

Meeting Minutes
Storm Water Committee Meeting
Department of Public Works
April 13, 2017
8:00 am

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 am.

The following members were present

Bob Watt, Maryann Rober, Tom Bowers and Lloyd Palans

Also present

Anne Lamitola, Public Works Director, Ashley Quinn, Administrative Assistant

Members of the public present

Pat McKinnis, 20 Overbrook

Sharon Daily, 18 Overbrook

Adoption of the Agenda

Chairman Watt asked for a motion to approve and adopt the agenda; Lloyd Palans made a motion to adopt, Tom Bowers seconded the motion. All present were in favor – “aye”

Approval of the February 16, 2017 meeting minutes

Chairman Watt asked for a motion to approve the February 16, 2017 meeting minutes; Lloyd Palans made a motion, Tom Bowers seconded the motion. All present were in favor – “aye”

Public Forum

None

Storm Water Master Plan

Representatives from HR Green presented the Stormwater Master Plan. The following members were present: Pete Merten, Steve Stump, Samantha Smith and Josiah Holst. Mr. Merten began by presenting the table of the prioritized projects based on need. The projects were separated into neighborhood projects and channel projects. The Master Plan would be a program implemented over the next 20-25 years. There were an estimated 55 projects identified to be addressed over the course of that implementation.

The top five neighborhood projects were presented to the Committee. These neighborhood projects were those identified with the highest Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR). Those projects were:

1. South Tealbrook Dr.
2. Babler Lane
3. Clerbrook
4. Deerfield/Wakefield
5. Foxboro Roadway Flooding

Chairman Watt asked how this plan compared to other municipalities in the area regarding implementation. Mr. Merten stated that it was a large undertaking in comparison to other municipalities because Ladue has a lack of infrastructure, no pipe systems and only drains by creeks and drainage ways. As for implementation, the City needs to "think big" when choosing contractors and look for those that are familiar with these types of projects.

Ms. Rober asked about easements that were a part of certain projects and who was responsible for the maintenance in the neighborhoods. Mr. Merten stated that if a resident allows the easements they are dedicated to MSD and it would be MSD's responsibility to maintain.

Mr. Merten stated that there was no program designated in Denny Creek. MSD has a large project plan which would take care of these issues. Mr. Bowers asked how large the scope of that project was. Mr. Stump answered that it would span from Conway to Lindbergh and be over \$1 Million for the project.

In response to some of the neighborhood projects that would require resurfacing of roadways, Ms. Rober asked if part of the cost responsibility would fall to the neighbors. Ms. Lamitola stated that people from these neighborhoods were free to organize for raising funds. Many of the projects did not need road resurfacing alone, they also need to realign roads with pipe systems. Mr. Merten added that some of the resurfacing would be raising areas that were prone to flooding. Ms. Rober felt that these projects would be of great benefit to the neighborhoods and should be cost shared with residents. Mr. Palans asked about the possibility of trustee funds helping. Ms. Lamitola stated that the City could work with trustees to advocate for cost sharing. However, when other cities were polled about cost sharing for storm water programs she found no other cities that had private funding. It is hard for the City to implement that.

Mr. Palans felt that the City needed to engage MSD once the committee had decided the priority of the projects. Ms. Lamitola said that MSD had not committed any funding to storm water projects, they had simply identified that the funding was needed. Last year they passed a tax increase for storm water equalization to maintain their jurisdiction so that everyone is getting the same services. They do not currently have money for any more projects. They are going through a series of public engagements because they know they need the funds for storm water projects, that would not be something that would go on a ballot until 2019. There would be no MSD contribution until at least 2020. Mr. Palans felt there needed to be an integrated strategy to approach MSD to maximize the use of City funding because our projects would provide relief to the cost of some of their identified projects. The City will meet with MSD but needs to encourage them to raise funds by a rate increase or property taxes. Mr. Holst added that the problem with asking MSD for funds towards certain projects was that they may be a high priority to Ladue based on their BCR, but they may not have a high rating based on MSD's rating scale.

