



Devereux Meadow Park - Concept Design Phase

May 6, 2021 Project Public Meeting

Responses to public questions to date (June 10, 2021)

The following comments and questions were received during and in the month after the May 6, 2021 Devereux Meadow Park Open House virtual meeting. Questions and comments have been categorized by topic.

Responses from the project team are shown in green bold font.

Project Funding and Costs

A lot of residential development has occurred recently. To what extent are Impact Fees available to offset the new users?

All funding for the Devereux Meadow Park project is anticipated to come from the future Parks Bond, currently under review by City Council.

How much, if any, funding is coming from building and development firms looking to further develop the surrounding area?

At this time, there is no outside funding being considered for this project.

What kind of funding is available for this park? Is any of the ARP (Am. Rescue Plan) funding going to be used for this?

The current phase of work, including environmental site assessment and analysis, conceptual and schematic design, and public engagement, is funded via the 2014 Parks Bond. There will be additional funds from the 2014 Parks Bond to fund the next level of design. Construction is currently unfunded. Additional funding for finalizing design, permitting, and construction is currently being considered for inclusion in the upcoming Parks Bond. American Rescue Plan funding is not being considered for this project.

There are many demands for park funds in Raleigh (eg Dorothea Dix concept alone has cost over around 2 MM alone). Will a "lower cost, less stream restoration" concept be more likely to be built more quickly, given the lower cost to construct?

Lower cost alternatives will not necessarily mean a quicker build. Project costs for each of concept plan alternatives will be one of several factors used in determining the preferred design alternative. Each concept will be required to go through standard stages of design and permitting. Construction funding is dependent on inclusion of this project in the Parks

Bond package, and then voter approval of the Parks Bond. Design, permitting, and timing construction funding are more critical drivers of project schedule.

Are there any options for TIGs to help with funding?

At this time, only Parks Bond funding is being considered for this project.

What are projected cost estimates for each of the 3 concepts?

Preliminary, total projected costs vary from \$12 million to \$15 million. There are still many unknown factors regarding project costs, including environmental remediation and permitting, that must figure into the project costs. Ultimately the selected project alternative will need to fall into the project budget as funded by the Parks Bond.

Stream

What has been the source of the contamination and what is the impact to the creek?

The project team is currently working to identify the sources of contamination identified on the site. Preliminary evaluation of the stream water quality indicates there is limited negative impact to Pigeon House Branch at this time.

Seems Option 3 puts the stream through a pollution plume. Why do that?

While groundwater pollution does present a constraint to the stream restoration pattern, we believe the stream can be restored as conceptualized in any of the 3 options by avoiding or remediating the contaminants. There are certain characteristics of the restoration approach that may enhance the remediation process. However, the Project Team is conducting additional investigation during later phases of the project to ensure we are addressing public safety and protecting water quality.

What are differences in flood capacity in the three options? And what is the local flooding impact of the differences in flood capacities?

One of the project goals is to maintain, and where possible enhance, current flood capacity through the project site. While the Project Team has not conducted any detailed analysis of flood reduction for any of the three concept options at this time we can project that Option 1 will maintain existing capacity. Option 2 and 3 will present the best opportunity to improve flood capacity but the design will need to balance ecological uplift with hydraulic function. And while all three options may provide an opportunity to enhance flood capacity any reduction in flood impacts would be quite limited and likely restricted to areas immediately adjacent to the project site.

Are the elevations of the pipe outleting into the existing stream going to be able to outfall into the bioretention or would they be realigned into the proposed stream channel?

There are roughly 30 outlets into the stream channel within the project area which have been identified. Preliminary topographic survey results indicate that outfalls adjacent to the potential bioretention area are at a sufficient elevation to provide positive drainage into the potential bioretention facility. The design team will confirm once topographic survey is completed and propose rerouting storm drains as deemed necessary.

Would you consider leaving the concrete pad over the stream, while integrating much of the concept 2 options? Can you merge 1 and 2 to keep the concrete pad?

Option 1 would propose to keep the concrete cap over the stream in place and offers some enhancements on the downstream end of the reach. There is the potential for the final plan to be a hybrid incorporating elements from two or all three concepts based on input from stakeholders and decision makers.

Which concept allows most visibility of water?

Option 3, followed by Option 2, and then 1.

Pigeon House Branch isn't exactly clean. How do you integrate it into the park and keep it from being a flow of grossness?

Instream structures and stream gradient can be incorporated into the design to keep the water flowing and bubbling to mitigate this issue. Stream restoration works to enhance the capability of the stream corridor to remove pollutants from upstream sources and reduce the contribution of the stream channel to pollutant through reduction of stream bank erosion. There will also be the need for maintenance to clean trash, etc.

