

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**JOINT MEETING OF PUBLIC WAYS COMMITTEE**  
**& THE STORMWATER COMMISSION**  
**Wadsworth City Council**  
**February 10, 2016, 5:45 P.M.**  
**City Council Chambers**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dave Williams, presiding  
Bruce Darlington, Patty Haskins

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ralph Copley, Ward 1 Council

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ray Moser, Jim Sickels, Bob Park,  
Tom Stugmyer

**OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Public Service Director Robert Patrick,  
Asst. Public Service Director Harry Stark,  
City Engineer Tom Tucker, Josh Wolf,  
Engineering Department

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Lynn Snyder, *Engineering Associates*

**PRESS REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:** *None*

Mr. Williams welcomed everyone to the joint meeting of the Public Ways Committee and Stormwater Commission of February 10, 2016.

**I. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** *None*

**II. ORCHARD CREEK STUDY PRESENTATION**

Mr. Stark said they were going to talk about the Orchard Stream Valley. It was a residential area developed in the mid-1900's. The area had experienced flooding, as far as they knew, back to the 1960's. In the presentation, they would see rain events for the last 50-100 years. Since 2007, there had been a record number of rain events that had caused additional flooding. It was an area of priority for the City. They started by working on the College Street culvert in 2010. That took care of many of the issues. Then they did the Baldwin Creek culvert area. Traveling upstream, they were at the area of Simcox and North. The purpose of the study was to look at alternative plans for the area.

Mr. Wolf said that he, Mr. Tucker and Mr. Patrick wanted the meeting to be an open forum. They welcomed any comments. They would present several alternatives. There were many directions they could go. As representatives of the community, they needed to know the feelings of those present. They wanted to apply for some grants to help improve the area and would need to know that preferred alternative. The decision lay in the hands of those two committees.

Several of those present were with the fire department and knew well that there were a lot of basement flooding events and a series of houses that were impacted every time there was a decently large event, which he considered to be 2" and above.

The area studied was between Simcox and Euclid. Mr. Wolf referred to an aerial photo. The City had proceeded as Mr. Stark said. In 2010, they replaced the College Street culvert, and in 2014, the Baldwin culvert. Those made a lot of sense due to the fact that there was space in which to put those culverts. Two houses heavily impacted by the storms were acquired by the City and taken down, giving them the space. As they moved up to Simcox, they did 3/4 of the design for a culvert that would fit the drainage area to go through there. They could get the water through the culvert, but the problem was that even with the culvert, the homes upstream were not benefitting. They then stopped and decided not to go street by street, but as more of a grouping of culverts. They fit in a kind of sequence. Whatever happened with one affected the other. Everyone there experienced flooding.

A hydraulic model of the area was done by Engineering Associates. Mr. Lynn Snyder was present to handle any technical questions they might have about that. His firm cross-sectioned the whole valley, not just the roadway culverts where the stream crossed the road, but (they looked) in residents' backyards. A big profile of what the valley actually looked like was put it into modelling software that showed where the rising water was and what was impacted by the floods.

Property damage was a big issue. They heard about it often. Many claims were submitted to the City. The impression was that something had to be done, and people did not know where to turn, so were turning to the City. So what could they do? Unfortunately, they had property damage and did not know what to do with their claim. Some insurance agents were giving bad information to the residents, as well.

The study would provide alternatives to alleviate or lessen the flooding in the area. The area was to the west of High Street, north of College Street and just north of the cemetery. It was just down the hill from SR-261.

Some questions were commonly asked and Mr. Wolf would supply answers to those. The watershed had been in that developed state since the 1970's. Many times people thought the development across I-76 affected that area, but it did not. That area did not come to the side of the interstate until the Holmesbrook Park area. It was one common misconception that ever since Walmart came in, they had flooding problems. Mr. Wolf wished to dispel that rumor.

Replacing existing culverts would not fix the problem. It would alleviate some of the roadway flooding, but would not fix the over lot flooding.