Ms. Rober asked if there was already an incremental increase to which Ms. Lamitola clarified was relative to sanitary sewer only.

The top two channel projects were presented to the Committee. These channel projects were those identified with the highest BCR. Those projects were:

1. Pebble Creek at Warson Road Bank Stabilization
2. Briarwood Drive

Ms. Rober requested that the stream buffer ordinance be reviewed to ensure that development is not occurring in the required stream buffers. She noted that the ordinance is not entirely clear on how it differentiates for the solid and intermittent blue line streams. Ms. Lamitola agreed to review the ordinance with the Building Department.

Resident Pat McKinnis asked about the use of walls to stabilize the sides of the banks. She noted that she was aware of several different types of walls, one being Gabion walls and the use of Riprap.

Mr. Merten stated that Gabion walls were failing all over, they were not a good choice. Some of the channel walls they were referring to were vertical walls where the use of block walls was more effective.

Ms. McKinnis asked where the failure of the Gabion wall was.

Mr. Merten stated that it was upstream near the two-mile bridge. The whole bottom row of wire baskets was completely gone.

Ms. McKinnis asked if they would be covering Overbrook at the meeting and if they were not when would they be studying it.

Ms. Lamitola said that it was studied but the purpose of the meeting was to address the highest-ranking projects, which did not include Overbrook. She also shared that there would be three open meetings for members of the public, broken down by ward. The dates for those meetings would be April 25 (ward 1), May 2 (ward 2), and May 4 (ward3) from 4:00pm to 7:00pm.

Resident Ms. Daily asked for additional information about the large diameter pipe that was mentioned to empty into Deer Creek, and what would happen when all that water came down.

Mr. Merten stated that they were very aware of that, they cannot change the influx velocity or level in Deer Creek. The water is getting there now, but with their proposed piping it would result in a more controlled drainage. The reason for the large pipe and maintaining depression storage is so that they do not put the water into Deer Creek any faster than it is flowing now. They are very conscious of not raising the water level.

Chairman Watt asked if the creek was threatening the structures near it.

Mr. Merten said that it was mostly threatening the roads. If there were a slope failure or slide it would impact ingress or egress of the road. This factor made the Briarwood channel project "high profile."

Ms. Lamitola shared that the Briarwood area had very organized trustees which could be beneficial for encouraging cost sharing.

Ms. Rober asked if there was weight given to unstable conditions when reviewing these projects and determining the level of importance.

Mr. Holst stated that it was all taken into consideration, but homes, roads, etc. impacted were rated in different tiers.

Chairman Watt asked if there would be pushback from people living in and around areas like Overbrook because their project ranks near the bottom of the list.

Mr. Merten felt that it was important to stick to the process for determining the ranking of importance and to stress that to residents whose projects may be disappointed that neighborhoods don't rank higher on the list. It is defensible and supported by data.

The committee took a five-minute break.

A discussion ensued regarding creeks, creek clean up and community education about creek maintenance.

Chairman Watt asked why the creek cutting was happening, if it was because the water was moving faster.

Mr. Merten stated that it was because the water was moving faster and there was more of it. Older communities are over developed and the amount of run off has increased with little to no infrastructure to handle it. Creeks will get down to bedrock and widen as the flows and velocities increase. That is a creek's natural process. After years of development, when homes are built near the creeks it can cause issues.

Ms. Lamitola added that in the past, the science and engineering wasn't developed when a lot of the homes and neighborhoods were developed. Small subdivisions did not trigger certain requirements with MSD for basins or other storm water detention.

Chairman Watt asked what could be done to make residents feel that these studies had been done fairly.

A discussion ensued about the meeting format. The suggestion was made to not overload residents with information. It was decided that there would not be a formal presentation made, the open house would be more informal focused on the engagement of residents with questions or concerns.

Chairman Watt felt it was important to let residents know that there was a process behind identifying the ranking of the projects and that it was not just based on those who complained.

Mr. Palans felt it was important to show residents where the City has been, where we currently are in the process and where we are going in the future with the 5-year implementation plan.

