

MINUTES: STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, September 26, 2012-Leawood City Hall, Main Conference Room

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jim Rawlings, Councilmember Ward 2 and CHAIR
Julie Cain, Councilmember Ward 4
Debra Filla Councilmember Ward 1
Pat Dunn
John Kahl
Carole Lechevin
Alec Weinberg

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Gary Bussing, Councilmember Ward 3
Skip Johnson

GUESTS: (by order of sign in sheet)

Tom Bruce, 12504 Cedar, Leawood, KS 66209
Denise Mills, 12512 Cedar, Leawood, KS 66209
Mickey Dobratz, 12448 Linden, Leawood, KS 66209
George Handley, 12508 Cedar, Leawood, KS 66209; also Secretary of the Patrician Woods Homes Association

STAFF PRESENT: Joe Johnson, P.E. Director of Public Works
David Ley, P.E., City Engineer
Julie Stasi, Administrative Services Manager

- **Chair Jim Rawlings** called the meeting to order at 7:38 AM and asked for those in attendance to introduce themselves.
- **OLD BUSINESS: Previous Meeting Minutes**
Alec Weinberg asked about a subdivision name on Page 2 of the Draft Minutes and that the referenced subdivision should be “Worthington” instead of “Waterford”, as written. Staff made note and will make the correction.
Deb Filla Motioned to approve the April 25, 2012 Minutes as corrected.
Pat Dunn seconded the Motion, all attending members in favor. Motion approved.
- **NEW BUSINESS: Drainage and Erosion Concerns-Patrician Woods Townes Homes Association**
Chair Rawlings asked Joe Johnson to give his presentation.

Joe Johnson displayed a map of the general location of concern and also had copies of some of the plans. In giving a brief history, Joe advised that when the development came in in 1984 Linden was developed. Roe was a 2 lane street. We had a 40” pipe that ran underneath Roe. This stormsewer was in place when Linden was built. The stormsewer constructed under Linden tied into the existing stormsewer that ran under Roe. The stormsewer that comes under Roe picks up about 16 acres on the east side of Roe and takes it under Roe before day lighting into an existing channel. In 1984 when Patrician Woods came in, Linden was constructed and the existing pipe under Roe was tied onto and extended under Linden and day lighted into a natural channel. At that time there was not much development on the east side, eventually Berkshire and another residential development was constructed. Over time everything developed like it was supposed to. Now when we get our rains, there is more water that comes through the stormsewer due to the area being

developed. It was always designed for that, but the natural channel does see more water than originally when the subdivision was constructed. Consequently the channel there is experiencing a lot of erosion between the end of the pipe down to the creek.

Joe Johnson- advised he had met Mr. Handley on the site a couple months ago and they walked up and down and looked at the area and decided the best thing to do was to send a letter to have this situation referred to the Stormwater Committee to review.

Mr. Handley brought a display of pictures titled: "Pictures BEFORE Roe Improvement" and "More Pictures Today, 8 Years after Roe Improvement".

Alec Weinberg- Asked about the natural. Is this the channel that goes up through Normandy and up to Carriage Crossing? To the south?

Joe Johnson. The main channel this pipe dumps into, yes, it drains from Tomahawk Creek all the way up to Carriage Crossing.

Alec Weinberg. But water above this pipe is all coming up from all those other subdivisions to the south.

Joe Johnson. The water comes all the way from 135th Street. Yes and drains along the west side of Roe.

Carole Lechevin. There aren't any problems on the east side from where it comes along Roe?

Joe Johnson. No. We came back in in 2001 and widened Roe. Joe shows the improvement area of Roe on a map. When we improved Roe, we took the pipe out. Berkshire collected all their water into a pipe and it discharged to a low area and then into the pipe that went under Roe. When we built Roe, we put an area inlet that is open on 3 sides to catch the surface flow. The pipe from Berkshire tied into the new box that was constructed with Roe. We installed curb inlets along Roe picking up the same area. It is just now picked up in a stormsewer system instead of being conveyed to this point and then flowing into the pipe.

