



# AGENDA COMMISSION ON STORM WATER ISSUES MEETING

December 7, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.  
Heman Park Community Center  
975 Pennsylvania Ave., University City, Missouri 63130

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
5. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION
6. NEW BUSINESS
7. OLD BUSINESS
  - a. US Army Corps of Engineers Upper River Des Peres Flood Risk Management Draft General Reevaluation Report – Update and Discussion (please see Attachment)
8. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS
  - a. Flood Early Warning System
  - b. Communications
9. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS
10. COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS
11. ADJOURNMENT

Please call (314) 505-8572 or email [salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org) to confirm your attendance.



## Department of Public Works

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 862-6767, Fax: (314) 862-0694

ATTACHMENT

November 5, 2021

Matthew A. Jones

Project Manager / CAP Program Manager

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-St. Louis District (MVS-PM-N)

1222 Spruce Street

St. Louis, MO 63103

RE: University City Branch, River Des Peres, Missouri  
General Reevaluation Report  
Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) Request for Information

Dear Matt:

Based on communication as of last week with your team on the referenced study project, I am writing to request the following items:

- 1) Please provide a definitive answer as to how can the City use any remaining budget for those voluntary measures that are not fully utilized due to lack of participation in the plan? You've previously indicated in writing that a 20% scope change is the extent at which that is limited by the law, but the definition of that change was not definitive. In connection with this answer, please inform as to whether the City will have flexibility to direct remaining budget for other flood reduction measures that are not defined by the TSP.
- 2) Please provide a breakdown of the costs for each nonstructural category, so we have a better idea of what part of the budget is mandatory vs. voluntary, and commercial vs. residential. Based on your latest presentation, the categories for which we'd like to see costs include elevation, fill basement, dry floodproofing (nonresidential), and acquisition. We understand the only mandatory measure is the buyouts; the floodproofing and filling of basements are voluntary measures. However, we don't have the aforementioned cost breakdown to assign with the mandatory vs. voluntary measures, as well as commercial vs. residential.
- 3) Please provide addresses for the 48 properties listed under the Detention Basin 4 (DB4) plus Nonstructural ("mixed plan") – New National Economic Development (NED) Plan and the 119 properties listed under the Nonstructural only ("mixed plan"). The City is understanding of the fact that these addresses are subject to change in the final stages of the study, and that the City should not yet contact the owners of the structures.

Staff reviews of the information that you have submitted up to this point in the study project and deliberations of the same with the Commission on Storm Water Issues have revealed that the information listed above is critical for an adequate evaluation and subsequent development of a recommendation. Therefore after your team supplies the requested information the City Council and Stormwater Commission need an additional 90 days to turn around a response to you for use as of the Agency Decision Milestone (ADM) of November 30, 2021. At this point, I feel that it is prudent to ask what impact this potential time extension request will have on the project.

It would be helpful if you please return a response to this request at your earliest convenience. Please contact me at (314) 505-8572 should you require further information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alpaslan". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Sinan Alpaslan, P.E.  
Director of Public Works

**From:** [Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP \(USA\)](#)  
**To:** [Sinan Alpaslan](#); [Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS \(USA\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Update  
**Date:** Friday, November 5, 2021 3:52:47 PM  
**Attachments:** [internal use only New NED Plan Structures 11-5-21.xlsx](#)  
[internal use only Nonstructural Only Structures 11-5-21.xlsx](#)

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good afternoon Sinan,

Thank you for providing this response.

I can speak to requested item #3: I had thought that the numbers of structures receiving nonstructural treatment would not change again between now and the ADM (i.e., 48 structures for the new NED plan (DB4 + nonstructural) and the 119 structures for the nonstructural-only alternative (i.e., no DB4)). However, the economist informed me that the cost updates provided on 10/25 actually changed the calculations for each reach, so that there are now 47 structures receiving nonstructural treatment in the new NED plan and 75 structures receiving nonstructural treatment in the nonstructural-only plan; these lists are attached. My apologies that I wasn't aware of this change at the time of the meeting on 10/25. Please also note the following caveats:

These lists of structures are not written in stone. During implementation, some of these structures may drop out or some structures that aren't listed in these documents may be added. This should be considered an approximation that is more accurate in the aggregate and less accurate on a structure-by-structure basis. For example, you'll notice the count of structures included in the nonstructural-only plan dropped significantly (from 119 to 75). This is due to the revisions in cost estimates from the economic modeling update based on revised cost estimates on 10/25. We're still expecting revisions to nonstructural floodproofing costs, which will likely result in more changes. Please refer to the answer to Q1 in the questions and responses document sent 10/29 that explains more about how the report recommendations may differ from implementation.

