From: Ron Roberts
To: Teresa Barnes
Cc: Jim Ritter
Subject: Re: PPS"n West Chester - 9117 Cincinnati Columbus Road (US 42)
Date: Thursday, April 06, 2017 3:58:06 PM

Teresa,

Please see below.

Ron

From: Teresa Barnes
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 3:06 PM
To: 'Ron Roberts'
Subject: RE: PPS'n West Chester - 9117 Cincinnati Columbus Road (US 42)

Ron

I am not sure what you mean by "expanding existing facilities that are not providing storm water management." The existing site does not have any stormwater management facilities on site. The site was developed years ago and although there is a pond that encroaches the northwest property line of which a portion of this site drains to, that pond is not, and cannot be, used for stormwater management. The stormwater management facility along the south property line serves properties across the street and cannot be used to serve this site.
For any site, the current rules are, either prove that the existing basin can function "as is" – or – if an existing detention/retention basin needs to "be expanded", then the basin must be brought up to today's standards. There are no stormwater management facilities on site.
Therefore, if you are looking at expanding the existing basin that is on the neighboring property, calculations will have to be submitted that shows the basin can either handle the additional water from your site and still function – or – calculations will have to provided that show "existing conditions" and "proposed conditions" – that meet today's standards of design – such as critical storm and water quality requirements.

The existing conditions will be dependent on if the site you are working on was accounted for in the basin originally or not. Again, there are no stormwater management facilities on site. In cases when additional development is added to an existing site most jurisdictions require that a "pre-developed" runoff

coefficient of 0.45 be used for the existing site area for comparison with the post developed runoff coefficient. This is what we are trying to confirm. If the water from the site passed through the basin – then the site can be considered "existing impervious"; if the water from the site does not pass through the basin, but will go there after changes, then the site is considered undeveloped for "existing" and then developed for "post construction".
If you have any questions, just let me know.
THANKS

Teresa

Teresa K. Barnes, P.E., CPESC
DESIGN ENGINEER
1921 Fairgrove Avenue
Hamilton, OH 45011
513-785-4142
Fax 513-867-8549
barnest@bceo.org

From: Ron Roberts [mailto:ronroberts@reiteam.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:38 AM
To: Teresa Barnes
Cc: Jim Ritter
Subject: Re: PPS'n West Chester - 9117 Cincinnati Columbus Road (US 42)

Teresa,

Apparently, the owner has purchased additional property to the east which will allow a dry detention basin and eliminate the need for underground storage.

Please advise us what pre-developed runoff coefficient Butler County requires for expanding existing facilities that are not managing stormwater runoff.

Ron

From: Ron Roberts
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 4:10 PM
To: Teresa Barnes
Cc: Jim Ritter
Subject: PPS'n West Chester - 9117 Cincinnati Columbus Road (US 42)

Teresa,

We are going to provide the stormwater management design for PDA for the subject project and would like to obtain your early input on our planned design approach. Per the attached plan dated March 17,2017, the property contains a dry stormwater detention basin that apparently serves property on the opposite side of US 42. We do not have any information on this basin, nor are we aware of an easement for the basin. Therefore, our goal would be to establish a site design that would have minimal disturbance to this basin.

Since there is little room on the property for another surface dry basin, and the existing grade drops toward the north it appears that a subsurface basin would be an appropriate solution for the site and that the existing basin on the site can be included in the existing pervious surface calculations.

Additionally, since the outlet for the existing basin would be located under the proposed pavement, would a drainage easement be required and if so, who would be the beneficiary of the easement?

Ron

Ronald W. Roberts, P.E.
President

ROBERTS ENGINEERING INCORPORATED 25 YEARS

602 Lila Avenue
Milford, Ohio 45150

P-(513) 831-6868
F-(513) 831-6894
ronroberts@reiteam.com

The information contained in this email message and any attachments is confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entities named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by email at the originating address.

No virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 2016.0.8012 / Virus Database: 4769/14252 - Release Date: 04/06/17