How wide would the creek be at widest point?

The creek would range from 20 to 35 feet wide.

Have you considered adding riparian wetlands on the east side of the stream, perhaps integrated with the stormwater daylighting, to give the site more storm water storage for the City?

Riparian wetlands are a possibility but would have to be considered carefully regarding how they would affect the aesthetics and function of the park facilities.

What is the ecological impact of redirecting the branch?

Any redirecting of Pigeon House Branch would be done from a standpoint of increasing ecological function and stability after construction.

Will it be possible to be in the water in the parks...ie kayaking, swimming?

Such uses will probably not be possible due to the low average flow of the stream.

Doesn't the Capital Blvd corridor plan daylight the creek? Would it be continuous with this project?

We can't speak specifically to the current vision for Pigeon House Branch outside of the project limits. Project limits for the stream end at the property lines along Peace and Dortch Streets.

Is there any benefit to beginning to daylighting Pigeon House Creek now?

There would not be a significant benefit to daylighting the creek before implementation of other aspects of the project.

Park Design

Will the site be cleared earlier and green spaced before the initial design and start begins?

We do not currently anticipate any pre-park construction phasing, clearing, or "greening" of the site. Removal of the existing paving and other existing facilities will be part of the park construction project (pending construction funding).

Do you see this park having picnic areas with grill sites?

There will be opportunities for picnic areas, but no structures are currently included in the park design. We will work with the City to evaluate the feasibility of adding amenities such as grills.

Curious to know which of the 3 options minimizes the area of the park that is "out of bounds," i.e., marked off and doesn't allow entry. As an example, it seems that people aren't allowed to access a lot of the revamped Moore Square.

Determinations of the limits of public access will be determined as design advances. We anticipate that most of the site will be accessible ("in-bounds"). However, there will be areas within the riparian corridor and distributed throughout the project site that is not intended for active foot traffic to protect the vegetation, ensure ecological and water quality function, and user safety.

Does "passive park" imply that there is no opportunity to include infrastructure like electrical hookups for festivals/outdoor movies) or restroom facilities?

Infrastructure uses such as mentioned are still to be determined as we advance the design beyond the concept phase.

What are the width and length of the Park?

The park is approximately 1850 feet long North to South and 500 feet wide East to West at their longest points.

Will this project incorporate oak trees? Highway noise screening?

We are still in the early stage of the design and are not at the level of detail that would involve specific plant material choice. We are the City of Oaks so there is certainly opportunity to include oaks, as well as other native plantings and shade trees, in the future landscape design of the proposed park. It will also be important to provide some level of buffering along the edges of the site.

Would additional tree plantings be considered along Capital Blvd as well to help with air quality impacts from the adjacent vehicles?

Considerations on the exact methods for buffering Capital Boulevard will be made at later stages of the park design processes.

Will there be a "grand entrance" on Dortch St side as well?

As we are still in concept design, all ideas are still on the table. That said, there is currently less of a need for a "grand entrance" at this end of the park - however we certainly anticipate some type of pedestrian and greenway entrance at Dortch Street.

If I heard correctly, Option 1 is best suited for flexible programmatic use. Is this because the Option 1 design elements or land use create the flexibility, or is this because the stream restoration cost is lower, so you assume more budget could be used for these other elements that is available for the other options?

Option 1 does provide more flexibility in programmatic use due the relatively smaller amount of overall park space dedicated to the stream corridor.

Is there any parking? Other than West St.?

The current vision is for this to be an urban-oriented park in line with the future development and expansion of downtown anticipated in this area. Like Moore Square and other urban parks, public parking is typically not part of the park programming. However, there may be a few accessible parking spaces available and parking/access for maintenance vehicles.

Maybe bike parking?

Bike parking (in the form of bike racks) will be included in the park design, especially considering the park vision includes a new greenway connector path.

Will there be any historic signage to represent the history of the land as Devereux Meadow baseball stadium?

We are still very early in the design process, but, as you will see in the presentation, we foresee there being opportunities for historic interpretation and possibly art throughout the site.

Are there any design options to incorporate a ballpark to continue the history of the area?

The vision for the park is a passive park experience. As such, it not planned to include active, programmed spaces such as a ballfield. The site is also mostly floodplain which would preclude such uses. However, please feel free to include your preferred uses in the open comments boxes of the project [survey](#).

I love the idea of framing the past location of the baseball field with pathways but noticed that design concept was only in the Option 1. Are there constraints preventing that concept from being applied to option 2?

There may be the ability to incorporate this concept into the other design options as well, and the design team will take this under consideration to see how it fits into the overall design themes.

Would public art projects be delegated to the Raleigh Arts Commission for oversight and management?