Ms. Rober asked about there being information on the website and/or a letter with details of introduction to the storm water meetings.

Ms. Lamitola shared that there would be a flyer with information sent as an invitation to those in areas with projects identified as the most beneficial. She also presented the committee with the idea of having comment cards or a survey to engage with the residents. She also said there would be a meeting in September with trustees that would be a good time to share information on trustee

participation, financing for subdivisions and how organizing the community can be beneficial to the Benefit Cost Ratio.

Mr. Palans suggested inviting MSD to give a presentation at the meeting.

Ms. Lamitola disagreed about inviting MSD because this was Ladue's program and MSD does not currently have funding available for storm water projects.

A discussion ensued about what top ranking project would be the most beneficial to start with in the 5-year implementation.

Chairman Watt felt that there needed to be time given to residents and trustees to fully explore outside funding because that could have an impact on the BCR for certain projects.

The committee discussed how much time should be given to residents and trustees to organize funding before a decision is made on what projects would be done to start with.

Ms. Lamitola felt that there needed to be a balance between the private projects and the public projects, she did not feel they were in a place to start figuring out how to spend the money.

Mr. Merten suggested the option of getting feedback from residents and then the committee could take that information into consideration to make changes to the Master Plan.

Ms. Lamitola stated that the channel projects were driven by the engineers and the neighborhood projects were driven by the public. It was a balance between the public and the private.

A discussion ensued about how the committee would go about choosing what projects to start with. Ms. Rober suggested a modest project that fulfilled public happiness.

Ms. Rober asked if 2018 was considered "year 1" for starting these projects. Ms. Lamitola said that there was money ready to use to start projects in 2017 if they were ready. Starting with a public project was suggested so that neighborhoods were given some time to organize funds for cost sharing, giving a deadline to the public by when they should have organized. If they did so, that funding could raise the timeline for their project. Ms. Lamitola thinks they should be given some time but not too much or her fear is that they won't organize and the time will have been wasted. A deadline of July 2018 was suggested but Ms. Lamitola felt that was much too long, and suggested November 1, 2017. That would give the public several months to organize, but if they didn't, it was enough time to figure out a plan for executing the other projects in an order deemed appropriate by the Committee.

Ms. Rober agreed that a shorter duration for neighborhoods to organize would provide the motivation for them to get things in order. She also asked if they would be negotiating with MSD on all projected projects.

Ms. Lamitola said that they would not negotiate on all projects, but could request MSD rankings on projects because MSD would only negotiate on those projects high on their rankings.

Chairman Watt asked if the level of a project could fluctuate based on public influence with funding. He also felt it was important to stress to the public that there was a clear and defensible process to this review and plan.

Ms. Rober felt it was extremely important that it is stressed at the meetings so that residents understand that it is fluid. All projects won't be addressed in 5 years and that the City lacks infrastructure.

A discussion ensued about the committee's participation and roles at the open house meetings. The idea of computer stations was discussed so that maps and plans from HR Green could be viewed. The City's role in helping to organize trustees was also discussed. There was discussion about how much time to allow trustees and residents to organize funding if they choose. Some members felt that too much time could be bad thing as it would create no sense of urgency to organize. Ms. Rober felt there needed to be a firm deadline date set.

Chairman Watt suggested a recommendation for the 5-year implementation plan by January 1, 2018 to give trustees and residents time to organize for funding. Then the Committee had plenty of time to adjust the plan based on MSD participation, if any, or matching funds.

Ms. Lamitola will coordinate with HR Green on informational flyers that would be distributed.

At the next meeting the committee will recap the public meetings, any public comments received and work on a draft schedule of project rankings.

Other Matters Deemed Appropriate

None

The next meeting will be at 8:30 am on June 15th in the Police Department Conference Room.

Mr. Bowers made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Ms. Rober seconded the motion. All present were in favor – "aye". Meeting adjourned at 11:27am.



Mr. Robert Watt, Chairman
Ladue Storm Water Advisory Committee