

**City of Troy, Missouri**  
**Public Hearings, Public Meeting and Regular Board of Aldermen Meeting**  
**Monday, August 7, 2017**  
**6:30 P.M.**

Present for the meeting were Aldermen Eversmeyer, Detert, Anderson, Sconce, Curt, Walker and Mayor Cross. Also present were Court Reporter Susan Schroeter, Police Chief Taylor, Treasurer Flinn, City Attorney Granneman and City Clerk Schneider.

Mayor Cross opened the Public Hearings and Public Meeting for the purposes of citizen input on:

The purposes of the Public Hearings and Public Meeting are for Citizen Comment in accordance with the requirements of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). A public meeting and two public hearings will be held regarding upgrades to the City of Troy's Southeast Wastewater Treatment Facility (SE WWTF). The City's Highway 47 WWTF (HW 47 WWTF) does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate its current influent wastewater flows and loads and has received a Notice of Violation for discharges below the State water quality standards. As part of the project, wastewater entering the HW 47 WWTF will be transported to the SE WWTF for treatment via a new interceptor sewer system. The SE WWTF will undergo upgrades to receive this additional flow.

- (a) Alternative Engineering Solutions Public Meeting: A public meeting to discuss the alternative engineering solutions discussed in the facility plan will occur at 6:30 pm on Monday, August 7, 2017 at City Hall located at 800 Cap Au Gris Road.
- (b) Environmental Impact Public Hearing: A public hearing to discuss the environmental impacts related to the project will occur at 7:00 pm on Monday, August 7, 2017 at City Hall located at 800 Cap Au Gris Road.
- (c) Estimated User Charge Rate Public Hearing: A public hearing to discuss the user charge rates related to the project will occur at 7:30 pm on Monday, August 7, 2017 at City Hall located at 800 Cap Au Gris Road.

Court Reporter Schroeter transcribed the Public Hearings and Public Meeting. The transcript is attached hereto.

There was no citizen comment.

Mayor Cross called the Regular Board of Aldermen Meeting to order at 7:35 p.m., announced a quorum present and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Alderman Anderson made a motion, seconded by Alderman Detert to approve the Consent Agenda. Vote: Anderson aye, Detert aye, Curt aye, Eversmeyer aye, Walker aye, Sconce aye.

\*Approved Payment to Woodard & Curran for WWTP Upgrades through April 2017 in the amount of \$22,827.00

Alderman Eversmeyer made a motion, seconded by Alderman Curt to Approve and Authorize Treasurer Flinn to Make Application for Financing with US Bank for Police Cars. Vote: Eversmeyer aye, Curt aye, Walker aye, Sconce aye, Detert aye, Anderson aye.

City Clerk Schneider requested a date for a Public Hearing/Special Meeting to Set the 2017 Property Tax Rate. The Board agreed to hold the meeting on August 24, 2017 at 6:30 p.m.

Mayor Cross requested D.A. Davidson to review refunding the Series 2011 Certificates of Participation (Troy Aquatic Center and Street Projects) for 2017 Issue. Steve Goehl of D.A. Davidson was present at the meeting and indicated a savings of approximately \$67,000.00 over the life of the issue utilizing the redemption date option. Alderman Sconce asked about the rate. Goehl answered the rate was 2.97% and pays off in 2026. Also, the refunding was not obligated if the City cannot get better rates. Alderman Eversmeyer asked about cost. Goehl answered the \$67,000.00 is net savings to the City and all bond, escrow, verification report by an accountant and the financial work was already included. Goehl continued that the refunding would not impact the state revolving fund funding application for the City's sewer improvement project. Goehl also looked at 2012 and 2012A certificates of participation but the numbers were in the negative for refunding. Alderman Anderson made a motion, seconded by Alderman Curt to Approve Refunding Series 2011 Certificates of Participation for 2017 Issue Upon the Condition that Net Present Value Saving Must Meet or Exceed 2.11% as recommended by D.A. Davidson. Vote: Anderson aye, Curt aye, Eversmeyer aye, Sconce aye, Detert aye, Walker aye.