Regarding item 1: Based on an initial conversation with more experienced USACE planners, it seems a more specific answer on this will take some time to coordinate. We'll keep you posted as we learn more about how flexible we can be with federal funding during implementation.

Regarding item 2: I'm hoping we can provide a cost breakdown to you early next week.

Regarding the additional 90 days: Thank you for raising this concern and request. We will coordinate on our end and get back to you as soon as possible.

Many thanks, and I hope you have a great weekend.

Janet

## New NED Plan Structures

Structure ID	Reach ID	Fill Basement	Floodproof	Acquisition	Address	Zip Code
35	2	NO	YES	NO	1353 BAUR BLVD	63132
75	3	NO	YES	NO	1575 WOODSON RD	63114
272	5	YES	NO	NO	8428 BRADDOCK DR	63132
302	5	YES	NO	NO	1241 82ND BLVD	63132
303	5	YES	NO	NO	1243 82ND BLVD	63132
304	5	YES	NO	NO	1255 82ND BLVD	63132
321	5	YES	NO	NO	8167 VARDAMAN DR	63130
368	5	YES	NO	NO	1249 HAFNER PL	63130
382	5	YES	NO	NO	1319 RUSHMORE DR	63130
384	5	YES	NO	NO	1323 RUSHMORE DR	63130
385	5	NO	NO	YES	1301 RUSHMORE DR	63130
390	5	NO	NO	YES	8012 BRIAR CT	63130
409	5	YES	NO	NO	8003 MALIBOU CT	63130
410	5	YES	NO	NO	8000 CANTON AVE	63130
413	5	YES	NO	NO	8000 MALIBOU CT	63130
415	5	NO	NO	YES	8000 BRIAR CT	63130
443	5	YES	NO	NO	1319 MENDELL DR	63130
446	5	NO	NO	YES	1303 MENDELL DR	63130
467	5	NO	NO	YES	1214 WESTOVER AVE	63130
468	5	NO	NO	YES	1216 WESTOVER AVE	63130
469	5	NO	NO	YES	1218 WESTOVER AVE	63130
621	9	YES	NO	NO	7430 CHAMBERLAIN AVE	63130
789	10	YES	NO	NO	7475 SHAFTESBURY AVE	63130
796	10	YES	NO	NO	7467 SHAFTESBURY AVE	63130
803	10	YES	NO	NO	1063 WILSON AVE	63130
843	10	YES	NO	NO	1131 WILSON AVE	63130
848	10	YES	NO	NO	1153 WILSON AVE	63130
860	11	NO	YES	NO	7318 OLIVE BLVD	63130
864	11	NO	YES	NO	7270 OLIVE BLVD	63130
866	11	NO	YES	NO	1121 PURDUE AVE	63130
869	11	NO	YES	NO	1121 PURDUE AVE	63130
916	12	YES	NO	NO	1223 WALDRON AVE	63130
918	12	NO	NO	YES	1219 WALDRON AVE	63130
928	12	YES	NO	NO	1220 WALDRON AVE	63130
931	12	YES	NO	NO	1234 WALDRON AVE	63130
1182	14	NO	YES	NO	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1185	14	NO	YES	NO	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1186	14	NO	YES	NO	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1187	14	NO	YES	NO	975 PENNSYLVANIA AVE	63130
1188	14	NO	YES	NO	975 PENNSYLVANIA AVE	63130
1193	14	NO	YES	NO	1004 PENNSYLVANIA AVE	63130
1207	14	NO	YES	NO	6921 OLIVE BLVD	63130

City of St. Louis

Structure ID	Reach ID	Fill Basement	Floodproof	Acquisition	Longitude	Latitude
1633	20	NO	YES	NO	-90.299034	38.658951

1635	20 NO	YES	NO	-90.297246	38.658105
1641	20 NO	YES	NO	-90.296374	38.66043
1645	20 NO	YES	NO	-90.295931	38.661266
1648	20 NO	YES	NO	-90.29563	38.660004