There are multiple paths for public art, depending on programming and funding. If it is Percent for Art project, then the Public Art and Design Board would have oversight over the commissioning of new artwork for the park. If it involves donations or relocation of City sculpture to the park, then the Arts Commission would oversee that process and make recommendations to Council. If it is related to temporary art programming, then either

Raleigh Arts would lead those projects or assist our partners in their efforts through guidance in best practices for hiring artists, etc. If projects come in through the community, it would go through the City's Citizen-Initiated Process which is overseen by the Arts Commission.

Might the Light + Time Tower be moved to the park from the Capital Blvd median nearby?

There is a possibility that the future Devereux Meadow Park would be considered for a re-location of the Light + Time Tower, along with other public art works depending on the final design, programming of the park, and approval of the Arts Commission.

I was exploring that river and noticed there seem to be left over stone structures that I think were from the old stadium - will those be restored?

These are the walls of the former stadium. The project team is considering preservation of portions of the stadium in some of the concept alternatives.

Would all 3 concepts still utilize the wall stone from Pigeon House Branch?

All three options try to preserve the wall in Pigeon House Branch. The extent varies in the differing options, but a goal of the project to preserve this history of the site.

Site Access

Is there an opportunity to include walking access to the park that crosses the railroad tracks between the Glenwood Brooklyn neighborhood and West street?

Is there any way to provide an easy connection to a street leading to Fred Fletcher Park? Or is the railroad too large of an obstacle?

How do the Mordecai and Oakwood neighborhoods walk there, crossing the RR tracks?

What is the possibility of connecting under the railroad at Washington to provide connection to Fletcher Park?

The existing rail line, as well as the future high-speed rail proposal, presents a very real barrier. Technically any access across the rail line is outside of the scope of the park project, but we will pass along these concerns to City Planning and other relevant staff.

The greenway connector - does it stay on the west side of Capital Blvd. or cross Capital Blvd. north of the park?

The current plan would have the connector crossing Capital once it is closer to the existing Crabtree Creek Trail. This is subject to change as design for that segment of the greenway occurs.

The greenway is being designed for both bike and pedestrian use concurrently?

The greenway for this site would safely accommodate both bicycle and pedestrian use.

Are you including pedestrian access issues as part of this project? Will there be any pedestrian bridge over capital Blvd that connect the seaboard station area? The current sidewalk access from there is a bit far south and the sidewalks are pretty substandard, especially under the rail road bridge.

How will you focus on orienting the park towards increasing walkability in areas to the north and east?

There are currently no plans to create new pedestrian connections across or under the railroad tracks or across Capital Boulevard - and such would not be within the scope of the park project. The design team will work with City of Raleigh Transportation to create safe pedestrian access at proposed site entries on Peace, Capital, West and Dortch. The future West Street cycle track, development of the greenway, and Capital Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit service will also lead to improved connections in the site vicinity.

Will the sidewalk along Capital Blvd. connect with Devereaux Meadows somehow?

Our intention is to connect to the Capital sidewalk in one or more locations, based on site grading.

Downtown North-South Connector

Note that the North-South Connector project is not part of the Devereux Meadow Park project. However, City of Raleigh Transportation staff attended the May 6, 2021 park meeting to briefly present the Connector project. Below are questions and responses from that portion of the meeting.

Why add a bike trail on West St when you could use the park for biking?

Partly because in street is constructable much sooner and partly because (at least under current rules) the greenway would be closed at dusk--which does not work for bike commuters and may have issues around personal security after dark.

What is the timeframe of the bike lanes on West between Peace and Wade?

If we can figure out the transitions at either end and work through the parking impacts with the community...probably next summer.

Any chance we can add dividers to the "bike lanes" along Peace St as part of this? Seems like the park would increase bike traffic. Those lanes don't feel that safe to ride in.

We are looking at those for the section on the south side in front of Publix as part of the Smoky Hollow section of the North-South Downtown Greenway Connector; we don't have a buffer to do a traditional installation of separators and we would need both our staff engineers and NCDOT to be comfortable with putting the delineators directly on the stripe.

Regarding the West St cycling path, will there be anything done to mitigate the impacts of the Thomas Concrete plant on a long portion of the west side of the street, which uses West St as their sole access for many large concrete trucks?

Other than the natural narrowing of the street to help reduce speeds, no. Conditions are what they will be. We do have a budget request in this year's draft to fund street sweeping equipment that is specifically sized for bike lanes and other smaller facilities.

A bike lane would remove parking for adjacent businesses. How would that be replaced?

It would likely not be fully replaced, but staff is evaluating designs that will have the least impacts to on-street parking and will be out meeting individually with business owners and other stakeholders on the corridor this summer to look for ways to mitigate any impact to parking.

