



Town of Chapel Hill
Stormwater Management Program
Lower Booker Creek Subwatershed Study UPDATE

Meeting Summary
Public Meeting 2, Session 2
June 23, 2016, 5:30 PM

Town of Chapel Hill and Consultant Attendees

Sue Burke, Stormwater Engineer, Town of Chapel Hill	Kevin Nunnery, Biohabitats
Tom Murray, Project Manager, WK Dickson	Ted Brown, Biohabitats
Scott Sigmon, WK Dickson	Inga Kennedy, PEQ
Ebony Hagans, WK Dickson	

1. Welcome and Purpose of Meeting

Residents of the Lower Booker Creek subwatershed were invited to attend a public meeting on June 23, 2016 at the Chapel Hill public library, to receive an update on the Lower Booker Creek subwatershed study including the existing conditions findings and the proposed solutions.

Two meetings were held on the morning and afternoon of the 23rd to accommodate residents' work schedules. Each meeting began with a presentation followed by a question and answer session. Following the meeting, attendees were invited to view maps of the Lower Booker Creek subwatershed summarizing the proposed solutions and to speak with staff and consultants about any questions or concerns. Attendees were also given comments cards to provide additional written feedback and input if desired. This summary represents the afternoon meeting and a total of 15 persons attended.

2. Overview of PowerPoint Presentation

Tom Murray kicked off the presentation portion of the meeting and spoke on the following topics:

- Overall Agenda and Goals.
- June 2016 Progress Update.
- Public Outreach.
- Existing Conditions Evaluation.
- Alternatives Development.

Ted Brown next discussed with the group neighborhood retrofits and various screening factors.

The following examples were presented:

- Streets – grass swales, bioswales, and stormwater tree pits.

- Residential Lots – rain gardens.
- Parking Lots – bioretention islands, perimeter bioretention, and bioswale/linear bioretention.
- Plazas – stormwater platers.

Tom Murray then covered the following topics:

- Multi-objective projects.
- Next steps moving forward.

A copy of this presentation can be found on the project website.

3. Verbal Questions/Comments by Participants during and following the Presentation

- **Question:** When you are talking about 10- and 25-year storms, are you talking about statistical or the storms we are actually experiencing? **Response:** The most current statistical rainfall model and totals provided by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) were used which takes into account recent storm data. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** What does a 1.9 reduction mean? **Response:** These are water surface elevation reductions achieved in the stream at specific locations if the alternatives are implemented. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** What year storm was the June 2013 event? **Response:** This was between a 10- and 25-year storm. It was close to 25-year at its highest intensity. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** A 10-year storm means there is a 10% chance of it happening not the it happens every 10 years. Correct? This may be a better way to present it. **Response:** Yes, that is correct. It could happen several times in a 10-year span. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** Do the proposed solutions take into account hurricane-type floods like we are seeing in Texas, etc? **Response:** These types are storms ware well beyond the design standard. As part of our evaluation we looked at the 2, 10-, 25-, 50- and 100- year storms. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** Did you account for the increased impervious area that will come with development? **Response:** Yes, the future conditions assumed full built-out conditions. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** The green areas on the maps, are they topographically higher now and will be flattened? **Response:** Yes, by excavating the water is given a place to go and this will also lower the resultant water surface elevation. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** The Ephesus-Fordham development, has its impacts on impervious cover been considered? **Response:** Yes, it has been accounted for. It should be noted that this area is already at about 60% impervious. There will be little change. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** The greenway tie-in, fantasy is from behind Eastgate down to Jordan Lake. Where would it extend to? **Response:** It would match up with the floodplain storage locations downstream of Willow Drive. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** Where can we find the assumptions made as part of your evaluation? **Response:** Most of the information comes from readily available GIS layers. All of assumptions and supporting calculations will be provided in the submitted report in August. (Tom Murray)

- **Question:** What is floodplain storage? Will it be installed in floodway? **Response:** Yes, it is in the floodway. It will be grading and excavation to lower the water surface elevation. Permitting will be required for work in the FEMA floodway. The wetland impacts are temporary and will be permitted as such. Currently, working on similar type project used 401/404 NP. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** Will it be able to complete greenway to take advantage of cost efficiencies? Do you need to re-establish wetland first? **Response:** The greenway can be completed concurrently; the projects can be completed at the same time. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** Elliott Road across Fordham, will it require a bridge or culvert? **Response:** It is not known at this time. The exact alignment of the road has not been finalized. (Tom Murray) The Council has just provided the go ahead to start working on the 30% design. (Sue Burke)
- **Question:** Are you working on the road design also? **Response:** No, another consultant is completing design for road extensions. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** Our neighborhood streets have no curb and 60' right-of-way? Would design be different? **Response:** Yes, there are various different options. (Ted Brown)
- **Question:** Where are we going to be able to view map, Town Hall or other central location? The reality of what is built and what you are showing may not be the same. **Response:** There will be a copy with Sue and they are also available on the website. Inga will send an email when they are posted. The maps will be PDF documents. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** Will the presentation slides be available on the website? **Response:** Yes, they will be posted along with the maps. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** Will you post the workshop work from April? **Response:** Yes, can be added to the website. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** What are your thoughts are sedimentation movement and erosion control? **Response:** There is runoff from construction that requires permit from Orange County which is more stringent than State requirements. These features once installed need to be maintained. Enforcement is another component, if you see problem call and an inspector will come out. As far as in-stream sediment load, some of the stream stabilization projects will help with existing problems. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** The pond upstream of the channel improvements overflows on western side. Are there any plans for improvements if not purchased by Oxford Reserve? **Response:** It is not currently a maintained pond. A riser/barrel system can be installed. If Oxford Reserve purchase, they will be required to retrofit pond. (Tom Murray)
- **Question:** How will Town respond to recommendations? Any idea on how many they will implement? **Response:** The final prioritization list has to go to Council. They will hold public hearing and decide which to proceed with and how much funding will be allocated.