

City of Chesterfield

To: Mike Herring, City Administrator
From: David Christensen, Deputy Director of Public Works/Assistant City Engineer
Date: 3/26/99
Re: Minutes – Public Works/Parks Committee , March 24th , 1999

A meeting of the Public Works/Parks Committee began at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 24th, 1999. All members of the committee were in attendance: Chairperson Barry Flachsbart (Ward I), Councilmember Barry Streeter (Ward II); Councilmember Dan Hurt (Ward III); and Councilmember Mary Brown (Ward IV). Also in attendance were, Councilmember Mike Casey, City Administrator Mike Herring, Director of Public Works/City Engineer Mike Geisel, Deputy Director of Public Works/Assistant City Engineer David Christensen, Superintendent of Parks, Recreation and Arts Darren Dunkle, Bob Wald and Terry Weatherby of the Parks, Recreation and Arts Citizen Advisory Committee (PRACAC), and Darcy Capstick of the Chesterfield Citizens for the Environment, two representatives from BFI/Allied (Midwest), two representatives from the HBA, CCDC/TIF Legal Council Jim Mello, Executive Director for the CCDC Keith Riesberg, and four citizens.

- 1) The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. Councilmember Streeter motioned to approve the minutes (January 17) without correction. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Brown and passed unanimously, 4 – 0.
- 2) Mr. Jim Mello, the City's TIF attorney with Armstrong Teasdale, gave a brief overview of the Neighborhood Improvement District (NID) process. A question/answer session followed and issues were addressed regarding traditional public improvements, how property owners benefit, criteria to qualify for an NID, voting process, petition process, financing (general obligation funds with a 20 year maximum), and minimum size projects (cost should be over \$½ million). Councilmember Streeter asked if sewer problems would be eligible? Mr. Mello replied that sewer projects would qualify for NID improvements. Councilmember Flachsbart made a **motion to include an article describing the NID process in the City's next newsletter**. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Brown for discussion. During the discussion, Councilmember Streeter also suggested that the City develop an informational brochure on NID's and after review by the committee, that this be mailed to all trustees. Mr. Mellow indicated that he had relevant information for use in developing this brochure. The motion passed unanimously, 4 - 0.
- 3) Mr. Geisel reported that the Home Builders Association of Greater St. Louis (HBA) sent a letter expressing opposition to the City's new policy which required vertical curbs. The policy states that "all new streets, where curbs are required, shall be constructed with integral vertical curbing, in lieu of rolled curbing." Mr. Leonard Kiem, who was in attendance representing the HBA, explained that the association objects to the new policy and would like a chance to make a presentation outlining their concerns. He also stated that the HBA had not been notified of this new policy until after council approval. Councilmember Hurt **motioned to send the issue back to the Public Works Citizens Advisory Group (PWCAG) to hear the HBA's reasons for opposition to the new policy**. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart, and passed unanimously, 4 – 0.

