WHITEHEAD CREEK
STORMWATER SEPARATION PROJECT

PUBLIC MEETING

Thursday, February 10, 2011
5:30-7 P.M.
Floyd Building
St. Joseph, Missouri

MEETING ATTENDEES

Project Team in attendance

– Andy Clements, City of St. Joseph
– Lee Sommers, City of St. Joseph
– Roger Sparks, City of St. Joseph
– Bruce Taylor, City of St. Joseph
– Bruce Woody, City of St. Joseph
– David Silverstein, Burns & McDonnell
– Steve Yonker, Burns & McDonnell
– Leigh Barnhart, Shockey Consulting Services
– Barb Sadler, Shockey Consulting Services

Others in attendance

– Scott Gann, Citizen
– Reba Hebert, Citizen
– David Hopper, Citizen
– Diana Hopper, Citizen
– Amy Kretzer, Citizen
– Gary F. Kretzer, Sr., Citizen
– Barbara LaBass, City Council
– Marilyn Labuck, Twin Peaks
– Andy Macias, Snyder Associates
– Kenneth W. Reeder, Public Citizen Local Associates
– Irene Schubert, Citizen
– Clinton Thomas, St. Joseph News-Press
MEETING NOTES

I WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS
Leigh Barnhart, Shockey Consulting Services, welcomed the group. She explained the purpose of the meeting was to talk about the Whitehead Creek project’s alternative plans the City has evaluated. Ms. Barnhart went over the agenda, introduced Councilwoman Barbara LaBass in attendance and the project team. She further explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the purpose of the project, alternatives, and the recommended plan. At the conclusion, the meeting will be opened up for questions.

II WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM OVERVIEW/PURPOSE OF WHITEHEAD CREEK PROJECT
Bruce Woody, City of St. Joseph, gave an overview of the Water Protection Program by explaining that the goals are to:

- continue to meet regulatory requirements;
- protect water quality;
- protect the Missouri River as a recreational resource;
- accommodate development and redevelopment;
- reduce flooding; and
- integrate community benefits.

Mr. Woody explained that St. Joseph has two types of sewer systems – combined (wastewater and stormwater in the same pipe) and separate (wastewater and stormwater in two separate pipes.) He then gave a brief history of the wastewater treatment plant (water protection facility). Mr. Woody described the problems with the combined sewer systems as an aging infrastructure and that the sewers are undersized. The City is required to reduce combined sewer overflows according to the federal Clean Water Act.

Mr. Woody gave a review of Whitehead Project. The main goal is to remove creek flow and stormwater from the combined sewer system, which is currently being treated at the wastewater treatment plant. He described a need for a separate sewer system where a stormwater pipe would be installed to convey stormwater directly to the Missouri River. This type of sewer system keeps stormwater separate from wastewater and therefore stormwater would not be treated at the wastewater treatment plant.
David Silverstein, Burns & McDonnell, explained the benefits of a new pipe in the Whitehead Creek Basin. It has been determined that it will be less expensive to transport the stormwater and creek water in a separate pipe directly to the Missouri River instead of building other facilities to capture and treat the water at the wastewater treatment plant. Reducing the volume of sewer overflows improves the water quality in creeks, lakes and rivers and improves public health.

### III ALTERNATIVES FOR WHITEHEAD CREEK STORMWATER SEPARATION PROJECT

Mr. Silverstein explained each of the alternatives and how the project arrived at this stage. The alternatives presented were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A- Pipe in Pipe (new pipe installed inside of an old pipe)</td>
<td>Dropped from consideration due to constructability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B- South Route</td>
<td>$21.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C- North Route</td>
<td>$23.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- New CSO Pipe</td>
<td>Dropped from consideration due to constructability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention and Smaller Alternative B Pipe</td>
<td>$34.1 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatives were dropped from consideration due to constructability issues or costs.

The recommended project is **Alternative B** which would involve installing a second large pipe to intercept water from the creek before it reaches the larger pipe and reduce the quantity of water and sewage that overflows.

The current proposed route of the new separation pipe will begin near the intersection of 17th Street and Garfield Avenue, and be installed along or near Seymour Street and west under I-229 to 6th Street. The pipe will tie into the existing Whitehead Creek channel west of 6th Street. *Figure One and Figure Two* shows the approximate location of the new pipe.
The final alignment of the pipe will be established based on field investigations, engineering and permitting requirements, and discussions with landowners and citizens.

Mr. Silverstein said that Burns & McDonnell is looking at the feasibility of this option. He mentioned that rather than making turns in the pipe, perhaps making the tunnel longer might aid in constructability. The entire project will need to be done in sections. There will
be a trench and shoring system necessary on Seymour Street as well as temporary easements and temporary accesses for residents.

Mr. Silverstein also discussed the alternate route for the pipe north of Seymour Street and that it may be less expensive, but it will be disruptive to the citizens along the route. He also explained that access will be easier to maintain with this option.

IV WHITEHEAD CREEK STORMWATER SEPARATION PROJECT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design Complete</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Complete</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Bids Received</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2012 to Late 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Woody explained that it will not be a full two-year disruption as the project will be done in sections. He also mentioned that a good project needs a good design as well as feedback from the public.

V OPEN DISCUSSION

The meeting participants asked questions and provided comments about the project:

Participant Question: Is the pipe larger or smaller than the existing pipe?
  
  Response: Smaller, but it will supplement the existing pipe.

Participant Question: If you go with a smaller pipe, where is the water going to go?

  Response: We are not replacing the existing pipe, but adding a second one. Flood water will follow the same path it does now and not along the new pipe.

Participant Question: Why don’t we add to the wastewater treatment plant?

  Response: It is cost prohibitive to expand the plant to handle all of the stormwater.

Participant Question: How do you clean mud out of a smaller pipe?

  Response: We need to figure out where it’s coming from, then we can determine how to treat it. Any construction project has runoff from mud. There needs to be an erosion control plan.
Participant Question: What about the flood zone?

Response: Water will continue to do what it does. Elevation and flooding will not change due to the pipe being in place. If water is currently flooding, it will continue to flood; it will fill up one pipe then the other, and then flood as it does currently.

Participant Question: What will this cost me?

Response: The City is working with the State of Missouri to obtain a low interest loan to help pay for this project through the State Revolving Loan Fund. The City will also ask voters for authority to issue bonds for the project. Individual residents will not see any direct charges for the project. The project will be paid for by City-wide sewer usage charges.

Participant Comment: With the current state of the economy and people losing their homes and jobs, utility companies seem to be continuing to raise their rates because they aren’t making a profit.

Response: The wastewater treatment facility is owned by the City and just tries to break even. All other utilities are privately owned.

Participant Question: Can you give us some traffic options?

Response: We will meet with you to determine your needs. There may be a need for temporary roads for citizen access. Our goal is to minimize disruption.

Participant Comment: Reopen 16th Street for access to the neighborhood.

Participant Question: When is the next meeting?

Response: We need to meet in the next couple of months. Before we get heavily involved, we need to meet with residents to determine the best route.

Mr. Silverstein mentioned that within the next 30 days, the project team will be meeting individually with residents. By the end of July, the project team will have a recommendation for the city council, public works and the public to provide input on.