Another misconception was who maintained the stream. The City did not own it or maintain it. It was on private property. They owned to the limits of the right of way. There was one enclosed area with a storm sewer in it, and one recorded easement for one of the storm sewers in the side yard of one of the homes. He believed that was directly south of Tolbert.

Flooding in the area was not more common now than before. Properties had changed hands, but it was not more common. The rainfall graph showed that many of the properties had changed hands. The previous City Engineer, Ed Steele, had records of every storm complaint from every year. He had a thick 1992 file, when there was a large storm. There were photos of that. Mr. Tucker and Larry Jenkins started in 1993. They were there and they knew. The next big storm was in 2007. In the years between, there were some isolated storms that caused problems for individuals, but in terms of the valley being affected, it was not until the 2007 storm that they really felt the hit. The 2009 storm didn't really show it, but Mr. Wolf knew it was a decent event. Then there was the Father's Day storm of 2011, which the Stormwater Commission and several members of Council certainly recalled. There was a long period, though, without many storms. Almost all the properties in that bottom area transferred during that time. The people who were there in 1992 were no longer there. It was a new group of owners and they perceived that as a new problem. Mr. Wolf also referenced the July 4, 1969 flood.

There had been some significant events, in relation to the 'hundred-year storm.' In 2007, rainfall gauges at the water treatment plant showed it as a hundred-year storm. There could have been an extra inch on the north side of town than there was at the interior. They could take those numbers with a grain of salt, but they did illustrate where the big storm events were.

**Mr. Patrick** asked if those numbers were for twenty-four hours. The conditions of the storm could also be a factor. Mr. Wolf agreed. That was like the 'zone 9' storm. Flash floods were what were dealt with in urban areas. That area was very prone to it. He would touch on that in a moment. The area in question predated all retention/detention requirements. There were some later redevelopments on the north end where the commercial facilities were, by Rite-Aid and the interstate, which had added retention. In the residential area, there was not one detention basin in the whole watershed. Everything developed. Roads were put in and houses built, with no attention given to flood routing and detention.

Mr. Wolf showed some photos from the Father's Day storm. One was the house on Simcox that was up on stilts. That house was high and dry. When it was constructed in the early 2000's, they wanted to build on what was essentially a swamp lot. They were warned about flooding, so the gentleman went through several options to protect it there. There was an open-air garage underneath and dwelling area on top. He did his homework.

The duplex next to it was about a foot up on the garage doors.

Mr. Wolf showed a house on Tolbert with a flooded area of road about 75-100' long. The next was Franks, directly north of the study area. It showed the same thing also across the street. Wolf Avenue was the next and was consistent. No one escaped. Everyone in that valley was hit.

The watershed was approximately 227 acres to the study point at Simcox. The land use was almost entirely residential. The streets and infrastructure was placed at that time. There was only part that was commercial – now Chase Bank, Dunkin Donuts, Auto Zone, Sherwin Williams and those. They were the only commercial areas that contributed to the water that came down through there. Many of those had been redeveloped since 1980, so they had detention presently. When they first went in, there were a couple of little restaurants and some

different gas stations. Those likely didn't have detention initially. The water impact from those up there was probably not as significant as when the houses went in 'the heights' area of town. The biggest impact to the area was probably the development of the 1930's.

Looking at the area before 1930, it was probably mostly wooded with fields. A flow characteristic statistic would have been around 53 CSS. The current condition was 133 CSS. That was a 150% increase in one of those two-year storms. A two-year storm was roughly 2.5" of rain. That was 2.5 times the amount of water coming down through there than did in 1930, because no detention was in place in the uplands to control that flooding. It was the same for the hundred-year. It was more impactful in those flash flood events that were more frequent storms – smaller, 2-2.5" – where that area was really hit. They knew that if there were 2" of rainfall and it was spread out through the whole day, raining all day as a light drizzle, ending up at 1.5-2", he would not receive any complaints. As soon as there was a hard rainfall from an inch to 2" in an hour or two, the phones were ringing off the hook. Therefore, they knew it was the flash flooding that affected the area.