Alderman Eversmeyer made a motion, seconded by Alderman Anderson to Go Into Closed Session in compliance with 610.021 of RSMo., for the purposes of discussing Legal and Personnel. Vote: Eversmeyer aye, Anderson aye, Detert aye, Walker aye, Sconce aye, Curt aye.

Alderman Sconce made a motion, seconded by Alderman Detert to Hire Sean Brown as a Full-Time Police Officer at Grade 16-Step 6, \$19.10 per hour. Vote: Sconce aye, Detert aye, Walker aye, Eversmeyer aye, Curt aye, Anderson aye.

City Attorney advised the Board on Legal matters.

Alderman Eversmeyer made a motion, seconded by Alderman Curt to Go Out of Closed Session. Vote: Eversmeyer aye, Curt aye, Sconce aye, Detert aye, Walker aye, Anderson aye.

Alderman Anderson made a motion, seconded by Alderman Eversmeyer to Adjourn the Meeting. Vote: Anderson aye, Eversmeyer aye, Curt aye, Detert aye, Walker aye, Sconce aye. The meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\*Approved on Consent Agenda

**CITY OF TROY**  
**ALTERNATIVE ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS PUBLIC MEETING**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT PUBLIC HEARING**  
**ESTIMATED USER CHARGE RATE PUBLIC HEARING**

**MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 2017**

**6:30 P.M.**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

1                   **MAYOR MARK CROSS:** The first item is the  
2 Alternative Engineering Solutions Public Meeting.

3                   **MAGGIE CONNOLLY:** I would like to introduce  
4 myself. My name is Maggie Connolly. I am the project  
5 manager for Woodard & Curran. We are the engineer for  
6 the City of Troy, and this is Robert Polys. He is our  
7 technical manager for Woodard & Curran, and tonight we  
8 are going to be discussing the alternative engineering  
9 solutions for the City of Troy's proposed upgrades to  
10 the wastewater treatment facility. During this meeting  
11 we are going to cover the existing conditions of the  
12 City's current wastewater facilities. We will talk  
13 about what the goals of this project are, and then we  
14 will review some of the alternatives that are being  
15 considered as part of the analysis in the discussion of  
16 this project. We will review the selection criteria  
17 that we used to determine the proposed alternative that  
18 was ultimately selected for the City of Troy, and then  
19 we will get into a little bit of the treatment  
20 alternatives that were reviewed and selected as part of  
21 the project, as well.

22                   **ROBERT POLYS:** So as Maggie mentioned, first  
23 we are going to talk about the existing conditions. So  
24 as she mentioned, the City currently has two wastewater  
25 treatment facilities. Both have a history of overflows

1 and permit violations, and a consent order has been  
2 issued to the City by the US EPA, and that is really the  
3 driver and need for this project is to mitigate and  
4 solve the problem of wastewater treatment for the City  
5 and to comply with the consent order issued by the EPA.  
6 Both facilities are in need of upgrades due to the age  
7 and condition of the equipment and existing systems, and  
8 the EPA has really driven this such that the City must  
9 resolve issues by October, 2019, and eliminate overflows  
10 and permit violations before that time.

11 First, jumping into the Highway 47 Treatment  
12 Facility. It was built in the early 1970's. Upgrades  
13 occurred in the mid-1990's with a smaller upgrade in  
14 2007. This facility treats approximately 80% of the  
15 City's wastewater flow and discharge as treated effluent  
16 to the Town Branch Stream.

17 Moving right along to the Southeast Treatment  
18 Facility. This was newer and built in 2005. It treats  
19 approximately 20% of the City's wastewater flow. It  
20 discharges treated effluent directly to the Cuivre  
21 River, and at one point, in fact, the Southeast  
22 Facility's outfall has been severely damaged due to the  
23 bank erosion of the Cuivre River.

24 Jumping right into the overall project goals. One  
25 of the first goals is to provide robust and reliable

1 wastewater treatment for City for both now, to meet its  
2 current needs, and for the future to meet the future  
3 needs, eliminate the untreated bypasses, eliminate the  
4 effluent permit violations, and, most importantly,  
5 improved equipment reliability and operability for the  
6 City's wastewater treatment staff.