## Nonstructural only plan structures

Structure ID	Reach ID	Fill Basement	Floodproof	Acquisition	Address	Zip Code
35	2	NO	YES	NO	1353 BAUR BLVD	63132
73	3	NO	YES	NO	1601 WOODSON RD	63114
75	3	NO	YES	NO	1575 WOODSON RD	63114
212	4	YES	NO	NO	8307 ARCHER AVE	63132
220	4	YES	NO	NO	8300 ORCHARD AVE	63132
247	4	YES	NO	NO	1316 GRANT DR	63132
248	4	YES	NO	NO	1308 GRANT DR	63132
280	5	YES	NO	NO	8408 BRADDOCK DR	63132
301	5	YES	NO	NO	1237 82ND BLVD	63132
302	5	YES	NO	NO	1241 82ND BLVD	63132
303	5	YES	NO	NO	1243 82ND BLVD	63132
304	5	YES	NO	NO	1255 82ND BLVD	63132
321	5	YES	NO	NO	8167 VARDAMAN DR	63130
368	5	YES	NO	NO	1249 HAFNER PL	63130
373	5	NO	NO	YES	1234 HAFNER PL	63130
374	5	NO	NO	YES	1230 HAFNER PL	63130
380	5	NO	NO	YES	1305 RUSHMORE DR	63130
384	5	YES	NO	NO	1323 RUSHMORE DR	63130
385	5	NO	NO	YES	1301 RUSHMORE DR	63130
390	5	NO	NO	YES	8012 BRIAR CT	63130
400	5	YES	NO	NO	8008 MALIBOU CT	63130
407	5	NO	NO	YES	8004 BRIAR CT	63130
410	5	YES	NO	NO	8000 CANTON AVE	63130
414	5	NO	NO	YES	8001 BRIAR CT	63130
415	5	NO	NO	YES	8000 BRIAR CT	63130
443	5	YES	NO	NO	1319 MENDELL DR	63130
446	5	NO	NO	YES	1303 MENDELL DR	63130
467	5	NO	NO	YES	1214 WESTOVER AVE	63130
468	5	NO	NO	YES	1216 WESTOVER AVE	63130
469	5	NO	NO	YES	1218 WESTOVER AVE	63130
492	6	NO	YES	NO	8109 OLIVE BLVD	63130
860	11	NO	YES	NO	7318 OLIVE BLVD	63130
864	11	NO	YES	NO	7270 OLIVE BLVD	63130
865	11	NO	YES	NO	7281 OLIVE BLVD	63130
866	11	NO	YES	NO	1121 PURDUE AVE	63130
867	11	NO	YES	NO	7273 OLIVE BLVD	63130
869	11	NO	YES	NO	1121 PURDUE AVE	63130
873	11	NO	NO	YES	7255 OLIVE BLVD	63130
874	11	NO	YES	NO	7245 OLIVE BLVD	63130
875	11	NO	YES	NO	7241 OLIVE BLVD	63130
880	11	NO	YES	NO	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
918	12	NO	NO	YES	1219 WALDRON AVE	63130
927	12	YES	NO	NO	1208 WALDRON AVE	63130
928	12	YES	NO	NO	1220 WALDRON AVE	63130
929	12	YES	NO	NO	1224 WALDRON AVE	63130
930	12	YES	NO	NO	1230 WALDRON AVE	63130

1182	14 NO	YES	NO	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1183	14 NO	NO	YES	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1184	14 NO	YES	NO	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1185	14 NO	YES	NO	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1186	14 NO	YES	NO	7210 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1187	14 NO	YES	NO	975 PENNSYLVANIA AVE	63130
1188	14 NO	YES	NO	975 PENNSYLVANIA AVE	63130
1194	14 NO	YES	NO	1000 PENNSYLVANIA AVE	63130
1204	14 NO	YES	NO	6931 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1205	14 NO	NO	YES	6921 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1207	14 NO	YES	NO	6921 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1500	18 NO	YES	NO	868 KINGSLAND AVE	63130
1504	18 NO	YES	NO	6633 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1507	18 NO	YES	NO	6615 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1513	18 NO	YES	NO	6601 VERNON AVE	63130
1515	18 NO	NO	YES	6504 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1517	18 NO	YES	NO	863 WESTGATE AVE	63130
1520	18 NO	YES	NO	6301 NORTH DR	63130
1523	18 NO	YES	NO	6301 NORTH DR	63130
1524	18 NO	YES	NO	6301 NORTH DR	63130
1525	18 NO	YES	NO	6301 NORTH DR	63130
1527	18 NO	YES	NO	6363 OLIVE BLVD	63130
1528	18 NO	YES	NO	6301 NORTH DR	63130
1531	18 NO	YES	NO	6301 NORTH DR	63130

