



**The Harbors at Lake Chesterfield Homeowners Association  
Mayors Lake Meeting  
July 16, 2020**

**Wildwood Representation on call: Jim Bowlin (Mayor), Dan Flaschar (Ward 7)**

**Board Members on call: Nathan Hopper (Phase 2), Chris Schepis (Phase 1), Bob Kramer (Phase 4), Joyce Del Vecchio (Phase 4), Pat Ward (Phase 3)**

**Residents on call: Steve Krumrey, Mike Rothe, John Metz, John Moore, Cheryl Templeton**

**Also on call: Samantha Hoene (Community Manager)**

---

**General Discussion**

**Call to Order Time: 6:30pm via zoom**

**Mayor Jim Bowlin presents three options for the lake:**

1. Do nothing
2. Try to fix the leaks- believes that this is not the most financially feasible option
3. Focus on saving the portion of the lake that does not have the leaks (southern 2/3rds) and fill in the upper 1/3<sup>rd</sup> to permanently plug the holes and discuss putting in a park or something along those lines.

**Loose ends from the last meeting...**

- George Lindh's suggestion of an engineering option where a well is dug to replenish the water as it leaks. Mayor Bowlin reached out to the city attorney and Joe Vunich at Wildwood and it would not be permissible by the city to drill a well of that magnitude.
- What do the LCHOA covenants allow? There is no restriction on any of these options. To financially move forward 2/3 of residents would have to vote to increase dues or create a CID. If we want to proceed with option 2 or 3 we can look into creating a CID, with its own board.
- Tom Kelpel from Kelpel Construction gave a general number of \$100-200K to get option 3 done.

Pat- Would the park be a public park if we moved forward with option 3?

- Mayor- No it would be private, but if that is the route chosen it can be posed to the city to make it public and they would cover some of the cost. Not guaranteed the city would be interest, but it could definitely be presented.

Joyce- Can someone please clarify what 1/3 portion of the lake would go away in relation to building 1?

- Bob- Larger end of the lake; lighthouse to approximately somewhere between building 1 and the tennis courts

Steve- I don't think our subdivision would be interested in option 3 without getting a cost for option 2. We cannot move forward on just one of the options without presenting the cost to actually fix the lake. We are stuck at the scope of work phase and would need the city to help us with the scope of work to get preliminary bids.

- Mayor- The city can help with the scope of work preparation. I'm not sure who to go to for bids for option 2 though. Tom Kelpel originally mentions the option of a bladder under the bottom of the lake as an option.



**The Harbors at Lake Chesterfield Homeowners Association  
Mayors Lake Meeting  
July 16, 2020**

Bob- I don't think a bladder would work because it's being put on an unstable base. Option 3 of filling in a 3<sup>rd</sup> of the lake- where is the water going? It seems MSD would have an issue with option 3. And they would want to study it and that would lead to something like a 2 year delay.

- Mayor- My understanding is the drain and spillway would be extended and the volume of water would not be greater, although it could be released faster.

Bob- What about the option of putting in a dam somewhere? It still leaks, but it doesn't go down as far? The condo side would always remain full and a spillway would go to the other 1/3<sup>rd</sup>.

- Mayor- Based on my discussions this would cost more and it doesn't address the safety issues that were the city's original concern at the dam. We do not currently have a safety issue, but erosion at the dam cannot be ruled out in the future. The idea of building a dam does not help to address safety concerns down the road.

Bob is concerned that we would be losing the widest and largest portion of the lake and homeowners that back up to that portion of the lake would not be happy about now backing up to a park.

John Metz- We all want to have a lake. I agree with Steve that we need to have a cost for both ways. I don't think the flow will be a huge issue. We just need to get the cost both ways before we get ahead of ourselves.

George- Grouting could be an option. The alternative I would suggest is have an RFP to go out to grouting specialist. Also, I suggest an outline spec be created telling contractors from a point in the road (examples: center of Pierside or 900 ft from edge of the road). We should go direct to contractors.

- Mayor- Speaking pragmatically, 1. filling in the leaks has been tried before and it did not work. 2. We know based on the studies we have that the leaks at the northern end of the lake are pervasive and 3. In terms of least risk between option 2 and 3, option 2 is without a doubt more risky when to think about it in the position that you are taking someone's money for a project and likely getting the results you said you were going to get, option 2 is the most risky. I feel the chances of success with fixing the issues of the lake are very low. It causes me pause to entertain that.

Nathan- I think a lot of that is going to come from conversations with residents and getting people behind it. Without due diligence upfront and seeing what option 2 realistically cost, we are going to have a major uphill battle with residents. At a minimum we have to see what pricing is going to be before we can hitch our horse to one wagon. Then we can have a more distinct conversation.

John Metz- We've been here 33 years and we have seen many many leaks. People are sick of the leaks and dumping money into it. If we can get it fixed I'm all for it, but we are sick of the stink smell when the water goes down or having no water at all. We would like to see something on a more permanent basis, so if that means losing a portion of the lake, as much as I don't want that, I think that's the way to go.

Mike Rothe- I'm a visual person. I need to see a rendering of what would be left of the lake. I'm envisioning a parallel line from Pierside to distinguish the 1/3 filled in from the remainder of the lake. I'm sure that based on the leaks it can be made to look more natural. Can we make it look more natural and fill less in? Also, based on listening to John the depth at the southern end of the lake has been modified over the years by at least 8 feet. So, with option 3, could we dredge the south end and use that to fill the holes? We would want to get the southern end deeper again. Also, I think it's important that we see a rendering as well.

Steve- We need quality clay and I don't think that silt would work to fill the holes. We got lucky in the past because Dierbergs was clearing their land and that provided us with quality clay.



**The Harbors at Lake Chesterfield Homeowners Association  
Mayors Lake Meeting  
July 16, 2020**

- Mayor- These are all excellent points. Dredging is a great option, but yes it will also need more quality material to built up. I think it would be good to spend the couple \$100 to get artist rendering before presenting to homeowners so they can have something that they can “touch and feel”, see where benches would go, etc. for them to understand the concept.

Steve brought up the wetlands option as a 4<sup>th</sup> option we have had presented in the past. It was determined that they hadn't reached out to us about what MSD had to say and no one had contacted them to push the project further. The consensus was that the wetland option wouldn't work because of how fast the lake retains water, so a stream wouldn't really work out and the smell once the water did go down.

Mayor Bowlin: Here is the overall consensus of what I am hearing from the group:

1. I'll start the process with Joe V. determining the points or items that need to go into the RFP for both option 2 and option 3 and writing that up.
2. I'll try to get an artist rendering showing where the boundaries need to be, 2 dimensional for the time being.

Then we will have another meeting looking at the above two items to get a better idea of what direction we want to go in.

Joyce- RFP, can it be put in there that there is some type of guarantee?

- Mayor- I would suggest that we ask in the RFP if the leaks aren't fix or the filling in doesn't work what do you as the contractor plan to do at no cost to correct it.

Another zoom meeting date will be sent out in 30ish days, etc. by Mayor Bowlin.

Mike- Can you also include more clarity on the CID vs. funding by the homeowners and what all that entails for the next meeting? What do we lose in terms of control?

- Mayor- I'll put something together for that, but I'll just say there is a blank canvas with the CID. The funding isn't going to be any different, with respects to the residents, unless you were to get other subdivisions to participate. The CID has great flexibility in how it's structured and operates. We will talk in more detail about it at the next meeting.

Bob- Can we put rough timelines on the next steps?

- I tend to move fairly fast. I goal is to move forward as quickly as possible, but I can't determine anything after the next meeting.

**Meeting ended at 7:23pm.**