7         So as Maggie mentioned, we looked at several  
8 different project alternatives to set up this project  
9 and to plan for the future for the City. These  
10 alternatives include doing nothing, upgrade both  
11 facilities individually, those being the Highway 47  
12 facility and the Southeast Plant, divert flow, all  
13 wastewater flow, from the City to a regional facility  
14 elsewhere, decommission the Southeast Facility and  
15 divert all flow to the Highway 47 Treatment Facility,  
16 and decommission the Highway 47 Treatment Facility and  
17 divert flow to the Southeast Treatment Facility. As  
18 part of the alternative project selection process,  
19 several different criteria were analyzed. Those  
20 included the ability of the alternative to meet the  
21 project goals and needs, the ability to meet the  
22 effluent permit requirements set by the State of  
23 Missouri, the cost-effectiveness of the alternative for  
24 the City and the rate fares, and operability and  
25 reliability for the City's wastewater treatment

1 operational staff.

2 So alternative number one, do nothing, is really  
3 not a feasible alternative for the City as mentioned due  
4 to the client's requirements of the US EPA. Alternative  
5 number two, upgrade both facilities. This was not  
6 recommended as it was not cost-effective for the City in  
7 the long-term to run two treatment facilities.

8 Alternative number three, divert flow to regional  
9 facility, really not feasible. There is not one located  
10 in close proximity that would be a cost-effective means  
11 for the City to dispose of their wastewater.

12 Alternative number four, decommission the Southeast  
13 Plant and upgrade the Highway 47 Plant. This was also  
14 not recommended due to non-cost-effectiveness and also  
15 lack of land area to provide robust and reliable  
16 treatment for the City for that site.

17 So with that being said, the selected and  
18 recommended selection alternative is alternative number  
19 five, which is to decommission the Highway 47 facility  
20 and divert all flow, wastewater flow, generated within  
21 the City to the Southeast Plant site. The Highway 47  
22 Treatment Facility would be converted to a lift station,  
23 and that would divert all that flow through a  
24 one-and-a-half or two-mile interceptor sewer and forced  
25 main down to the Southeast Treatment Facility site.



1           The Southeast Treatment Facility will be upgraded  
2 with a capacity increase to treat all flow generated by  
3 the City, and the outfall in the Cuivre River will be  
4 rehabilitated at the Southeast Treatment Facility site.  
5 So we have a figure here to the side showing an overall  
6 summary of the project. We will start from the top and  
7 work our way down. You can see at the top we have  
8 Highway 47 Treatment Facility. As mentioned, that will  
9 be converted to a lift station. The orange line showing  
10 here shows an approximate planning level route for the  
11 sewer interceptor and force main to divert all the flow  
12 from the site down to the existing Whitcomb Branch Sewer  
13 which feeds all the flow into the Southeast Facility.  
14 The Southeast Facility would be operated with an  
15 increased capacity and more robust and reliable  
16 treatment, and then the treated effluent will flow to  
17 the existing discharge point and the outfall in the  
18 Cuivre River will be rehabilitated as part of the  
19 project.

20           So as Maggie mentioned, as part of the process, we  
21 looked at those five alternatives, what to do with the  
22 facilities, where to send wastewater, what is the most  
23 reliable and cost-effective solution for the City. Once  
24 we determined that, we also looked at several different  
25 ways how can we treat wastewater at the Southeast Site

1 most cost-effectively for the City to meet immediate  
2 needs and in the long-term. As part of that process, we  
3 looked at upgrading the existing Southeast Facility and  
4 continue to use a dye reactive treatment process. We  
5 also look at converting it to an activated sludge  
6 treatment process or a conversion into an oxidation  
7 ditch treatment process, as well.

8 As part of that evaluation of those three treatment  
9 alternatives, we looked at different selection criteria,  
10 those being how, what kind of effluent quality, and what  
11 kind of sludge reduction does that treatment alternative  
12 give, how complex is the construction and operation and  
13 maintenance for the City's wastewater treatment facility  
14 and staff to run it in the long-term, how much tankage  
15 storefront does it take up, any additional required  
16 equipment above and beyond what the City has to deal  
17 with right now, what is the energy input for  
18 year-to-year operation and maintenance costs, how viable  
19 is that treatment alternative to meet both the current  
20 and future permit requirements that may come from the  
21 State of Missouri and the US EPA. And finally, and most  
22 importantly, the upfront capital costs and total  
23 life-cycle costs were analyzed as part of the process,  
24 as well.