City of St. Louis

Structure ID	Reach ID	Fill Basement	Floodproof	Acquisition	Longitude	Latitude
1633	20 NO	YES	NO		-90.299034	38.65895
1635	20 NO	YES	NO		-90.297246	38.6581
1641	20 NO	YES	NO		-90.296374	38.66043
1645	20 NO	YES	NO		-90.295931	38.66127
1648	20 NO	YES	NO		-90.29563	38.66



**From:** Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 10, 2021 3:12 PM  
**To:** Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>  
**Subject:** Follow-up to City/Commission Letter

Good afternoon Sinan:

After reviewing your letter dated 5 November 2021 and discussing with our USACE Vertical Team, our team will accommodate University City's request for an additional 90 days before holding the Agency Decision Milestone meeting. While your letter requested 90 days from the date you receive the requested information, we suggest the slightly longer period of 90 days from our original ADM date (November 30<sup>th</sup>), i.e., a new ADM date of approximately 28 February 2022. The exact date and time will be forthcoming as our Division schedules the milestone meetings; we will forward you the meeting invite as soon as it becomes available.

Our team is currently working on responses to your questions as well as the data that the City and Commission have requested. We anticipate having that to you all next week.

After discussing with the team, it would be very helpful for our team to know whether the City wants to go the LPP route with 60 days (so by approximately January 30<sup>th</sup>) or even sooner if possible. That should leave us approximately 30 days to perform the needed analysis, compile the documentation, and prepare the LPP Waiver Request prior to the new ADM date.

I want to share with you a concern that our team has in regards to study funding. If the City and Commission choose an LPP that requires additional analysis that has not already been performed, it is likely that we will require additional funding to complete the study. We, of course, will stay engaged with the City Council and the Stormwater Commission during this extension period via email or by attending meetings when requested. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or would like to chat with Janet and myself over the phone.

Thanks much,

Matt

***Matthew A. Jones***

Project Manager / CAP Program Manager  
President, Civilian Activities Council (CAC)  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-St. Louis District (MVS-PM-N)  
Office: (314) 331-8293

**From:** [Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP \(USA\)](#)  
**To:** [Eric Karch](#); [Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS \(USA\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Eric Stein](#); [Sinan Alpaslan](#)  
**Subject:** RE: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update  
**Date:** Friday, November 19, 2021 3:45:09 PM  
**Attachments:** [Response for UCity Question #1 funding flexibility.docx](#)

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good afternoon Sinan, Eric, & Eric,

We have an update for you on the requested items. A more detailed response has been developed to answer question #1 regarding the flexibility of funding in implementing the project; please see the Word doc attached.

We are still working on getting the cost breakdown information (question #2) and the updated structures lists with elevations rather than depths (question #3); we had been hoping to send this information today but it will be early next week.

Best, and hope you all have a great weekend!

Janet

Janet Buchanan  
Plan Formulation  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-St. Louis District (MVS), Regional Planning & Environment Division,  
North (RPEDN)  
[janet.i.buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:janet.i.buchanan@usace.army.mil)  
(314) 243-4401

---

**From:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:10 AM  
**To:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>; Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>  
**Cc:** Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Absolutely. I just talked with Jordan about it and he should be able to provide these by Friday.

Best,  
Janet

Janet Buchanan  
Plan Formulation  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-St. Louis District (MVS), Regional Planning & Environment Division,  
North (RPEDN)

[janet.i.buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:janet.i.buchanan@usace.army.mil)

(314) 243-4401

---

**From:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 16, 2021 11:07 AM

**To:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>; Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>

**Cc:** Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>

**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Re: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Matt & Janet,

The Commission meets the first Tuesday of each month, and I suspect this will remain the same thru March 2022. Huge thanks for the tabulated info, but we were expecting to see elevations whereas the table only shows heights/depths. That makes it difficult for us to relate the tables to the modeling. May we have the elevations that were used to calculate the heights/depths? These columns must already be present in your data, so I hope they won't be too onerous to share. Some commissioners have already done fieldwork to review the identified structures, so we're busy using this info.

Sincerely,

University City Stormwater Commission

Eric Karch

---

**From:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>

**Sent:** Monday, November 15, 2021 3:24 PM

**To:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>; Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>

**Cc:** Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>

**Subject:** RE: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Good afternoon Eric and all,

Please find attached the structures lists with additional columns on main floor elevations (from June 2021 survey data, not the 2013 data), '25-year' flood elevations, and '100-year' flood elevations.

