

**City of Arnold, Missouri**

---

**Pursuant to Section 2-28 of the City of Arnold Municipal Code**

**Special Council Meeting**

**February 11, 2016**

**Council Chambers**

**6:00 p.m.**

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Motion:
  - A. A Motion to Hold a Closed Session for the Purpose of Discussing Litigation Pursuant to RSMo Section 610-021. (1)
4. Adjournment

---

**Work Session**

**Immediately Following the Special Meeting**

**Agenda**

1. Melody Lane Update
2. Street Repair Plan
3. Alternate Street Standard
4. Personnel Cost
5. Adjournment

# RESOLUTION 16-09 APPROPRIATION OF \$500,000 FOR CITY STREET IMPROVEMENTS

Ed Blattner

Fri 1/22/2016 1:40 PM

To: Bryan Richison <brichison@arnoldmo.org>;

Cc: Ed Blattner <eblattner@arnoldmo.org>; Charlie Allen <callen@arnoldmo.org>; Tom Palasky <tpalasky@arnoldmo.org>;

Bryan,

In follow up to the City Council's approval of Resolution 16-09 and the allocation of \$500,000 for each fiscal year 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, & 2020 the following plan of action is proposed by the public works department for FY 2016.

The City's concrete streets are in dire need of slab replacement. We are using an estimate of \$60/square yard of residential street pavement to be removed and replaced. Such unit price cost includes rock base and necessary joint saw cutting. Of course this price is set by the low bid contractor.

Using the assumed unit price:  $\$500,000 / \$60 \text{ per square yard} = 8,333 \text{ square yards}$  (2,083 square yards per Ward) of residential street replacement. A normal street slab is 20' x 13' which is nearly 29 square yards per street slab. Therefore we can estimate the proposed \$500,000 budget will provide for 287.34 street slab replacements or nearly 72 street slab replacements in each of the four wards (again this number will be determined by the lowest responsive responsible contractor bid we receive and those submitted unit price work items).

From the public works survey of concrete streets in all four Wards, we propose street slab replacements as follows:

## WARD 1

Stardust Court.....36 street slabs  
Trinity Circle.....36 street slabs  
Total.....72

## WARD 2

St. John's Crossing.....61 street slabs  
Rosedale Drive.....11 street slabs  
Total.....72

## WARD 3

Hickory Square Drive.....72 street slabs

## WARD 4

Doe Run/Buck Drive & Ct. ....39 street slabs  
Bender/Apache/Shawnee/Cheryl.....33 street slabs  
Total.....72

If contractor low bid unit prices are below the assumed \$60/square yard complete price, then more slab areas can be added. If prices are higher, then less pavement square yardage can be undertaken. This will be determined by the lowest responsive responsible bid we receive.

If the City Council approves this proposed concrete street priority rating list, we will proceed with the preparation of bid documents for bid advertisement. We presume this matter will be discussed at the upcoming February 10, 2016 Council Work Session. It is my thought you could share this memo with the Mayor and Council members before the work session to get an indication they accept the propose slab replacement plan as the time it will take to prepare the bid specifications, bid advertisement, Council approval, and complete contract documents we may well be into the construction season and area contractors may already be booked up for the 2016 construction season and thus their bid prices may go up to meet the work scope time table.

As indicated to you in my email memo of 12/28/15 we estimate a total concrete street slab replacement need of 32,000 square yards or some 1,100 street slabs. The above referenced proposal addresses 288 of the total deficient estimated city wide concrete street slabs.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know.

Ed Blattner, P.E.  
Public Works Director - City of Arnold  
Phone: 636-282-6650 Fax: 636-282-2394  
Email: [eblattner@arnoldmo.org](mailto:eblattner@arnoldmo.org)

# RE: PRIVATE STREET REQUESTS FOR CITY PUBLIC MAINTENANCE NID PROCEDURE I & II

Ed Blattner

Thu 11/19/2015 8:42 AM

To: Mary Holden <mholden@arnoldmo.org>; Bryan Richison <brichison@arnoldmo.org>;

Cc: Christie Hull-Bettale <chullbettale@arnoldmo.org>; Ed Blattner <eblattner@arnoldmo.org>;

Mary,

Thank you for your comments below. I am pleased you found proposed Procedure I as a possible alternative to the current NID private to public street process. I would comment to your comments below in green.