Carole Lechevin asked what size pipe was there and what did we put in?

Joe Johnson advised it was a 36" concrete pipe and the old one was a 40" corrugated pipe.

Chair Rawlings asked if the pictures could be passed around for the Committee Members to view.

Mr. Handley explained what the pictures are about. The outlet from the Linden Street view 8 years ago and then today. Today you will see it has eroded out 10 to 15 feet depth waterfall area from what it was before the Roe Improvements. It has taken over 8 years for it to happen. He just moved in 2 ½ years ago and he has repaired cracks three times because their house is shifting down the hill (he is in the center of a tri-plex). His neighbor next door has spent a great deal of money this year and other years' stabilizing his foundation. His neighbor to the left has massive cracks in his foundation and even in the stucco.

Mr. Handley described how there is a gigantic pile of rock that has washed down the hill and is on the other side of the creek. Mr. Handley also had pictures of cracks in his neighbor's home. How it has taken eight years to happen, but the erosion is undermining their homes. There are five homes involved. All of the property owners are very concerned about the erosion. This situation is getting worse and what they would like to see is the City extend the pipe that is coming off of Linden and extend the pipe all the way to the creek; instead of letting it run down the hill and take everything with it.

Chair Rawlings-How long is the distance between the end of the pipe and to the creek?

Joe Johnson-About two-hundred (200) feet.

Alec Weinberg-Has an engineer looked at the foundations to say that the cause is the creek?

George Handley-when he moved in the previous owner had an extensive structural engineer write a report. Yes, that is one of his reasons for the settlement in our house. We were given an extensive list of things to do, that if we did them we were assured by the structural engineer that we would be save and happy with the results. It all had to do with water. We are on a steep terrain that goes down and it slowly, the gully is releasing the pressure and it is allowing things to slide. We had in that report instructions for interior water. We had a problem with water in the basement, which is easily corrected by diverting the water that was coming into the courtyard. That has nothing to do with this area. This has multiple things going on, this being one big one.

Tom Bruce-Lives on end that borders along the gulch/gully and has had \$20,000 worth of piers put in about five (5) years ago. To answer your question, the recommendation I was given was multiple causes for the settlement. One of which is the gully. Other was the fill that was used from property that has been filled. Tree root structures around the property, so the answer I received was a combination of things.

Alec Weinberg-Not a single element.

George Handley-In the gully were a number of trees. A major diameter tree was cut down because of the water going through was killing the roots. We have another major tree at the end of the gully going down to the creek, and it is all exposed on three sides and is about to fall. So we think that over a period of time the removal of the vegetation has definitely exasperated the erosion because of the loss of trees through this area. The area has this huge waterfall that goes down and down. When we first met with Joe and were describing the water. Roe was widened to double it's size and the number of storm inlets went from 1 to 5. Granted it is still all water collected from Roe, but it accelerates it. The real stinger to the story is and I asked at one point we concluded it was nothing that the City had caused and that it was our problem. I asked him to give me the names of some people who have been used to correct this problem for us. I called the people and the two gentlemen in their street clothes climbed down a number of storm sewer and found out where pipes were coming in and what we discovered which they were amazed at because they came out thinking this was just our problem. But the reason instead of just the one storm sewer on Roe, there also as he pointed out 4 others besides the one on Roe. This thing connects to this gigantic concrete vault that is in between two houses and has several pipes coming out of it, which means it is collecting the water from the Berkshire Estates and also going down to our creek. So when all of this was added over a period of eight years, these pictures show what has happened.

Joe Johnson-Water wasn't added. It drained there. What we had before we improved Roe and Berkshire was developed. Berkshire had it's existing stormsewer and all the water discharged in the low spot. The water ran off Roe and collected and went into the pipe.

Alec Weinberg-But Roe didn't have stormsewers before on this section right? Before we improved it?