25 So with that being said, the three alternatives

1 again were analyzed, and alternative number two was the  
2 selected and recommended treatment alternative for the  
3 City and that is the conventional sludge treatment  
4 process. The drivers and reasons for this were it was  
5 the lowest total life-cycle cost and long-term for the  
6 City. It had superior provisions for the facility  
7 layout and constructability while keeping the existing  
8 systems online. It has superior wet weather  
9 flexibility. It can handle high flows that can occur in  
10 the City and in the Midwest as a whole. It is a  
11 reliable and robust means for future expansion so easily  
12 meets the current needs of the City, and is easily  
13 expandable in the future for increasing flows and change  
14 in discharge permit requirements, and, again, it can  
15 really is a be converted in the future to meet the EPA  
16 requirements, as well. That is all we have for this  
17 part of the presentation.

18 **MAGGIE CONNOLLY:** Are there any questions?  
19 Any questions from the public?

20 **MAYOR MARK CROSS:** That is all for the  
21 Alternative Engineering Solutions Public Meeting  
22 portion. Shall we adjourn?

23 **JESSIE GRANNEMAN:** You can go ahead and close  
24 this portion. There is never public comment to it.

25 **MAYOR MARK CROSS:** Okay. If there's no

1 public comment, then we will close this portion of the  
2 public meeting. We will reconvene in 20 minutes, I  
3 guess.

4 **(Thereupon, the Alternative Engineering Solutions**  
5 **Public Hearing was adjourned; after which, the**  
6 **Environmental Impact Public Hearing was held:)**

7 **MAYOR MARK CROSS:** Okay. Call to order of  
8 the Environmental Impact Public Hearing.

9 **MAGGIE CONNOLLY:** Thank you. My name is  
10 Maggie Connolly. I am a project manager for Woodard &  
11 Curran, and we are supporting the City of Troy on the  
12 work to upgrade the Southeast Treatment Facility. This  
13 is Robert Polys. He is our technical manager, also with  
14 Woodard & Curran, and today we are going to be  
15 discussing the environmental impacts associated with the  
16 upgrades to the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Facility.  
17 The environmental impacts that we will cover during this  
18 hearing will be impacts associated to floodplains,  
19 wetlands and endangered species, cultural resources,  
20 prime farmland, public land and parks, and city  
21 development. We will also discuss the environmental  
22 clearances that were granted as part of this project and  
23 generally cover the impacts to private property and air  
24 and water quality.

25 So starting with the floodplain. The Southeast

1 Facility is completely outside of 100 year floodplain,  
2 so there will be no impact associated with the upgrades  
3 at the facility. There are structures at the Highway 47  
4 Facility, but all of the structures are above the base  
5 100 year floodplain elevation, as well. The interceptor  
6 sewer and outflow reconstruction that are associated  
7 with the project are within the floodplain boundary.  
8 However, the construction associated with those aspects  
9 of the project are a temporary impact to the floodplain.  
10 There will be no loss of floodplain flood-containing  
11 capacity and no permanent impact of the floodplain as  
12 part of this project. All of the components associated  
13 with the interceptor and the outfall will be located  
14 below ground.

15 Moving along to the wetlands. The National  
16 Wetlands Inventory Map was consulted regarding the  
17 wetlands in proximity to the project. There are  
18 wetlands that are located within the proximity to the  
19 Cuivre River, and outfall pipe that will be  
20 reconstructed will be adjacent to those wetlands. The  
21 Army Corps of Engineer was consulted as part of the  
22 project and the environmental impact document that we  
23 put together, and they require wetland mapping as part  
24 of the project. Any permits that may be required for  
25 impact to wetland will be obtained prior to construction

1 on this project, and impacts will be avoided to all  
2 extent possible.

3       So impacts to endangered species. There were no  
4 critical habitat that were found within the project  
5 area, and all of Lincoln County has been identified as a  
6 potential northern long-eared bat and gray bat habitat.  
7 However, if your project is disturbing less than 10  
8 acres of forested area, and any clearing would be  
9 associated between and occurring between November 1st  
10 and March 31st, then there won't be any likely impact,  
11 which is what proposed as part of this project.