Other

Is the City considering acquiring any land to the north to add to the park, or at a minimum, continuing the stream restoration to the north?

Over than future development of the proposed greenway connector to Crabtree Creek Trail, Raleigh Parks has no plans for expanding the park to the north. Note that most parcels immediately to the north of the site (north of Dortch St.) are private properties.

There are some future projects along Pigeon House Branch. It remains to be seen if any of these projects would affect the park design. The City Stormwater Management Division will be embarking on a Pigeon House Branch watershed study, which is scheduled to begin in early 2022, subject to FY22 budget approval. This study will be a comprehensive look at flooding and water quality issues in this watershed, which includes the areas referenced. The outcome of the study will be a list of ranked improvement projects to address identified flooding and water quality priorities. In addition, as NCDOT proceeds with plans to re-align Capital Boulevard between this area and the I-440 beltline in the future, the City plans to collaborate and implement improvements to Pigeon House Branch, including possible realignment and restoration of riparian buffers in this vicinity. The City has already partnered with FEMA to buy-out a number of flood prone structures in this area, and additional buy-outs are under consideration.

Seems the City of Raleigh owns the large tract to the West. Why not add that to the park footprint, or at least create more parking for park access?

Although that site is city property, it has other uses and is not considered part of the park property (under Raleigh Parks). It is understood that the current use for this site will remain in place for the near future.

Can you provide names of stakeholder committee members?

Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board

- Brad Johnson
- Charlie Townsend
- Christina Jones

Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

- Liz Hester

Local Business/Development Interests:

- Brian Burnett, Owner, Glenwood South Tailors
- Will Gaskins, Downtown Raleigh Alliance
- Drew Yates, Kane Development

Representing both Local Residents and Merchants Interests:

- **Larry Miller, President, Glenwood South Neighborhood Coalition,**
- **Ken Jacobson, Mordecai Community Action Coalition**
- **Octavia Rainey, representing the North Central Raleigh area**

Raleigh Youth Council

- **Zachary Milton**

Raleigh Housing Authority

- **Laura McCann, Special Assistant, RHA**

Wake County representative

- **Nancy Daly - Water Resources Manager, Wake County Environmental Services**

Peace University

- **John Cranham, VP for Buildings and Ground**

What is the timeline for when we might start to see construction? And when do you envision we might have a fully viable park?

If construction for this project is funded, the timeline for the start of construction is probably 5 years out from now, with 2 years of projected construction based on the current design concepts. The current design process, along with the remedial investigations and assessments, will help to give the project team a better understanding of the future park design, environmental remediation, and permitting requirements. This, along with construction funding timing, will help to refine the project timetable. By the next public meeting, Raleigh Parks hope we have a better idea of overall project schedule.

You could have a portion of the park to stay open at night if you had the bike trail tucked in the green space beside the stream. Is that not possible?

The park and greenway opening/closing times will be determined at the time of park opening, based on overall Raleigh Parks policy at that time.

Are there any active business properties left in the space?

The project site is entirely on City owned property and is currently a City of Raleigh maintenance and vehicle fleet facility. All remaining buildings on site are used by City of Raleigh staff. There are no private businesses currently on this property although there are a number along the west, southwest, and north property lines.

Will the speed limit be lowered on Capital Blvd adjacent to the park?

Decisions on speed limits of adjacent roadways are outside of the park design process.

Has there been concern about the Devereux family name and associated history?

Concerns over the Devereux name have been raised by several members of the public. The City could be open to renaming options, based on public feedback, and can investigate ideas

for a possible new name as a part of this design process. Ultimately the Parks, Recreation, and Greenway Advisory Board (PRGAB) would recommend any potential renaming to the City Council, where the final decision will most likely be. All comments on this matter, as well as all comment and questions, are invited to be sent to the project email address: DevereuxMeadowPark@PublicInput.com.

Can you give an elevator speech summary on the high-speed rail plans?

Information on the high-speed rail can be found at:

<https://railroads.dot.gov/environment/environmental-reviews/southeast-high-speed-rail-tier-1-eis>

Seems that Devereux Meadows is historically more prevalent than Devereux Meadow. Did you find this the case? if so, why did you choose Meadow?

Our research by PRCR historic staff is that "Meadow" was the more common term, especially as it relates to the name of the former ballpark. It was shown a "Meadow" in ball game advertisements and in old news articles about the former "Devereux Meadow Playground" and for other ball games at the original park.

Raleigh Parks welcomes additional comments and questions.

Please send to the project email address: DevereuxMeadowPark@PublicInput.com
or leave a voice mail at 855-925-2801, project code 6331.

Project Web Page: <https://raleighnc.gov/projects/devereux-meadow-project>

Gary Claiborne, Capital Projects Manager
City of Raleigh Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Dept.