Ed Blattner, P.E.

Public Works Director - City of Arnold

Phone: 636-282-6650 Fax: 636-282-2394

Email: [eblattner@arnoldmo.org](mailto:eblattner@arnoldmo.org)

---

**From:** Mary Holden

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 18, 2015 3:01 PM

**To:** Ed Blattner; Bryan Richison

**Cc:** Christie Hull-Bettale

**Subject:** RE: PRIVATE STREET REQUESTS FOR CITY PUBLIC MAINTENANCE NID PROCEDURE I & II

Ed,

After doing some research, we have found that street standards were adopted in 1986 and updated in 1993, but that did not specify an aggregate sub-base for the street. That practice was started in the late 1990's with no code to back the request. The aggregate sub-base was specified in our Transportation Plan in 2001 and codified in 2006. Most of the streets prior to the late 1990's have no or very little sub-base.

Proposed Procedure I looks good. My suggestions are below.

- Do not categorize streets pre and post 1986 since the majority, if not all, private streets pre-date the incorporation of the City or shortly thereafter and most are in poor condition. All private streets should be treated the same regardless of their date of construction. I would ask you to consider there is a distinction between all residential streets before the City incorporated in 1972 (being private under Jefferson County) and streets accepted for public maintenance after the City incorporated, and subsequently selected for public maintenance. There are streets in the City that are publicly maintained that do not meet the minimal proposed Procedure I standards. The City does not have the financial resources to upgrade current publicly maintained streets to proposed Procedure I standards or above to meet St. Louis County standards (Procedure II). Our City street standards have evolved with time as you have stated. We may want to discuss further.
- If storm water facilities are needed, look at green solutions instead of concrete. I have attached two

informational pieces from Best Management Practices - US EPA on eliminating curbs and gutters and grass swales. If storm water management is needed these are less intrusive and costly. Your two EPA attachments regarding Gassed Swales and the Eliminating Curbs and Gutters is right on in terms of creating a more green impervious storm water flow situation/water quality treatment which is good, however, from a street structural standpoint the curb and gutter section provides much integrity to the pavement edge and an expected longer service life. It may be in some cases storm water improvements would be necessary due to concentration of storm water flows. Each street case and drainage area should be reviewed on a case by case basis.

- If there is no sidewalk then do not require them to install one. Only if the residents want sidewalks or if we know of some public safety issue that would mandate their construction. ADA requirements would need to be considered as well. Sidewalk construction of course would add to the street upgrade cost, but again should be looked at on a case by case basis.

Do we want to provide them the opportunity to install street lights? I am all supportive of more street lights but again, presume the homeowners would have to agree to the cost of installing and accepting the monthly Ameren electric service charges to provide street lighting.

The proposed Procedure I is a plan to bring up a private street into an acceptable minimal condition for public maintenance but would not meet Procedure II (full St. Louis County Standards). There would still be significant costs to the potential private street subdivision through the NID process to bring their private street up to the proposed Procedure I minimum standards which would improve their street into better conditions than some of the current publicly maintained streets. Requiring private street residents to bring their streets up to the Procedure II standards would likely be so cost prohibitive they could not consider or afford.

As you know, we have three private street subdivisions currently asking for City takeover and public maintenance with likely more to follow. The City Council will have to make a decision as to what street upgrades will be required by those residents in order to accept their streets for public maintenance. I believe we the City staff need to present the options available to the Council for their consideration.

I look forward to our further discussions in this matter.