12       For cultural resources. There was a Phase I  
13 Archaeological Survey that was conducted as part of the  
14 project, and during that survey, one isolated find was  
15 located along the Interceptor Sewer Route, but they were  
16 determined to be artifacts of no significance as part of  
17 that survey. There were two archaeological sites that  
18 were identified at the Southeast Treatment Facility  
19 where stone pieces were found, and they were potentially  
20 adjacent to the creation and use of stone tools which  
21 triggered a required Phase II Survey for the Southeast  
22 Treatment Facility. A Phase II Survey was conducted as  
23 part of the due diligence for this project, and no  
24 intact subsurface features or cultural deposits were  
25 observed. The site is not eligible for inclusion in the

1 National Register of Historic Places and was cleared by  
2 the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office.

3 As far as impact to prime farmland, the treatment  
4 facility upgrades will occur on the existing City  
5 property and construction of the Interceptor will be  
6 temporary located along farmland in that area. All  
7 infrastructure will be located below grade, and no  
8 long-term impacts to farmland are anticipated as part of  
9 this project.

10 As far as impact to public land and parks, the  
11 project development will not take place on any public  
12 land or in parks.

13 Impact on city development. The project accounts  
14 for population growth and consideration for future  
15 growth in the city, and the treatment facility is also  
16 set up that it could be expanded in the future if  
17 further growth is anticipated.

18 As far as environmental clearances, the project was  
19 cleared with the Missouri Department of Natural  
20 Resources, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources  
21 Division of State Parks, the Missouri Department of  
22 Natural Resources Geological Survey, the Missouri  
23 Department of Conversation, the Missouri Federal  
24 Assistance Clearinghouse, the State Historic  
25 Preservation Office, the US Fish and Wildlife Service,

1 and the US Army Corps of Engineers.

2 As far as impact on private property, the project  
3 will primarily occur on existing city-owned land. The  
4 Interceptor Sewer will pass through private development,  
5 and easements will be obtained from the property owners,  
6 and I believe it was the only city street that will be  
7 impacted as part of this project with the Interceptor  
8 route, but, again, all of the infrastructure will be  
9 located below grade.

10 There will be no impacts anticipated as far as air  
11 quality. There may be temporary dust and vehicle  
12 emissions during construction, but dust control will be  
13 included as part of the construction project.

14 There are no impacts anticipated for water quality.  
15 Cuivre River is the discharge point. Any runoff to  
16 nearby surface waters will be managed during  
17 construction, and, again, the primary goal of this  
18 project is that the treatment upgrades will eliminate  
19 overflows and permit violations, therefore really  
20 improving water quality in the Cuivre River.

21 In conclusion, there are very minimal environmental  
22 impacts as part of this project, and Missouri Department  
23 of Natural Resources has already approved the  
24 environmental information document.

25 That said, are there any questions?



1                   **MAYOR MARK CROSS:** With no further questions,  
2 we close this portion of the hearing. Meeting  
3 adjourned. Our next hearing will start at 7:30.  
4 Meeting adjourned.

5                   **(Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned; after which,**  
6 **the Estimated Use Charge Rate Public Hearing was held:)**

7                   **MAYOR MARK CROSS:** Call the next public  
8 hearing to order on Estimated User Charge Rate.

9                   **MAGGIE CONNOLLY:** Thank you. My name is  
10 Maggie Connolly. This is Robert Polys. We are from  
11 Woodard & Curran, the City's engineer, assisting with  
12 the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Facility upgrade  
13 project. This presentation will cover the user rate --  
14 impact to the user rates associated with the project.  
15 In this presentation, we will cover the cost of the  
16 project, the financing associated with the project, the  
17 user rates to reflect finances, and an estimated user  
18 charge rates with the impact of the project, and the  
19 timeline associated with those rate adjustments.

20                   So the overall project costs at this point are  
21 estimated to be \$18.6 million. These costs include the  
22 design and construction, equipment costs, loan closing  
23 costs, and contingency associated with the project.