We have a question for the Commission as well: Can you provide to us the dates of upcoming Commission meetings through March 2022? These would be helpful for us to track along with our schedule. We'd also like to suggest that we attend one or more upcoming Commission meetings so we can follow along with your deliberations and help answer questions as they come up.

We're still working on responses to the other two questions; will keep you posted on those.

Many thanks!

Janet

Janet Buchanan  
Plan Formulation

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-St. Louis District (MVS), Regional Planning & Environment Division,  
North (RPEDN)

[janet.i.buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:janet.i.buchanan@usace.army.mil)

(314) 243-4401

---

**From:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 10, 2021 3:50 PM

**To:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>; Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>

**Cc:** Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>

**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Re: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Excellent ! Thank you Janet and Matt ! We'll stand by.

Eric K

---

**From:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 10, 2021 3:28 PM

**To:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>; Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>

**Cc:** Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>

**Subject:** RE: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Good afternoon Eric,

Understood, and thanks for the additional context. We can provide those additional columns. Jordan let me know he'll likely be able to provide on Friday (tomorrow is a federal holiday); we'll get it to you as soon as possible. Appreciate you all working hard on this to make an informed recommendation to the Council!

Best,

Janet

Janet Buchanan  
Plan Formulation

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-St. Louis District (MVS), Regional Planning & Environment Division,  
North (RPEDN)

[janet.i.buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:janet.i.buchanan@usace.army.mil)

(314) 243-4401

---

**From:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, November 8, 2021 8:41 AM

**To:** Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>; Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>  
**Cc:** Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Re: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Matt & Janet,

I'm writing to following up on our earlier request for the elevation data for each property (see 10/12/2021 email). You indicated you were gathering it, and asked about how we intended to use this information. We'll use it to help understand the rationale for the properties selected for the nonstructural alternatives. To that end, thank you again for providing the City with the list of addresses, but it would be helpful if you would add 3 columns to this data: two showing your estimates for "25" and "100" year water levels, and another for your the main floor levels. I assume the main floor levels were those generated by the 2013 economic study, but if not, we'd appreciate whichever floor levels you did use for the GRR.

From my 10/12/2021 email, the 2013 economic update indicated that:

"A windshield survey was performed for each of the 820 structures in the AOI. The information collected during the windshield survey was used to identify the first floor elevations, construction materials, and use of each structure." It seems you had a tabulation for each property. The economic part of that tabulation is surely outdated, but the physical info is not likely to have changed. If there are any major changes, the City will have records on building permits. Ultimately, the City will need to get surveyed info, but for concept understanding...the info use already gathered will be useful for our own assessment of the houses subject to different flood levels.

We are earnestly trying to do our due-diligence to make an informed recommendation to the City Council, and this information is critical for our assessment. Our volunteer crew is working as expediently as we are able, but our assessment will take some time. I appreciate your patience and understanding.

Sincerely,

University City Stormwater Commission

Eric Karch

---

**From:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 12, 2021 11:29 AM

**To:** Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>

**Cc:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>; Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>

**Subject:** Re: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Matt,

Critical info is the following: "A windshield survey was performed for each of the 820 structures in the AOI. The information collected during the windshield survey was used to identify the first floor elevations, construction materials, and use of each

structure." It seems you had a tabulation for each property. The economic part of that tabulation is surely outdated, but the physical info is not likely to have changed. If there are any major changes, the City will have records on building permits. Ultimately, the City will need to get surveyed info, but for concept understanding...the info use already gathered will be useful for our own assessment of the houses subject to different flood levels.

Thanks,

University City Stormwater Commission

Eric K

---

**From:** Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:19 AM

**To:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>

**Cc:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>; Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>

**Subject:** RE: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Good morning Eric!

My apologies for not responding back to you. This request did come up in a small team meeting last week, and I dropped the ball on a response back.

We are digging through our files for the data you requested, but it may also help us format that data (once we locate it) to know the how the Commission is planning on using that data. Most, if not all, of that data is outdated I don't believe used in the current study, so our team was wondering how to best package that old data up.

Thanks much!

Matt

---

**From:** Eric Karch <[ekar76@hotmail.com](mailto:ekar76@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 12, 2021 9:43 AM

**To:** Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>

**Cc:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>; Eric Stein <[emstein1114@yahoo.com](mailto:emstein1114@yahoo.com)>; Sinan Alpaslan <[salpaslan@ucitymo.org](mailto:salpaslan@ucitymo.org)>

**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Re: River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Matt,

Just checking in to make sure you received my note about our request for supporting documentation for the 2013 Economic Update project. I'm sure this takes some time to run through the USACE channels, so I'm not trying to rush that. If you need anything else from us for this request, please let us know. Otherwise, I assume you're working on this and will let us know a status update when you have one.