Mr. Patrick asked what contributed to the increase in those numbers. Mr. Wolf said it was additional hard surface, and they were piping a lot of the water. High Street was always there. All the houses that fronted High Street were a hundred years old. If one were to drive down Franks, behind those houses and from Euclid was a wide, open ravine where all the water used to dump, prior to 1930. There was never any consideration that as the heights area was built up, north of SR-261 and east of SR-94, all that area tied into the storm sewers. That pretty ravine between Franks and Euclid was now seeing two to three times the amount of water it used to. Then, when roadways were introduced, they were getting the water faster down into the bottom. Water came off downspouts, dumped on the ground, ran down the driveway onto the street. They were accelerating the water into the valley. It was considered acceptable standard for the time. There was no finger pointed at anyone. It was just a fact of what it was out there. It was the additional hard surface versus a treed area.

**Mr. Darlington** asked if the retention helped when the new Valley View School was built. Mr. Wolf said that it should. They ran through some iterations a couple of years ago when they looked at a sanitary sewer issue in that area. They were trying to spot locate different areas up through the water shed. That was during the time they were designing the College Street culvert. They had thought about adding detention basins in the low areas directly north of College Street. There were some big open areas in the cemetery that weren't plotted out and thought of an area there. Marlowe Street dead-ended. There was a ravine. They might find an area down in that ravine. The schools were going to be redone. They wondered if somewhere up along the schools would do anything. They re-ran through the iterations and added three or four basins. It helped some impact on the flash flooding. With the 5" flood, the water still went through those just as fast. There should be a lot of detention in through there, which never was installed. There wasn't room for it.

Mr. Wolf said they talked about College Street and Baldwin. College Street was roughly \$650,000. It was almost a 200' long culvert, because there were some constraints with Holmesbrook Lumber on the south side. That was already an enclosure behind the red barns used for storage and some improvements had been made on Mills Street. That was why it was

pricier than Baldwin Street culvert. Baldwin was \$450,000. That was the cost at each crossing when they began their plans. There was a house on College Street whose wall was knocked out during the storm of 2007. The City purchased the home to make room for the culvert.

Mr. Patrick asked what other improvements had been made to help alleviate the flow. Mr. Wolf said that when the Baldwin and College culverts were designed, the pipe was designed to carry as much capacity as it could. At some point, the road was going to flood, whether it was debris backing up against the culvert head wall or something similar. One of their goals, if they replaced the culverts, was to protect the remaining homes. Therefore, they re-profiled the road for Baldwin and installed new pavement on a 200' section of Baldwin. They moved the low point where flooding occurred across the road. The stream was realigned a bit to the west. They also regraded a part of College. Where the questions arose was Simcox. They could get the water through the pipe, but there was still water backing up before it got to the pipe. No matter how big the pipe was, it didn't protect the two houses upstream. The bigger storms in 2014 caused some flash floods, which played into the City beginning the study.

Mr. Patrick asked if it was wider now. Mr. Wolf said it appeared the same, but was wider at the cascade. It was maintainable now. When it was sheer walls on both sides, there was no opportunity to maintain it. The lot was now City property maintained by the Parks Department, along with the parcel north of College Street, where the house was taken.

**Mr. Tucker** asked Mr. Wolf to describe why the new culvert at Simcox didn't seem to be working. Mr. Wolf showed Simcox on the photo. When the new culvert was installed, the water would 'dive in' a little better, but it was still impeding the water getting from one house to another. They looked at replacing another culvert, but there was enough water coming from other directions, and surface water coming from the roadways, that it was still affecting those lots. There was a house about 6' off the stream. The back of the house to the top of the bank was no more than 6'. There were two houses that sat on the stream and 19 homes in that area. He illustrated how wide the water would be with a 5.9" rainfall. They didn't know exactly when the pictures were taken for the Father's Day storm or the highest point the water reached. Residents were out walking around, so it was higher than that. One of the photos showed debris on the road when the water receded. They surveyed across the locations to get a service model of the bowl that existed in the valley. If they got the hundred-year storm tomorrow, those houses would be hit. There were 19 of them.

