
MEETING MINUTES

Date: October 5, 2020
Time: 2:00 PM
Subject: IIP - Nixon/Pleasant Drainage Issues
Location: Rollingwood City Hall
Present: Amber Lewis, Gavin Massingill, Sara Hutson, Ashley Wayman, David Braisich (City); Abe Salinas, Lauren Winek-Morin (KFA)
Residents: Kevin Schell (300 Pleasant); Ching Hsieh (305 Nixon); Mike Marin (303 Nixon); David Beisner (301 Nixon); Duncan Ashworth (2910 Hatley)

The following items summarize the discussion at the above dated meeting. Unless adjustments are requested, these minutes will be filed as official documentation for this project.

1. Discussion Items

- These minutes summarize discussions with the City, residents, and KFA for the Nixon/Pleasant drainage issues.
- The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the project history to date, strategize potential solutions, and discuss opportunities for how the City can proceed with project implementation.
- Summary of project overview and history:
 - i. The primary issues associated with the Nixon/Pleasant area are 1) public safety due to high velocity and depths 2) property damages to 300 Pleasant 3) property damages to 303 Nixon Dr.
 - ii. Property owners provided additional concerns regarding the pooling of water at the Hatley Drive culverts. It is requested that the project improvements include reducing/eliminating the occurrence of standing water in this area.
 - iii. Property owners communicated that people are known to use the creeks as walking trails and expressed an interest to prevent people from accessing their backyards.
 - iv. Design criteria discussed was the 25-year frequency event for storm drains and 100-year contained within R.O.W.; 100-year for channels/major conveyance pathways.
 - v. The IIP provided holistic conceptual level solutions for the 100-year frequency storm event which is intended for guidance in project development and budgeting. Discussed with City and residents some of the design challenges of constructing a storm drain system on Nixon due to the significant grade changes and cut that would be required.
 - vi. The LNV design approach had aimed to alleviate the localized problem with a targeted capital budget of \$50k-\$250k. The availability of funds has since changed and additional improvements upstream may be possible which would improve the value of this concept. The localized solution was estimated to provide benefit for

up to the 2-year frequency storm event which would intend to alleviate flooding for the “every-day” type rainfall.

- vii. The current recommendation by KFA is to evaluate the potential of project phasing, as funding is available, that would aim to construct in Phase 1 a storm drain system on Pleasant Drive to alleviate flooding at 300 Pleasant, 303 Nixon and address the public safety concerns. This solution would be a hybrid of the IIP and LNV solution while having the capability for future phasing. Downstream impacts will need to be assessed for potential adverse impacts.
 - viii. Future phasing may include a closed pipe system to replace the creek between Hatley and Pleasant, and the replacement of the Hatley culvert crossing. This is dependent on negotiations with property owners for easement and the mitigation of any adverse impact analysis.
 - ix. KFA recommends prior to proceeding with design and bidding that a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) be completed to perform detailed analysis to explore solution options, phasing, benefit/cost analysis, and adverse impacts. This report is recommended to include 30% schematic plans for the full phased design to help “future proof” the implementation. This investigation will include geotechnical investigations, environmental, survey, adverse impact analysis.
 - x. Phase I construction plans, depending on result of PER, may include a bid add alternate for the Phase II solutions if budget is available.
- KFA communicated that a potential Phase 1 solution may be to construct a storm drain system from approximately 302 Pleasant Drive to 303 Nixon Drive. However, without doing any due diligence and feasibility analysis it is undetermined and difficult to quantify.
 - Feasibility of phasing solutions discussed in the meeting are subject to change upon further analysis. Topography/grading, utility conflicts, downstream impacts, and peak flow analysis may impact the feasibility of implementing the approach discussed.
 - Next steps understood will be a project walk-thru with property owners, selection of the design engineer, Council authorization to proceed with a PER and implementation of a Phase I solution. The design process is recommended to include presentation of project solutions at each milestone to City and stakeholders to build consensus on approach and solution.

2. Recommended Next Steps

- Perform an initial walk-thru with City and property owners
- Authorization to proceed with PER which will include survey, geotechnical investigations, environmental, alternatives analysis, project phasing recommendations, easement need identification, utility investigations, adverse impact analysis, and opinions of probable construction costs.
- Discuss draft findings and recommendations with City and stakeholders to inform the decision-making process and further develop a preferred option and phasing.
- Finalize PER and begin scoping of design and construction based on selected option and phasing. Initiate negotiations with property owners for any required easements.
- Complete easement acquisitions (if required)
- Design, bidding and construction of selected phase(s)