24                   For financing a project of this size, the City has  
25 chosen to submit an application to the State Revolving

1 Fund, or SRF Program. The application was initially  
2 applied in 2015, and was reapplied in 2016. The project  
3 was placed on the front of the list, and SRF has made  
4 available \$18.8 million for the City of Troy. The City  
5 is pursuing a low-interest loan. They are pursuing a  
6 30-year loan at this point, with the interest rate and  
7 loan terms to be finalized at the closing of the loan  
8 which will be prior to construction.

9 Associated with this funding, the City proposed an  
10 18.8 revenue bond in April of 2016. This issue was  
11 voted and approved by the voters, and this allows the  
12 City to leverage low-interest governmental loan programs  
13 such as SRF. The annual debt service which will be  
14 applied to the loan will be financed by the user rate  
15 charges that the City applies to their users. The user  
16 rate is composed typically of three funds. These would  
17 be the O&M costs, or the operation and maintenance  
18 costs, associated with running a wastewater treatment  
19 facility; debt service, such as what would be applied  
20 towards the SRF project and loan; and funds associated  
21 with the replacement costs or reserve fund for the City  
22 to apply to upgrading equipment during at the end of its  
23 useful life. So currently, the City runs \$1.6 million  
24 operation and maintenance costs, and they have existing  
25 debt of approximately \$825,000, which will be retiring

1 in 2024/2025. Currently there is not an existing  
2 replacement or reserve fund that are allocated by the  
3 user rates.

4 As part of this project, the proposed O&M costs  
5 will actually decrease. This is associated with  
6 decommissioning the Highway 47 Plant and other  
7 efficiencies that are made as part of project. The debt  
8 service, which is approximated at this time to be  
9 finalized prior to closing, is around \$900,000, and SRF  
10 does require that funds be set aside based upon the life  
11 expectancy of the equipment, and those are approximately  
12 \$45 million over the 30-year life of the loan.

13 So the user rates will have to be updated in order  
14 to finance this project and the SRF loan. SRF does  
15 require the proportional user charges for projects that  
16 it does fund. The City has previously passed a user  
17 rate update to fund the debt and currently has an  
18 ordinance that has been applied. The ordinance applies  
19 for both residential and commercial users a base fee of  
20 \$15.50, and currently the charge for a thousand gallons  
21 per monthly flow is \$4.40. The rate charges that will  
22 be applied over the next five years that will be  
23 increased in order to fund this project are as follows:  
24 For 2017, the charge is \$4.75 per thousand gallons; for  
25 2018, the charge is \$5.13; for 2019, the charge is

1 \$5.49; for 2020, \$5.87; and in 2021, \$6.22. The rate  
2 changes are effective October 1st of each calendar year,  
3 and run through September 30th of the following year.

4 The overall impact from 2016 to 2021 for an average  
5 user of 5,000 gallons per month will be an increase of  
6 \$9.10 over that five-year period. This rate and user  
7 charge will be reviewed annually and adjustments could  
8 be made as needed or required in the future. Any  
9 questions?

10 **MAYOR MARK CROSS:** No further questions, we  
11 will close the Estimated User Charge Rate Public  
12 Hearing. Thank very much.

13 **(The meeting was adjourned at 7:36 to begin regular**  
14 **Board of Alderman meeting.)**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 STATE OF MISSOURI)

2 COUNTY OF LINCOLN)

3 I, Susan D. Schroeter, a Certified Court Reporter  
4 within and for the State of Missouri, do certify that I  
5 was present at City of Troy, Missouri, City Hall, 8000  
6 Cap Au Gris, Troy, State of Missouri, on the 7th of  
7 August, A.D., 2017; that thereafter, three public  
8 hearings were held commencing at 6:30 in the evening of  
9 that day, that all proceedings which then transpired  
10 were contemporaneously reduced to voice writing by me,  
11 and later transcribed into typewriting, and that the  
12 foregoing 18 pages are a true and accurate transcript of  
13 the record of proceedings made by me at that time.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
15 this 18th of August, A.D., 2017.

16  
17 

18 Susan D. Schroeter, CCR #1236  
19 Certified Court Reporter within  
20 and for the State of Missouri  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25