Thanks,

University City Stormwater Commission  
Eric Karch

---

**From:** Eric Karch

**Sent:** Monday, October 4, 2021 9:16 PM

**To:** Jones, Matthew A CIV USARMY (USA) <[Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil](mailto:Matthew.A.Jones@usace.army.mil)>

**Cc:** Buchanan, Janet I CIV USARMY CEMVP (USA) <[Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Janet.I.Buchanan@usace.army.mil)>

**Subject:** River des Peres 2013 Economic Update

Matt,

The Commission would like some information associated with the 2013 USACE Economic Update. The study apparently estimated first floor elevations (see quoted passage below), and the Commission would like that data for our records. Can you provide this?

Thanks,  
Eric Karch

Page 7 Section 4.2 of the 2013 economic update says "The data provided by the assessor's office was already classified, valuated, and mapped in GIS. A windshield survey was performed for each of the 820 structures in the AOI. The information collected during the windshield survey was used to identify the first floor elevations, construction materials, and use of each structure. This data was used as input for the Marshall and Swift (M&S) Residential and Commercial Estimator programs. These programs combine the field information with depreciation tables to estimate the depreciated replacement value (DRV) for each structure."

- 1) Please provide a definitive answer as to how can the City use any remaining budget for those voluntary measures that are not fully utilized due to lack of participation in the plan? You've previously indicated in writing that a 20% scope change is the extent at which that is limited by the law, but the definition of that change was not definitive. In connection with this answer, please inform as to whether the City will have flexibility to direct remaining budget for other flood reduction measures that are not defined by the TSP.

USACE Response: Janet and Matt have reached out to several planning experts as well as USACE's National Nonstructural Committee in researching a response to the Council/Commission's question #1. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be a black and white answer, which we understand is frustrating. The short answer is that there is some flexibility to direct remaining funding to other flood risk management features included in the TSP, and that flexibility is generally granted and/or approved (when necessary) by the USACE Vertical Team (VT). However, there is less flexibility to direct remaining budget to flood risk management features that were not included in the TSP or authorized in a Chief's Report. As stated in our previous answer to this question, Section 902 of WRDA 1986, as amended, limits the extent of the changes to a 20% scope change, which can be defined by a several parameters including cost, outputs, environmental impacts, or other metrics (but is most commonly defined by increases in the total project cost estimate). Ultimately, we have less flexibility to materially alter the scope or function of the authorized project and cannot exceed the cost limit established by Section 902 for the project. Based on the extensive coordination that we have done with our Division and the Council and Commission and the level of transparency our team has had with everyone, we generally have a good feeling about our path forward.

The way that our PDT understands the flexibility that we were originally discussing can best be described with a hypothetical example with whole numbers. If the NED plan includes a detention basin plus 40 nonstructural (20 elevations and 20 floodproofing) for a cost of \$30M (\$20M for elevations and \$10M for floodproofing) but only 10 of the floodproofing residents want to participate (with a cost of \$5M), can the other \$5M reserved for the non-participants be used to elevate another few homes?

The short answer to that question is probably, based on our discussion with other Planning folks, as long as that funding is allocated to a feature included in the TSP and authorized plan. I think Janet and I are both tracking that that \$5M could not be used for a structural measure that was not identified in the NED plan (such as channel and bridge modifications or DB3). While we understand thinking of funding for the project as a pot that can be divided out into interchangeable solutions that solve the problem, it is more accurate to consider the funding in the following way: this feasibility study will result in a Chief's Report that requests authorization and appropriation for a project, a project that includes features like a detention basin plus nonstructural mitigation of structures. If Congress gives USACE authorization and funding, we have to use that funding within the confines of the Agency Decision. So if the Agency Decision could recommends the NED Plan (DB4 + nonstructural), we could not use the funding appropriated by Congress on DB3.

This example demonstrates why it is vital that there is a level of vagueness and approximation in the report when it comes to specific structures so that there can be flexibility in the selection of structures (partly based on participation by the public). Regarding flexibility of funding within nonstructural measures, we have flexibility in design during the Pre-construction Engineering & Design (PED) phase. During PED, we'll do further analysis and try to optimize to allow the most people who want flood risk



management measures to have the option to participate. At this point, we can't explicitly say what implementation/funding changes are possible with any given level of participation. The optimization process during PED will be further fleshed out after the TSP is selected at the ADM.