MINUTES

Lyon Court CIP Public Meeting January 5, 2012

I. Welcome and Introductions

- a) William Harris, project manager with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Storm Water Services (CMSWS), began the meeting by welcoming and thanking the residents for attendance at the meeting.
- b) William Harris introduced himself and the team members for the project: Amy Bice (CMSWS), Andrew Martin (USI), Daniel Duymovic (USI) and Ashlie Wood (USI).
- c) William Harris asked if any of the current attendees were not at the first public meeting. Two attendees expressed that they were not at the first public meeting for the Lyon Court CIP.
- d) William introduced the project, using exhibits to describe the project limits, project goals, and briefly summarized the existing conditions problem areas, and proposed alternative improvements.

II. Existing Conditions and Alternative Analysis

- a) William gave the floor to Andrew Martin to further explain the need for the project and existing conditions problem areas.
- b) Andrew described the City Design Standard (CDS) goals, and explained that the estimated cost to meet all CDS goals in the project area is approximately fifteen million dollars.
- c) Andrew used the exhibits to show the residents specific locations and examples of areas where certain CDS criteria were not critical for meeting the project specific goals. Andrew explained why the city chose to relax certain CDS criteria for culverts and gutter spread during the Alternative Analysis phase of this project.
- d) William briefly explained the savings in infrastructure by reducing the CDS criteria.
- e) Based on the dots citizens placed on the project exhibits, Andrew pointed out that many of the attendees live along the primary conveyance system.
- f) Andrew described primary system closed pipe replacement, culvert replacement, and channel and bank stabilization improvements proposed for the Selected Alternative.
- g) Andrew described proposed alternative alignments for the Selected Alternative along Hamorton Place, Tippah Avenue, Morningside Drive, and between Nassau Boulevard and Thurmond Place to divert flow and ease the installation of infrastructure.
- h) Andrew informed the residents that the Selected Alternative Design improvements include removing the Hamorton Place culverts from the abandoned right-of-way.
- i) Andrew explained that the Selected Alternative Design estimated cost is approximately eleven million dollars.

IV. Q & A

Question: Has the project already been funded?

Response: Amy and William: Yes the project has already been approved for funding. The desire is to fix as much as possible in the system so that it will work sufficiently for the foreseeable future.

Question: Are you aware and taking into consideration the redevelopment project on McClintock Road, and weren't they required to provide a bond for stream improvements?

Response: Andrew and William: Yes, we have taken future development projects into consideration for the calculation process. William is coordinating with the current owner of the development, the bank that financed and subsequently foreclosed on the property, to deal with the bond issue.

Question: One of the relaxed standards is that design will allow for at least one travel lane?

Response: Andrew: Yes, this includes the low point of a roadway as well as the upstream portions of each roadway. The one lane of travel assures that an automobile will have one passable lane in the event of a significant storm event.

Question: Is there anything being done along Nassau Boulevard (Segment A)? These improvements do not seem to address an issue I've had for years with roadway flooding along Nassau Boulevard. I believe it's coming from the church (at 1900 The Plaza).

Response: William: We will be available after the meeting for one on one group discussions for specific residential problems you have been seeing related to drainage.

Question: I see you are working in open channel areas, what are you going to be doing there?

Response: Andrew: We may be lowering the channel, stabilizing the channel, or doing something else to improve the channel capacity or stability in those areas along the channel that have a proposed bubble around it.

Question: Did you consider the downstream impacts when analyzing this watershed?

Response: Andrew: Yes, we assume the maximum built-out density, and resulting increased impervious area as well as the removal of structures that reduce the flow when considering future conditions for design to insure that the effect of the improvements is carried downstream throughout the watershed.

Question: Does the green on the exhibit, overtop of the culvert area, mean that the culvert will be made larger?

Response: Andrew: Yes, areas highlighted in green means that improvements are proposed there.

Question: Is there a record kept if we call the city and report an erosion problem?

Response: William: Yes, we keep a record of 311 request calls, as well as surveys submitted to the city by residents about the storm drainage and erosion in their neighborhood.