- 4) Mr. Geisel reported that the TIF Commission had a meeting on March 10, 1999, and reviewed a proposal from Valley Village and the City of Chesterfield to construct sanitary sewer facilities, in accordance with MSD's Valley masterplan, in the western portion of the valley. The TIF Commission determined that Valley Village's proposal provides an area-wide benefit. Because they would be incurring costs to provide infrastructure which will serve more than just their development, the TIF Commission recommended reimbursing Valley Village for the incremental increase in expense following construction and acceptance by MSD. The TIF Commission placed two stipulations on the recommendation: 1) the amount of reimbursement is not to exceed \$175,000; and 2) the improvements must be constructed in accordance with MSD's Master Plan for the Chesterfield Valley. Councilmember Hurt **motioned to accept the recommendation by the TIF Commission.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Brown, and passed unanimously, 4 - 0.
- 5) Mr. Herring reminded the committee of the necessity to take action relative to the City's option to extend BFI/Midwest Waste's contract for one year, prior to May 29, 1999. Councilmember Flachsbart distributed a handout (see attachment) and motioned that staff seek proposals from all firms operating in St. Louis County for a non-exclusive contract for one year. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt for discussion. A discussion ensued among the committee. In response to questions, Mr. Herring explained that BFI has recently been performing better. For example, lately the City has only been receiving calls for 3-4 calls/day, before it was 10-15 misses a day. Mr. Herring indicated that due to a recent labor dispute involving BFI, it had been reported to him that conscious and purposeful misses were made. Councilmember Brown said the City should have an exclusive contract, which will keep the rates down and reduce truck traffic. Councilmember Flachsbart wants staff to renegotiate with BFI and other firms to see what would change if a non-exclusive agreement were executed. Mr. Herring pointed out that renegotiating will probably not result in lower rates and recommended performance measures be established for BFI/Midwest. If the measures were not met, the City would be in position to cancel the contract. He noted that the City had negotiated 3 years ago for the new rate of \$8.23/month. Mrs. Capstick, Chairperson for the Citizens Committee for the Environment, summarized reasons why the C.C.E. voted to recommend extension of the current contract for one year. After much discussion, the motion failed 1 - 3, with Councilmember Flachsbart voting "aye". Councilmember Hurt then motioned to recommend approval of the 1-year exclusive contract extension with BFI/Allied (Midwest) at the negotiated rate of \$8.23/month and that staff should investigate other haulers who might wish to bid on an exclusive contract. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter, and failed, 1 - 2, Councilmember Hurt voted "aye" and Councilmember Flachsbart abstained from the vote. Councilmember Brown **motioned for a one-year exclusive contract extension with BFI/Midwest, at a fixed rate of \$8.23/month.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter, and passed, 3 - 1, with Councilmember Flachsbart voting "no". Councilmember Hurt motioned for staff to research other service options prior to the next Council meeting. The motion failed 2 - 2, with Councilmember Streeter and Councilmember Brown voting "no".
- 6) Mr. Herring reported that the Parkway School District would like to enter into a cost sharing partnership with the City to upgrade the playgrounds at River Bend and Green Trails Elementary Schools. As a result, the playgrounds would be designated as City parks during non-school hours. He noted that Parkway would use funding from its proposed bond issue. The City would obtain two parks in the northeast part of the City at ½ the cost. Mr. John Sievers, Director of Public Affairs for

the Parkway School District, and said that the District had been in the budget cut mode for the past ten years, therefore, the PTO's had been responsible to finance playground upgrades. He noted that Parkway would assume full maintenance responsibilities, if approved. A discussion ensued with many questions for the City and the District. Councilmember Flachsbart **motioned to table this issue until after item #9 on the agenda.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter, and passed unanimously, 4 – 0.

- 9) Councilmember Flachsbart distributed a handout on his thoughts on the future of the parks system (see attachment). Councilmember Streeter indicated he wants closure on the Parks Bond Issue, so it would be clear to voters what was promised and what has been accomplished. [Councilmember Brown left at this point in the meeting.] Mr. Herring stated that the City has met and exceeded all improvements promised in the Phase I improvements of the Parks Bond Issue. Councilmember Flachsbart made a **motion to accept City staff's acknowledgment that all items in Phase I of the Parks Bond Issue have been met and publish an article in the next citizen newsletter, detailing this effort.** Councilmember Hurt seconded the motion, and passed unanimously, 3 – 0. Councilmember Hurt emphasized that he doesn't want to spend any more money on the parks until City Hall has been financed and wants the Parks, Recreation & Arts Citizens Advisory Committee to develop recommendations for future parks priorities. Mr. Geisel pointed out that the masterplan for the Chesterfield Valley Athletic Complex is on track and still usable. However, the masterplan for the Central City Park and Rail Road Park sites need to be revised. Councilmember Flachsbart made a **motion to 1) direct staff to develop an inventory RE: all current land/facilities and concept plans for each park the City owns and in so doing, to take under consideration any recommendations made by the PRCAC; 2) city staff develop recommendations RE: other lands for future parks.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter, and passed unanimously, 3 – 0. Councilmember Hurt made a **motion to send the Parkway School District partnership proposal to the PRCAC.** (See #6 above) The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart, and passed unanimously, 3 – 0.
- 14) Councilmember Flachsbart made a **motion to table the potential use of fill material for mutual benefit, until the next Public Works/Parks Committee meeting (5/26/99).** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter, and passed unanimously, 3 – 0.
- 15) Councilmember Flachsbart made a **motion to direct staff to send a letter to East-West Gateway and the Missouri Department of Transportation to urge them to plan and schedule funding for interchange improvements on I-64 at various locations in the Chesterfield Valley.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter, and passed unanimously, 3 – 0.
- 7) Mr. Dunkle reported that the PRCAC made a recommendation not to have Celebrate Chesterfield this year. Councilmember Flachsbart made a **motion to cancel Celebrate Chesterfield in 1999, but to tentatively resume in the year 2000.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter, and passed unanimously, 3 – 0.
- 8) Mr. Herring reported that the Chesterfield Chamber of Commerce formally requested the City of Chesterfield to provide a fireworks display for the first concert at Faust Park, which is part of the annual summer concert series. He also noted that \$20,000 is budgeted for fireworks, but that staff had been directed to seek approval from council before spending these funds. Councilmember Flachsbart made a motion to direct the City Administrator to allow an appropriate low budget for