Mr. Wolf pointed out the hundred-year flood plain, as it existed today. The green line represented the 25-year storm. The difference between a 25-year and hundred-year storm, based on width, was not that significant. It was the depth. The hills and flat spots were illustrated.

There were three alternatives.

*Alternative A:*

Pick up the water at Franks and pipe it all the way down past Simcox. The size of the pipe, based on the grade and depth, would have to be 20' wide and 4' tall. If they left the houses where they were, in their current state, and spent that kind of money to put it in, they would basically have to come down Orchard Street. The pavement on Orchard Street was only 18'

wide. The entire width of the pavement would be excavated, a big box installed the entire way, and it would work. The illustration showed that the flood plain was very limited—still north toward Franks. They were squeezing that water in. Theoretically, it worked.

The big problem was that a sanitary sewer also went up the street. The alternative would be to slide it over, but then they would have to acquire houses to fit it in. Several residents wanted to know why they couldn't pipe it. Engineering Associates did find a way to pipe it. It worked, but it was costly. The existing pipe between Tolbert and Euclid was a 48" pipe. The easement area was a double 42" pipe. Some of the existing culverts were in the range of 4'x6'. They were not too horribly sized for a one to two-year event. They would handle that. The congestion was at the pipe in one of the backyards and side yard. Those were clogged when the water reached it and bubbled out over the top of the roads.

Mr. Darlington wondered if the 4'x20' culvert was opened or closed. Mr. Wolf said it was closed. Mr. Darlington asked about having it open. Basically a re-done stream, said Mr. Wolf. They would discuss opening the area back up.

Mr. Patrick talked about the alternative. The road would be taken out and the 4'x20' pipe box would be installed. Then the roadway would be put back on top. Mr. Darlington suggested eliminating the roadway and making an open box culvert. Therefore, Mr. Wolf said, they would be driving on top of that box culvert. That was similar to 'Alternative C.' Mr. Park pointed out that if they put an enclosed box there, bars would have to be put in on both ends. Mr. Wolf agreed. There were safety issues. It was the same thing they had at Durling Park. There was a cage north of the big culvert that went across to the Catholic school. Several years ago when it overtopped, there was so much debris that everything was washed out of the creek. Pipes were not the easiest answer.

*Pros:* It did reduce the flooding and the owners weren't relocated.

*Cons:* Cost was a huge issue. It would cost \$1.8-\$2.8 million to accomplish that. Relocating other utilities, such as gas lines or water lines or sanitary lines was included in the \$2.8 million cost, but they had to find a place to put all those things. If they had a storm larger than a hundred-year storm, that same area would flood, or they would have a problem across the beginning to the front, as Mr. Park spoke to. They'd be back where they were.

#### *Alternative B:*

They could just buy all the houses in the flood zone and get rid of them. They could create a green space. The existing roadway network would remain the same. There were 19 homes.

Alternative B and C lent themselves to better grant opportunities. They probably wouldn't have a big grant opportunity to install the large storm sewer. Opening up green space, parkland, passive area, restoring flood plain—there were grant opportunities through the ODNR and EPA. Several different entities wanted to see some of the flood plains restored.

The idea was that the flood plain didn't change, although all of the houses and structures were removed within it. It would all become green space and roads stayed as they were. In a two-

year storm, water would flood across. Their safety services would be made aware so they could plan an alternate route. No houses would be flooded. It would turn into some type of parkland. There would be 250' of green space west of Orchard Street.

**Mr. Snyder** said they were surprised when they ran the model. They thought that by removing all those structures, it would allow more flow and not be impeded as much. They were surprised that there was just a little piece at the top where the flood plain decrease, but that really didn't stop the flow. Mr. Wolf said there was a 30'-40' reduction in the flood plain where water could get through quicker, toward the Franks side, but nothing along the Orchard side. That was one alternative and did reduce the flooding to homeowners. None would be impacted.