Joe Johnson-Right, Roe didn't have any. Only this 40" pipe. It drained the 16 acres. When we improved it, we took the stormsewer out of Berkshire, we built a box structure which tied the pipes, collecting all the surface water that comes in from the east draining west and it gets into the box and it gets into the pipe. A 15" pipe collects water coming out of 126th Street and a couple inlets in the back that collect the road drainage. The rest of it from the wall along Roe, all drains and ties into Linden.

The reason they end up having more water is not because there is more area. At the time Linden was developed, the area on the east side of Roe was undeveloped. With natural development happening you end up with more rooftops and you end up with more volume of water, but when Linden was designed, this was all designed to accommodate that development. What happened is and as I've told George, today we would not have allowed them to stop the pipe where they did. Over time you will get erosion of the natural

channel. We would have required the developer to extend it down to the creek. And that is what we spoke about. The fix really is to take the pipe and extend it down to the creek. When you look at 16 acres of roof tops compared to a tenth of an acre of roadway, it does not add much additional flow.

Pat Dunn-What you are saying is the area that is draining into this location is the same as the area that was draining into it before. But what has changed is the amount of impervious surface within that area.

Debra Filla-Would it be fair to say that with the additional inlets you have kind of increased the velocity because of the improvements? Less percolation and more going into hard scape.

Joe Johnson- Not necessarily. The increase in roof tops has increased the volume of the water; the stormsewer makes it more efficient for the water to flow. The bends in the stormsewer have a tendency to impede the velocities, but the increased volume would have an impact.

John Kahl- Downstream of our outlet, is there any Drainage Easement or obvious responsibilities the City would have for those areas? What is different about this location as to any other places we have in the City that have these drainage systems? If we do a repair here, do we obligate the City to all the others that have asked that we have turned down?

Joe Johnson-No. And the odd thing about this when it was built, this is a private system. And in looking at it today, it should be a public system, because it tied onto our public system. At the time it was developed, there was no requirement for it to be put into a public easement and owned and maintained by the City. The drainage channel from there down to the creek is on private property. There are no easements dedicated private or public. The only thing we see that is different or somewhat unique is that there is a public system upstream from this and in staffs' opinion the private stormsewer pipe should have been a public system.

Debra Filla-If you were going to fix this and it were public, and you had placed it all the way to the creek, what does that entail?

Joe Johnson-We have estimated the cost around \$60,000 to put concrete pipe in and take the corrugated pipe out and place a manhole. The creek would be filled in with a shallow drainage swale on top of the pipe.

Joe Johnson-And you really wouldn't need much of a swale.

Debra Filla-So you fill in the creek/ditch area and contain it in a pipe.

John Kahl-Advised this is a jurisdictional water of the United States and would require a 404 Permit to do this work. The critical factor if it really is 200 feet of creek. If it is more and is 301 feet, then mitigation is required which can run \$40-\$50-\$60,000 in mitigation.

Carole Lechevin-There seems to be a point to be made that the public systems drain into the private and I'm wondering if this is common in Leawood? The other thing, if you go back to the drainage of the pipes. One area piped down to another area with a creek, to me it seems like that at some point in time is an issue. Are these others areas not similar, that daylight into the creek?

Debra Filla-This seems to always be the issue with stormwater. We do not know how to cost into a project of development. The true cost of stormwater when it goes in. Like when Berkshire came in. Was it properly costed to the developer?

Tom Bruce-Has lived in this house area since 1998. Has observed the drainage before and after the Roe Expansion. The velocity of the water that comes through there now since Roe was widened and the curbs put in on Roe, I think that's capturing and being channeled is dramatically different. There are stones that are larger than these chairs that have sat there for five, six years and water flowed over them, that have now been washed down the creek. It has scoured out this gully, so in my opinion just from an observation standpoint there is dramatically difference.

John Kahl-The evolution of the channel is a natural reaction of development and the storm sewer systems that were put in. So we have an increased volume of run-off that is collected much more efficiently and gets down there more quickly. And the duration of the flood event is shorter and flashier. It has a lot more rain in a shorter period of time and has that reaction on the channel. But it has more to do with the development of the area upstream of Roe and the installation of the storm sewers and the faster collection systems than it really has to do with Roe itself.