the concert, but indicated that the entire amount of the \$20,000 budgeted doesn't have to be spent. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Streeter, and failed, 1 – 2. Mr. Geisel pointed out that in his opinion, \$12,000 would probably create a fairly impressive fireworks display. Councilmember Streeter made a motion to direct staff to work with the Chamber on the event, utilizing the entire budget of \$20,000. The motion failed for lack of a second. Councilmember Hurt made a **motion to spend up to \$12,000 on fireworks at the first concert**. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Flachsbart, and passed, 2 – 1, with Councilmember Streeter voting “no”.

- 10) Items #10, #11, #12, and #13 on the agenda were combined for discussion. Councilmember Streeter made a **motion to accept the memo's prepared by Mr. Dunkle regarding 1) Policy on Pool Passes, 2) City Parks Fees and Charges Policy/Guidelines, 3) special events at the family aquatic park, and 4) park rules and contracts**. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt, and passed unanimously, 3 – 0. Following the motion, the committee discussed banning smoking at all City parks. Councilmember Streeter made a **motion to install signs prohibiting smoking in the parks except in parking lots**. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt, and passed, 2 – 1, with Councilmember Flachsbart voting “no”.
- 18) Councilmember Flachsbart distributed a handout on a new “charge” for the Public Works Citizens Advisory Group (PWCAG). Councilmember Flachsbart made a **motion for the PWCAG to look at all aspects of watershed protection and ask them to consider as many aspects of the issue as possible, recognizing that watershed protection includes storm water control, ways that development occurs, erosion problems, detention pond issues, education approaches, and possible Ordinances**. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hurt, and passed unanimously, 3 – 0.
- 19) Executive Session (closed meeting) – On a motion by Councilmember Streeter, seconded by Councilmember Hurt, the Committee voted to go into Executive Session, for purposes of discussing property acquisition. Roll call was taken, with the following results:

Flachsbart – Aye
Hurt – Aye
Streeter – Aye

The regular meeting was then adjourned at 8:23 PM.

[Next Meeting, May 26, 1999.]

cc: Mayor Nancy Greenwood
Department Heads/Executive Staff

Trash Hauling

The CCE and the City Administrator continue to urge us to commit to another Waste service by exercising our right to a 1 year extension of their contract.

The Chair of CCE and one of its members have sent me (and other members of the Committee and the Mayor) a memo describing the features that should be in a contract with any waste hauler.

I'd like to make the following motion:

That we direct the City staff to attempt to negotiate a non-exclusive contract with BFI/Allied Waste and with other potential waste haulers by the time of the second City Council meeting in May;

That such contract include the following terms:

- Recycling as a part of the basic package (not an option)
- Yard waste as an optional, extra cost service
- Trash, recycling, and yard waste pickups to occur on the same day
- A commitment to maximizing the number of types of items that can be diverted from the waste stream by recycling, with a minimum of
 - paper
 - plastic
 - metal
- and commitment to searching for ways to divert bulk paper/junk mail and cardboard
- Provision by the waste hauler of monthly reports on numbers of trucks picking up recyclables & copies of Material Recovery Facility (MRF) receipts for those trucks
- Provision of specific names and telephone numbers (kept current) of Customer Service representatives that customers may call to discuss service
- Servicing Parks and City-designated events for trash and recyclables (we recognize that they may choose to levy an additional fee for this)
- Commitment to work with the City to allow for all households to be serviced for trash and recyclables
- Provision of an educational presence at City-designated events (a reasonable number of them) and providing educational writings for our Chesterfield Citizen Newsletter at least annually
- Maintaining annually a "Recycle Right" (or similarly named) handout for those serviced by the hauler
- Picking up Halloween Pumpkins as yard waste (for those customers who opt to have yard waste pickups), just like Christmas trees