Thank you.---Ed Blattner.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Mary P. Holden

Director of Community Development

City of Arnold

2101 Jeffco Blvd.

Arnold, MO 63010

636-282-2378

[mholden@arnoldmo.org](mailto:mholden@arnoldmo.org)



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

---

**From:** Ed Blattner

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 17, 2015 10:40 AM

**To:** Mary Holden; Bryan Richison

**Cc:** Christie Hull-Bettale; Ed Blattner

**Subject:** RE: PRIVATE STREET REQUESTS FOR CITY PUBLIC MAINTENANCE NID PROCEDURE I & II

Mary,

Thank you for your response. I knew you and Christie would have more exact information and the first street standards requirements being implemented in 1986, which is close to my observed presumption of 1985 based on City present observations.

I will look forward to your future comments and our further discussions in this matter as I believe the Council is expecting us staff to submit a plan of action in the matter of private street petitions for City takeover.

Thanks,

Ed Blattner, P.E.  
Public Works Director - City of Arnold  
Phone: 636-282-6650 Fax: 636-282-2394  
Email: [eblattner@arnoldmo.org](mailto:eblattner@arnoldmo.org)

---

**From:** Mary Holden  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 17, 2015 10:29 AM  
**To:** Ed Blattner; Bryan Richison  
**Cc:** Christie Hull-Bettale  
**Subject:** RE: PRIVATE STREET REQUESTS FOR CITY PUBLIC MAINTENANCE NID PROCEDURE I & II

Ed,

Thanks for sending and I am including Christie in the review since she is the one that does the review for new street standards. We are looking into when the various street standards were adopted, but they started in 1986, then 1991, 1993 and 2006. I recollect we added a minimum base for streets in the 1990's because the 1986 standards resulted in failing streets. But we will provide more information along with comments.

Thanks

Mary P. Holden  
Director of Community Development  
City of Arnold  
2101 Jeffco Blvd.  
Arnold, MO 63010  
636-282-2378  
[mholden@arnoldmo.org](mailto:mholden@arnoldmo.org)



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

---

**From:** Ed Blattner  
**Sent:** Friday, November 13, 2015 8:38 AM  
**To:** Bryan Richison  
**Cc:** Ed Blattner; Mary Holden  
**Subject:** PRIVATE STREET REQUESTS FOR CITY PUBLIC MAINTENANCE NID PROCEDURE I & II

Bryan,

In follow up to the November 12 Council work session regarding "STREET STANDARDS", I would propose for consideration the following:

The City was incorporated in 1972. I believe a large number of the City streets that are publicly maintained existed as they are at the time of incorporation. I am guessing around 1985 (Mary Holden to verify) the City instituted more

stringent requirements for new developments and construction standards. That assumption would seem reasonable if you look at the City's development in terms of development construction (residential and commercial) since the mid 80's.

I would also comment that the City publicly maintains many streets that do not meet the standards we require for new construction and in some cases are in no better condition or less than some of the private streets which are petitioning the City for public takeover.

We have a detailed NID process (see attached) and believe it can continued to be used for either the proposed Procedure I or II (it could be named however desired).

I believe the City Council could adopt the Procedure I and II and apply it to petition private streets based on whether they existed at the time of City incorporation and before 1985 (a date we need to establish). Procedure I would apply to private streets that existed prior to 1985 and Procedure II would apply to private streets after 1985. I believe Procedure I would apply to the super majority of likely private street petitioners presently under consideration and in the foreseeable future.

The Procedure I private street candidates have some parallel ditches with driveway culverts or have no ditch lines and general sheet flow established drainage patterns. The concern of private street storm water runoff versus public street storm water runoff is genuine and should be looked at on a case by case basis. In some cases the current private street sheet flow storm drainage appears not to be a problem or the lack of a structural curb line, curb inlets/storm sewers. Again, each private street location would have to be reviewed. Some Procedure I private street petitioners may have to also include some storm water improvements in order to meet City requirements for publicly maintenance as may be determined.