Deb Filla-I agree that it's a faster collection.

George Handley-Well it's also true that at the same time that you widened Roe, you created the infrastructure under-ground for Berkshire to hook onto eventually. And as they grew so did the water volume on our side. I understand your point that Roe in itself (despite the fact that it's been widened by 50% or 100% or whatever or the 1/10th of an acre that it really represents may not be the issue). The issue is that when the whole improvement was done, concrete vaults were put in to accommodate future drainage at that time evidently it was known Berkshire was going in. And so instead of an area that our original developer put in in 1985 put in this 42" pipe across Linden to cover the drainage of just Linden, and there was one storm inlet you told me from Roe connected to it. Now we have five and that again is not nearly the problem that is coming from Berkshire.

Deb Filla-If this area was protected and there was no way we could touch this area, what would be the only other recourse? What if we had to go on an entire campaign of Berkshire and everybody upstream and say everybody has to do whatever little bit they can to help absorb and slow down water?

John Kahl-It has no bearing.

Deb Filla-I find that hard to believe.

John Kahl-Because the streets are already in place, and the houses are already in place and the storm sewer systems are already in place. So unless you are going to go tear down the houses, rip up the streets, and remove the storm sewer system, you can't change the conditions that are causing the channel reaction. We can't go in and do a buffer zone along this channel now. The channel is not reacting because it is not properly buffered, it is reacting because of the changed hydrologic conditions that are going on within it's watershed. So there really is nothing we can do to fix the conditions (without piping it). In other words, we can't go upstream and tell the 16 acres of people that drain to this-if you do things differently, their channel will behave nicely.

Carole Lechevin-Could you do an open system as opposed to a closed system; (where it daylights to the open area)?

John Kahl-You still would have to get a permit from the Corp of Engineers, but that is not that difficult. Especially if it is less than 300 linear feet, then it will not even require mitigation measures. It is an easy to get permit.

Joe Johnson-The estimate was about \$60,000 to pipe it.

Alec Weinberg-What if you did an open channel? Same?

Joe Johnson. Same, maybe even more.

Julie Cain-The Council always and strongly looks at what the committees say because they are the experts and engineers who deal with this every day. The Council Members are the first ones to say that we are not water engineers. Wants to stress that we put a lot of credence in what the individual committees recommend. Especially when we are dealing with stormwater and public works. Secondly, if we put in the 200' of pipe, what is that going to do when it ends up discharging eventually? Are we going to cause another huge

problem at the end of that pipe?

Joe Johnson-When we get down to the end of the creek, we would set a manhole and turn the pipe so that it is discharging with the flow of water.

John Kahl-The resident has made a comment that as it currently comes in at a high flow now, it backs up in the creek. So there is already an effect of the discharge of this channel down into the main channel. It would be a different kind of effect if we piped it, but it certainly could be designed to minimize any effect.

Joe Johnson-You turn the pipe so that it discharges in the direction of the flow. So there is less of a tendency to block the flow.

George Handley-You know this entire area is in a flood plain.

Carole Lechevin-A comment for discussion. We have heard this scenario before and like the gentleman said, this has been ongoing for eight years. It has been in progress for eight years. Would it not make sense for Leawood to look at a larger scale and identify some of these hot spots before they come here? Because it is totally possible with doing stream and drainage-way surveys and it's not really a highly engineering effort. It's something that would help Leawood get an idea at least from a budget standpoint instead of being hit with \$60,000 hit, if we're going to fund this drainage-way if maybe we addressed it four years prior, it could have been a \$15 to \$20,000 hit. Throwing it out there to think about. It is being done in other communities in this metro area and have been completed in the recent past.