**Mr. Sickels** asked if the last alternative included the restoration of a stream. It would, long-term, replied Mr. Wolf. All that would be left was culvert, restored to be open, to the northernmost limits of the project. Part of the grant application would be to restore the flood plain, add walking paths or make some type of green space park. To receive the grant, they would have to say they were going to do some of that.

Mr. Sickels asked if they would be removing the streets. No, Mr. Wolf said. The streets would remain in place. They would discuss some different things in the next alternative.

**Mr. Copley** asked if Orchard would have to be taken out. No, Mr. Wolf said. Orchard should be able to stay. It would be impacted by water in large storm events, but should be fine to remain. All of the houses that fronted Orchard would be part of it.

Mr. Patrick clarified that the roads would still be passable during a flood. Mr. Wolf said they could be impacted, as there would be roughly 15-18" of water. Mr. Darlington if they looked at making a retention basin of that entire area. Mr. Wolf said they had discussed that, but did not add that into the model. That created the green space to do it. It would have some impact, although he didn't know how much.

*Pros:* All homes were removed from the flood zone. Depending on the grant opportunities, it could give some of the homeowners who wanted out, an opportunity to get out.

*Cons:* There were still a lot of costs, with 18 or 19 homes. Owners would have to relocate. Some might not want to go. It was a long process when right of way acquisition became involved. Grants didn't cover everything. To be selected for grants, they had to show what the city was willing to match. An ODNR grant of a quarter million was very good. There were maximums on many of the grants. There was no assurance they would receive a grant.

#### *Alternative C:*

Remove all storm sewers and roadway culverts. All three streets became dead end streets from the west. Turnarounds would be added. They would be somewhat like Marlow coming from the west. Coming from the east, Orchard would remain. That alternative reduced the number of properties to be purchased to seven. By taking out the culverts, there was a 30' wide stream in the same location that it was today. They just opened it back up. All remaining houses would be removed from the flood plain that way.

Ms. Haskins asked about the dead end streets from the west. Mr. Wolf said the culvert would come out into the street itself for a short bit. Then it would not extend all the way to West Street, Ms. Haskins said. When coming down West Street to Simcox, Mr. Wolf said, they would have to turn around and go back out. Marlow was opposite. It was opposite of North Street, one street south of Simcox. That was a con, but that just affected the houses that fronted Orchard. It was opened back up. One house was questionable, and they'd have to look a little more at whether it would remain or not. The homeowner was the one he and Mr. Copley met.

Mr. Wolf observed that Alternative B was probably the most effective. There were no houses remaining that would be flooded. Alternative C was the second most effective. He didn't know how the owners would react to losing access to High Street, having to go out to West Street to get to High Street. There would be pedestrian crossings put back across when the stream was revitalized. Walking to High Street was fully probable. Driving a vehicle from the west side would not be possible. Safety services and Sanitation would have concerns. Four streets in a row would not cross to High Street. It was the cheapest alternative, at about \$1 million.

Mr. Sickels asked what was included in the cost and if there was a cost to create cul-de-sacs. Mr. Wolf said they had shown small 'T' turnarounds. They would have to find some open area. They didn't want to use anyone's driveway. It would have to be the size of a fire truck.

In their staff recommendations, there was another alternative, in the \$1.5 million range. It was to create a similar street to Orchard, and a parallel street on the other side of the stream, so that both sides functioned identically. Vehicles could come down and back out, just not be able to cross that way. It was a possibility and still, probably, cheaper than \$2 million. They'd be constructing a completely new street, which was probably half a million dollars.

Mr. Patrick observed that another idea was the cul-de-sacs. Mr. Wolf said that would take a little bit more property, as there might be an additional lot on each street to make that work. Instead of seven houses, it might be 10. The collector streets, too, Mr. Patrick said, would require that more houses be acquired. Right, replied Mr. Wolf. The same rules applied. They could 'beef up' that alternative if they wanted to move that way. More of the houses would be able to remain. The stream frontage houses would be impacted that way.