Question: What is the difference between modeled street flooding and reported flooding?

Response: Will and Andrew: Modeled street flooding is what we have found to be the areas of flooding with our calculations. Reported street flooding is what was reported by the citizens. In general they match up.

Comment: Morningside Drive does flood frequently. We've noticed it for years.

Response: Andrew: Yes, modeling has supported this notion, and we have proposed a culvert to meet the city design level of storm service for the receiving Lyon Court drainage. But Morningside Drive flooding is partly due to the FEMA floodway of Briar Creek, and this project will not address flooding resulting from Briar Creek.

V. What Happens Next?

- a) William explained that since the design alternative has been selected, the next step is the design phase. The design phase will last approximately two and a half years, which will include permitting and the real estate phase. The third public meeting will be held at the beginning of the real estate phase. The real estate phase begins upon completion of 70% design, and will last between 12 and 14 months.
- b) William explained that upon completion of the real estate phase, the bidding phase will begin, lasting between 5 and 6 months.
- c) William then explained that the construction phase will begin after the bidding phase. The project construction will be split into two phases with two separate contracts. Each phase of construction will last approximately two years. The purpose of dividing the project into phases is to give the City better control of the contractor, since this project is significantly larger than a typical Capital Improvement Project.
- d) William also mentioned that the City is considering communicating information about projects using social media such as Facebook, Twitter, or blogs.
- e) Amy talked about the project budget, and explained that the budget for Selected Alternative has been approved, but the design phase will refine some of the estimated expenses.
- f) William thanked everyone for attending and welcomed them to stay for group discussion sessions.

Question: So, what year would you anticipate construction beginning?

Response: Amy: Phase I construction is estimated to start in about 4-5 years. Phase II construction is estimated to begin about 2 years after Phase I beginning. There will be a more detailed schedule provided at the next public meeting at the completion of 70% design.

Question: What exactly does reported "structural flooding" mean?

Response: Andrew and Amy: It means storm water is getting in the basement, crawl space, air conditioning equipment, crawl space vent, or finished floor of a building. However, depending on the source of the water, the problem may not qualify for service by the City. For example, if your neighbor has their down spout pointed towards your basement, causing flooding or erosion issues, the problem would not qualify for City services.

Question: Where can you get records of groundwater movement? I'm not sure if this is the correct terminology. I am having an issue with debris I put in, disappearing from the sink hole in my yard.

Response: Amy: Storm Water Services and Mecklenburg County does not address groundwater movement, but we may be able to help you find the information you are looking for.

VI. Group Discussion Session:

Group Discussion A: Daniel spoke with the resident at 1925 Tippah Avenue. She stated that a lot of runoff from the street gets into her front yard and that they have spent a lot of money addressing the issue. They have installed a drainage system that goes around from the front yard to the back and connects to the existing DI. She mentioned that the water from Belvedere Ave. pours onto Tippah Avenue and there are not enough catch basins to collect all the water. Daniel mentioned that the project is adding structures along Belvedere Avenue in the proposed alternative. The resident also said that she gets a lot of runoff in her back yard coming from the alleyway behind her house. Daniel told her that the project is not addressing that issue. She said during large storm events that her backyard looks like a rice paddy field and is about knee deep with water. She wanted to make sure that the project was not removing the drop inlets beside her house and Daniel said that the project may realign them so that the pipe network is evenly placed between her house and her neighbor's. She mentioned if we need to get more people on board that she believed she was willing to approach others to support the project.

Group Discussion B: Andrew and Amy spoke with the resident at 1914 Nassau Boulevard. She spoke of concerns about a sink hole in the front of her yard. She tried filling it in with sand, bricks, and other debris, but they seemed to have disappeared. Amy asked her to mark the location of the sink hole in her front yard on the exhibit. She has also noticed drainage flowing downstream from the 1900 The Plaza church parking lot and flooding Nassau Boulevard. The resident pointed out neighbors on the exhibit that most-likely do experience flooding, but did not report it in the citizen input survey because they are renters.

The meeting was concluded.