Deb Filla-Recommend

Pat Dunn-I know in the past that Public Works has offered all sorts of services and assistance to private areas to try to help address these issues that do not create a president for fixing all these problems. Given the cost involved (not that it is minor folks) but it is small compared to a lot of them that we have. It would be my recommendation that the Committee recommend that the City offer to assist with that by providing it's own services in any way it can to minimize the cost of getting that done. So that this can get done in a timely manner. Do you understand what I'm saying?

Julie Cain-Who is paying for it?

Alec Weinberg-You are going to help them figure it and let them pay for it?

Pat Dunn-Yes, that is what I'm suggesting. That the City provide all of the external services it can to minimize the cost for the residents to pay for it themselves to get this done in a timely manner. I know that the services the City can offer to minimize those costs are significant.

Alec Weinberg-Seconds the motion.

Pat Dunn. I've been through a lot of these and there's nobody, Mr. Handley, that is going to convince you that the amount of water has not increased, because it has. Absolutely not. The problem we are addressing here is not that your experienced data is not correct, the problem we are experiencing here is there are a lot of developments out south that were developed when a lot of the area around it was not developed and as the area around it has developed, that flow has increased. It always does and that is the common factor with all the other places we are dealing with.

George Handley-In your motion though, you are actually putting the responsibility onto the homeowners for something they didn't create in the slightest.

Pat Dunn-That is correct. You are right. Not meaning to argue, but if you approach this from a matter of who is at fault for it, you are never going to reach a solution. You have to approach it from a standpoint of who is responsible to deal with it? And you have a private drainage system that we are dealing with. I'm trying to come up with the most responsible way I can for the City to assist you all in dealing with this so

you can get it dealt with.

George Handley-And in answer to that, we have a private stream that...The developer put in our private drainage system that you all have hooked onto to drain the water. Our system was there before your system.
Pat Dunn-I understand and there are a lot of private developers that I'd like to go back thirty years ago and talk to.

Debra Filla-I would modify it. I think that we do at a minimum have a 50/50 if not a 100% participation on the City's part because it is in fact taking public drainage...Do they have a right to say as a private subdivision to say they won't take our water?

John Kahl-No because it is a historical drainage path, it has always flowed there.

Debra Filla-But we also changed what we connected to it.

John Kahl-The same water that drained there fifty years ago is still draining there today. The timing of it may be different.

Chair Rawlings-We need to discuss what the motion means before we vote on it. I do not understand what assistance might be referring to. When it comes to construction what does that mean? Design?

John Kahl-Also permitted related, maybe walking them through it. Maybe helping them size the pipe, making sure they know what is approved. Maybe giving them specifications that they can give to a contractor to build it. Maybe assistance in finding a contractor, those kinds of things.

Jim Rawlings-So the estimated \$60,000 it may cost to put in a pipe, what percentage of that cost may be on the City verses the homeowner.

Joe Johnson-the \$60,000 is construction cost.

John Kahl- There is probably another \$10,000 or so in designing it.

Joe Johnson-We could probably waive any of the fees related to it. We talked about design. I am not sure the City wants to get into designing something for a private area.

David Ley-Unless they were willing to provide easements and after we built it turn it over to the City.

Joe Johnson-If they could do that, then it could be a public system for the City to maintain from that point on.

Carole Lechevin-Are there any cost share programs available? If not from the County from anything that Leawood has done in the past as a cost share?

Joe Johnson-The Council always has the ability to make that decision.

Debra Filla-I think we ought to ask for some easements and make this a public part. We've obviously changed the velocity with the last design and I think that for the costs involved, this is one we should step up to.

Carole Lechevin-I agree.