The type of minimal type of structural improvements I am suggesting for Procedure I candidates would be as follows:

1. Existing street pavement where required would have to be excavated and replaced with a new rock and asphalt base mix pavement.
2. A new ultra-thin asphalt wearing surface overlay would be required.
3. Appropriate street signage would have to be installed as well as "No Parking" established on one side to the street, and standard street termination signage posting.
4. A minimum pavement width of 20 feet would have to in place or constructed.
5. Streets with no ending cul-de-sac would have to provide for a street ending T section that would allow City snow plow trucks the ability to turn around (trash trucks as well). This would likely require the last two home owners allowing their driveways to be expanded to allow for such turning movements.
6. A review of existing storm water subdivision patterns and off site drainage would have to be made to ensure the proposed street improvements would not increase any existing storm water concerns.
7. The proposed street improvements may slightly widen existing street pavement but would not likely increase appreciable impervious area from what existed.

A cost estimate would have to be prepared for presentation to the petitioner subdivision along with right-of-way/easement needs plus all other requirements established and required by the NID process (see attached). The cost to undertake the Procedure I improvements will still be substantial but less than if current design standards for a Procedure II street upgrade were required.

The proposed Procedure I would meet the intent of providing a proper constructed public street that would be superior to many of the streets that became public when the City incorporated but not go as far as meeting the Procedure II requirements which basically meet our new City construction standards. This would be a City Council

decision.

Each private street petitioning the City for public takeover would have to be reviewed on a case by case basis as each may have particular circumstances or concerns that would require attention. However, adopting a two tier process method would give the City Council and residents some options and flexibility.

I would welcome comments from Mary Holden and would request you allow City Attorney, Bob Sweeney, to review and provide his comments/concerns.

Let me know when you would like to meet and discuss.

Thanks,

Ed Blattner, P.E.

Public Works Director - City of Arnold

Phone: 636-282-6650 Fax: 636-282-2394

Email: [eblattner@arnoldmo.org](mailto:eblattner@arnoldmo.org)

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A RESOLUTION LIMITING THE PERCENTAGE OF GENERAL FUND REVENUES THAT CAN BE BUDGETED FOR EMPLOYEE COSTS IN THE ANNUAL BUDGET OF THE CITY OF ARNOLD, MISSOURI

---

WHEREAS, a city adopts its budget to prudently manage the public's money and assure that funds are properly allocated to provide for the health, safety and general welfare of the community; and

WHEREAS, it is not unusual for expenses to grow at a faster pace than revenues; and

WHEREAS, one of the largest and fastest growing expenses in a typical city budget is the cost of wages and fringes of the employees hired to provide services to its residents; and

WHEREAS, when a city's budget becomes strained it will often reduce funding for projects and programs; may delay the purchasing of needed vehicles and equipment; and will often defer maintenance and repairs to balance the budget, which simply delays those costs and generally makes it more costly in the long term; and

WHEREAS, a strained budget also diminishes the ability of a city to address unanticipated problems, deal with emergency situations, and reduces its ability to take advantage of grant programs or other opportunities;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ARNOLD, MISSOURI AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. *Limitation on Percentage of Budget for Employee Salaries, Wages, and Fringes.* Not more than sixty percent (60%) of the general fund revenues of the City of Arnold shall be budgeted for expenses related to salaries, wages, and fringes in the Fiscal Year 2016 budget and subsequent budgets that are to be adopted by the Council.

Section 2. *Percentage of Salaries, Wages and Fringes to Be Corrected Through Attrition.* The percent of salaries, wages and fringes in the FY 2015 budget was determined to be sixty-five (65%) of the general fund revenues. It is the intent of the city council to bring this percentage into compliance with this policy through attrition. In the event that an existing employee is no longer employed by the city then that position will not be filled.

Section 3. *Essential Position Exemption.* Some positions within the city government may be considered to be essential and failure to fill such a vacated position would be detrimental to the city. An example of an essential position could be a department head. Those positions may be filled if deemed by the Mayor to be an essential position and approved by approval of two-thirds of the full city council.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Officer of the City Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Ron Counts

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk Tammi Casey

Date: \_\_\_\_\_