*Pros:* It reduced the flooding and restored the flood plain.

*Cons:* Dead end streets from the west might not be a positive for the homeowners. City services access was a huge issue.

*Summary:* In the short-term, property owners would be advised to purchase flood insurance. Mr. Wolf, Mr. Tucker and Mr. Kaiser attended a FEMA meeting in December. He was not saying that insurance agents were misleading, but there were misconceptions of what was available from an insurance companies. Many homeowners said they could not be insured. That was not true. Every person in Medina County, as part of a national flood improvement program, was in an emergency management group. Every person in the county, every house, whether on top of the hill or at the bottom of the hill, was eligible for flood insurance. The misconception was that



if a homeowner was in a flood plain, they were required to have it – their mortgage company would make them have it, if they were in a flood plain. It wasn't a FEMA designated flood plain. It was a local flood plain. Many owners said their insurance agent would not insure them. That wasn't true. Mr. Wolf explained that the insurance company didn't have the right to not insure them. If the Council members ever heard that claimed, it was not true. The people at FEMA shed considerable light on that to Mr. Tucker and Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Darlington understood that flood insurance was not purchased through a homeowner's insurance agent. He thought it was purchased through the federal government. Mr. Wolf said it probably went through different writers. He was not sure who carried it. Nationwide may not carry the national flood insurance program. The homeowner would have to contact a third party to obtain that, but they could get it. A flyer would be mailed to all of the 19 properties. Mr. Wolf knew of more than one homeowner that was told they couldn't be insured. That wasn't true. He and Mr. Tucker learned that those homeowners were in a local flood plain – not a FEMA flood plain. Their rates would be lower than those in a FEMA flood plain. It was actually very affordable. After applying, they could be insured with 30 days. In the short term, it was something they knew they could advise. They might not be able to go out there and dig anything up or move anything, but they could help them with that information.

Something else they learned from FEMA, that was more of a discussion topic than a statement, was that the study completed by Engineering Associates could be submitted to FEMA. If FEMA accepted the study parameters, and Mr. Wolf didn't see any issues with that, they could do 'a letter of map revision.' Some of the members might be familiar with what the flood plain corridor (maps) looked like. They were shaded in light blue and showed what areas were or weren't in the flood plain. They would shade that on their map and that was sent out to all of the parcel owners' mortgage holders. If those residents held a mortgage, the mortgage holders would force them to obtain flood insurance. That could be, they learned, at a higher rate because it was in a FEMA flood plain. There were positive and negative scenarios.

*Con:* They didn't want to put any burden on anyone that wasn't asking for it.

*Pro:* The positive side was that if one of the homes changed hands, and the purchaser was not aware of what went on there, they would have some type of protection.

It was a double-edged sword and something they needed to consider. No action would be taken at that point.

They were also going to begin exploring grant applications for some of those alternatives. At that point, they could narrow it down to which alternative they wanted to move forward with and begin pushing that.

*Long-term goals:*

If grant opportunities fell through, the City could, but was not required to, consider the use of public funds to mitigate the area by implementing one of the alternatives. They would look at grant opportunities first. They would have to start talking about five or ten-year plans. The City didn't *have* to do anything. It was private property. It was nothing that anyone had created. The

entire development was done within the current parameters at that time. Detention wasn't required by the ORC until 1981. Everything predated that. Anything since then had developed with detention. There was that option. The City could proceed as they did with Simcox, Baldwin and College Streets. Their technical opinion was that it was not a good use of funds to do that. It might help a few, but would not help the area. He didn't know if they wanted to throw \$400,000 or \$500,000 at every one of those streets and not see much benefit, other than travel. When they traveled the road, there was no water. They usually didn't hear about water across the road; they heard about the water in the basements.