John Kahl-In the general sense, my personal belief is (because I'm a stormwater engineer) that stormwater is something that is too challenging for individual property owners to maintain and to manage. That is my personal belief. To me all creeks, streams, drainages, whatever within the City of Leawood-or any City, ought to be owned by the municipality or the governmental entity. But the reality is, that in Leawood, that is not what we have. The City of Leawood is not currently prepared to take on the obligations and liabilities if that was suddenly thrust upon them. That would be a substantial increase in annual budgetary costs and so forth for maintenance and construction and repair, a number of other things like that that we are not currently

structured to do. While I empathize with the situation and you know the changed conditions that these residents had nothing to do with, that created this situation. But the City doesn't have anything really to do with it either, specifically. And you would have to go into that subdivision upstream and say you got 1/164th liability for my problem and go to every house and they would say, they just bought the house from someone else. I didn't create this condition. I just bought the house, why do I have to pay for it? And that is where we get this type of situation that just keeps passing the buck. And that's why the situation is too difficult for any individual property owners in most cases to manage. But until the City changes the policy and philosophy relative to stormwater, in a big picture sense, we have to deal with things as they face us and this channel is privately owned, just like many other channels in the City and it's having problems largely because of situations that the people that own it didn't create. But we are not helping a lot of other people that have come through here before. We have lists of problem areas where people have come in and asked us for assistance and we've turned them down.

Debra Filla-We have asked some of the private ones if they would make the area public and they wouldn't allow it.

George Handley-May I ask, If we agreed to make an easement and make this area public? That would be a piece of cake for us to get arranged.

Julie Stasi-To confirm, you have five (5) property/homeowners?

George Handley-Yes. Five properties that are directly affected. We have a Homes Association of 27 units. The five properties reside in the lowest area where the drainage issue is. Instead of it being 2 to 3 feet, now it's 10 to 15 feet deep.

John Kahl-Who actually owns the land that this drainage comes across? Is it Homes Association/Common Property?

David Ley-Mr. Bruce owns part of it. Guessing the Homes Association owns the street area.

John Kahl-So the channel itself is not common property?

Tom Bruce-The property line splits right down the channel between ours and the Lee's which live on the north side of the channel.

Chair Rawlings-Is there any more discussion on the Motion?

Julie Cain-Contrary to the Motion, if the City did agree to take \$60,000 expense; where would it be in the queue of our projects? It certainly wouldn't happen this year would it? When would it get in line with our other projects we have to do?

Joe Johnson-That is something the City Administrator could look at. It may be a decision that the Governing Body may be able to appropriate some of our monies in 2013 or maybe the 2014 Budget. Maybe when we do the 2014 Budget we could ask that funds be appropriated for it.

Julie Cain-I think we need to be very respectful of those that have gone before and waiting for years and years to get their concern areas addressed. We have agreed with some others who have waited 4 to 5 years to see their projects arrive. This is a smaller dollar amount than some, but is an issue we should take into consideration. Some people have basements flooding. Why would this one go to the front of the line?

Julie Stasi-Advised there was a Motion recommendation on the floor made by Member Dunn that the Committee recommend to the Council that the City offer to assist by providing it's services for external services to minimize the cost and help residents pay for the soft costs.

And, Alec Weinberg had seconded the Motion.

Deb Filla- In other words that the \$60,000 of construction costs Staff identified would be on the residents.

John Kahl-I think the way that reads and what he meant could be construed as different things.

Joe Johnson-In the end, he clarified it, that the construction costs would not be an expense to the City.

John Kahl-Is okay with recommending the City try to help the residents; short of just paying to fix their problem. And is not really opposed to the City just paying for the fix; placing an enclosed pipe. It's more a matter that we have told a lot of other people no before and I do not know why this situation is different from some of theirs. I empathize with the situation but are we opening ourselves up to other liabilities?

Ultimately it is the City Council's decision. Typically if we have not done it for one homeowner, is there something different about this one?

Debra Filla-Thinks there is something different about this situation and that is the City's Project changed the velocity.

John Kahl-It had no bearing on the velocity in the channel though.

Debra Filla-Joe would you say that is true? That when you put in those storm inlets that in fact you have not changed the velocity of how efficiently the water is gathered and sent down that channel?

Joe Johnson-I think there is an impact. But, yea, like John said you putting the storm sewer system in improves the way the water is transported.