That the Committee agrees that, because of the tight timing, there will not be time for the Committee to discuss potential contracts prior to the Council Meeting, so the Committee agrees to move the issue forward to the entire Council without a recommendation.

Parks -- Issues

Direction of Future Efforts

- Extreme 1: Acquire land, put only essential facilities into existing Park
Extreme 2: Finish the facilities in the existing parks before getting new ones

Middle?: Try to do both and do neither very well

I think this should be deferred until after the next election -- the direction of Council may change then. My personal opinion is that acquisition of land is essential and that development will have to wait! (i.e., I'm in favor of Extreme 1.) However, other Councilmembers probably feel differently.

Planning For Park Completion

- Extreme 1: Full architectural plans for each park (PRACAC recommends this)
Extreme 2: No further plans, do whatever we need on a plan-as-needed basis

Middle?: Do an update to our master plan for each park in-house, with help as available
Make sure we have at least a conceptual master plan for each park.

I think the "Middle?" would be appropriate. We don't need to spend a lot more money on studies and architectural plans at this time (and I don't think the citizens want us to spend much on that).

Estimating Costs

- Extreme 1: After full architectural plans are available, try to get firm quotes on doing them (RRACAC recommends this) Costs would be significant
Extreme 2: Obtain estimates when we need to do things. Hard to budget in advance, though

Middle?: Have our in-house staff, augmented minimally, if needed, provide general cost estimates in line with conceptual master plans. We may need to spend some money to get the conceptual master plans developed.

Again, I think the "Middle?" would be appropriate.

Watershed Protection -- Including Storm Water Problems, Erosion

The Public Works Citizens Advisory Group (PWCAG) was asked to look at how the Department of Public Works could work with citizens who have streambank erosion. They proposed some initial steps, which the City Council endorsed at their February 1999 meeting.

The PWCAG has continued by having a representative of the Conservation Department who is an expert on watershed protection meet with them and discuss all the aspects of watersheds.

The PWCAG is willing to continue this effort and, I believe, already has Council approval to do so, under their original "charge." However, they are looking at all aspects of the problem and it might be a good idea to formally give them a task to look at all aspects of watershed protection.

I propose that we reaffirm our request to them to look at watershed protection and ask them to consider as many aspects of the issue as possible, recognizing that watershed protection includes storm water control, ways that development occurs, erosion problems, detention pond issues, education approaches, and possible Ordinances.

Their efforts might include items like:

- developing recommendations for what might become a strategic plan on how to deal with watersheds over the next decade
- investigating how other municipalities (including, perhaps, some in other States) handle watershed protection and how we might coordinate with nearby municipalities for mutual benefit
- a possible inventory of detention basins in Chesterfield and how the City might deal with them in the future
- recommendations for rules about changing drainage paths during development or afterward
- recommendations for rules for storm water/drainage outlets (e.g., point them upstream, not perpendicular to a stream)
- ways the City might deal with specific situations or developments as problems arise
- recommendations on rules for clearing stream banks during development or afterward
- recommendations on rules for permitting (or not permitting) narrowing of streams for the purpose of increasing developable land or putting in infrastructure such as bridges
- recommendations on education approaches the City might take
- recommendations on Ordinance approaches the City might take -- e.g., is it practical to require subdivision developers to provide a watershed protection plan in connection with development along or including a stream and should this plan include a study of the impact ½ mile upstream and ½ mile downstream, outside of the development?

This effort would be a long-term task, to be fitted in with other tasks we might give them.

It was noted during the discussion that stormwater, like traffic and electricity, always seeks the easiest way out -- and this way may not be beneficial to nearby residents or to the City!