It was the Stormwater Commission's recommendation to notify the residents about the issues. They would also notify the residents about the study. It would be available on WCTV and available online. They had also considered sending a questionnaire to receive their input, to help decide on an alternative. A public meeting would then be held with a different version of that evening's presentation, to answer their questions. Grant options would be explored for that area. Funding sources would be explored for a permanent fix to see what the actual cost would be. They could also look at some of the other alternatives. There was a lot of discussion on Alternative C. There were so many ways to go with that. They had discussed the parallel road system on the west side of the stream. With Alternative C, they could install 30' wide culverts that might pass that new stream. It was a half million dollars for each culvert. They could get those roadway networks through there in a fashion that worked with Alternative C, but it would be a considerable cost to do so.

That concluded Mr. Wolf's presentation. The floor was opened to any questions or comments.

**Mr. Stugmyer** observed that two of the plans required acquiring the houses. If someone said no, was the alternative 'eminent domain for the good of the public'? Mr. Wolf said that was always an option for that type of improvement. It was not necessarily something, in his ten years with the City that they were aggressive about. He recalled the two that occurred at Baldwin and College. The gentleman on Baldwin rejected the City's first offer. They didn't want to go down that road of eminent domain, but then he called the City out of the blue and reconsidered the offer. It was always an option and something to think about when looking at each of the alternatives. Someone might know they flooded but not care. There were a few up through there that had been there for some time. He recalled the homeowner between Franks and Wolf. He had his basement pumped between 10 and 12 times. It flooded since the day he built it, and that's just the way it was. He knew what to do and liked where he was. It wasn't located in the 19-home corridor. It was just north. Mr. Wolf didn't think he would be excited about moving out.

**Ms. Haskins** thought it was important to receive the input from the residents and let them know about the flood insurance. It was a great way to begin the discussion. Mr. Copley said the questionnaire would be very helpful. Mr. Wolf said that the questionnaire hadn't been drafted yet. They didn't want the questions to come across as if they were making any promises. They could not do that. They wanted to craft the questionnaire to receive their true opinions. Mr. Copley commented that if the homeowners were aware of the alternatives, they could formulate their ideas as to those three alternatives, and it would be good input. Mr. Wolf said they all had their own opinions about how an alternative could morph into many different things. There were only so many alternatives they wanted to list on paper, before getting the public involved.

Mr. Darlington's thought was to receive input from the public meeting and then hold another joint meeting to evaluate that input in the context of all of the recommendations. He knew what alternative he would pick, but he didn't live there. Mr. Wolf thought that on the engineering side, it was a long process to fix the issue. Many of the council members were pressed by the residents who wanted it fixed now. That's why they had explored the issues as they had. It was a bigger issue than just throwing a pipe in or taking a pipe out. Mr. Copley said it was their job to hear from the residents who were affected. Mr. Wolf said there wasn't a perfect fix. Ms. Haskins said everything was expensive.

Mr. Sickels wondered if they purchased all of the homes, turned it into a big green space, and did something to slow the water down more, would it help with costs further downstream. Mr. Wolf stated that the downstream had been addressed. The one parcel downstream was significantly downstream and had problems was the old match factory. The big pond behind 'The Match' received the water from the stream. It did overtop. That was a private pond, not maintained by the City. It was the sole responsibility of the ownership. It would help the owner in the end. All the downtown water drained into there. Mr. Wolf didn't know if he would see a significant decrease in what happened at his location. That would be the one beneficiary.

Mr. Copley commented that it was an excellent presentation. They learned a lot.

Mr. Patrick observed that it was a significant amount of information. As they had time to look over it, the members were encouraged to contact him or Mr. Wolf with questions. They were going to send the letters out to the residents, go forward with the questionnaire idea and notify them of the video of the presentation that evening. Another presentation would be scheduled in the future. He wanted everyone to fully understand all of the options and issues. He hoped to come to an amicable resolution for all. He thanked Mr. Wolf and Engineering Associates who performed the study.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Darlington made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Haskins. All were in favor. **MEETING ADJOURNED** at approximately 6:43 PM.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date approved