Debra Filla-Yes. And I think that is the difference and his observations of living in the house that before the water came down and now it can take a bolder the size of this chair and move it, that velocity has changed that is the reason I think we ought to make it a public system and step up and do it. Because that to me is part of the change.

Julie Cain-Wants to know what City staff recommends every time we get an issue before City Council we always have a City Staff recommendation. I want to know what our City Staff's position is; given everything you have heard.

Chair Rawlings-That is a hard question for Joe or Dave just to answer; shoot from the hip right now.

Julie Cain-Perhaps today it is not appropriate. Maybe if we continued the discussion.

Chair Rawlings-Would like to recommend that we table this recommendation until next month. Let Staff go back and talk to our City Administrator and look at some of the other projects and see what recommendation he may make after they gather other information. I would like to have more information from them and the City if we do. I'm comfortable with this is not a precedent whatever we decide, I think we should stand alone with each project based on the severity of it or lack thereof; but also being sensitive to the people we have turned away. Does that make sense to table this for another month until we have more information?

Debra Filla-I will make that Motion. I move to table this discussion until we have more information.

Julie Cain-Wait, we have a motion and a second on the floor that we need to vote on first.

Alec Weinberg-Wait. I'll withdraw the Second to Pat's Motion, and that will kill it.

Chair Rawlings-Let the Minutes show that Pat Dunn's Motion died, due to a lack of a second.

Debra Filla-Moves to table this discussion until our next meeting in order to allow staff to finalize their recommendation and budgetary impact in comparison to other requests and hot-spots of concerns in Leewood.

Carole Lechevin-Seconds the Motion made by Member Filla.

All members present in favor of the Motion. Motion passes.

- **NEW BUSINESS: Consider a Green Street Pilot Project**

Chair Rawlings asked the Committee Members if they had had a chance to read the information from the meeting with David Dowell.

Deb Filla-asked that the Minutes reflect that he is not a doctor. It is Mr. David Dowell.

Deb Filla-Gave a recap of the meeting in July (31st) with Mr. Dowell and Kevin Perry (who is the gentleman from Oregon) that has experience in these applications. Staff's notes give us an idea of the whole concept and what applications we think would work and locations and possibly locations for a good pilot project.

Carole Lechevin-If we cannot find a street area to convert, maybe we can find a street island or something along a City owned project that people would be able to see.

Carole Lechevin-Also mentioned a project in Kansas City, Missouri in the Marlborough area near 72nd & Prospect that Committee Members might visit to get an idea of what we are talking about. Some things are working and some are not. It really is worth seeing in-the-ground and get an idea of the installations. There are certain plants that have done really well, and others that would not be successful here that work on the west or east coast.

Chair Rawlings-Made a suggestion that staff looks at other areas and also ask that Committee Members possibly find a time to drive by the Marlborough area Carole mentioned to get an idea of what is possible. Also noted, Joe does not think islands would work, but Carole thinks possibly they would.

Carole Lechevin-It doesn't need to pick up a huge amount of area in order to demonstrate success. We have to put the stuff in front of people and get them used to it. If it fills up a foot deep as opposed to picking up less than that. For example the island at Meadow and 91st. I think would work. Now, is that the best location for one? I don't know. But I think there are enough islands around that you could at least pick up some runoff, off the street and demonstrate what we are trying to move forward.

Joe Johnson-The island should be the high point of the street, so if we get any water in the islands.

John Kahl-If the street is built the way it was originally designed-the correct way, then the island will never get any drainage. Because the drainage is all designed to go away from the island and not towards it.

Deb Filla-Makes a Motion that we table this discussion in order to review the request that Committee Members take a look at the area in the Marlborough Neighborhood of Kansas City and give Staff time to come up with three or four options for the Committee to discuss at the next meeting.

Carole Lechevin-Seconds the motion.

All present members were in favor. Motion passed.

Chair Rawlings adjourned the meeting at 9:03AM.

Next Meeting scheduled for October 31, 2012.

Minutes transposed by Julie Stasi, Leawood Public Works Department
Folder B; DS300022.WMA