



WHERE COMMUNITY AND SPIRIT MEET®

## **WORK SESSION MINUTES**

A work session of the Kirkwood City Council was held on February 12, 2026, at 4:30 p.m. at Kirkwood City Hall, 139 S. Kirkwood Road, Kirkwood, Missouri. Present were: Mayor Gibbons, Council Members Jaksetic, Luetzow, Rheinnecker, Schaefer, and Zimmer. Also in attendance were Interim Chief Administrative Officer David Weidler, City Clerk Laurie Asche, Director of Public Services Chris Krueger, Assistant City Engineer Jennifer Brown, Director of Finance Mary Sprung, Police Officer Hance, and City Attorney Jackie Graves. Council Member McLean was absent and excused.

### **APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2026 WORK SESSION MINUTES**

Motion was made by Council Member Zimmer and seconded by Council Member Schaefer to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2026 work session meeting. The minutes were approved with all in favor.

### **MISSOURI HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM GRANT APPLICATION FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT**

Police Officer Hance addressed the Council regarding the Police Department's request for Council authorization to submit Missouri Highway Safety Program grant applications. Some of the discussion that took place is as follows:

- Grant funding supports overtime traffic enforcement with the goal of reducing crashes and improving safety in high-violation corridors.
- Council discussed past participation history, targeted patrol areas, coordination with neighboring jurisdictions, and expected enforcement hours.
- The Police Department has participated in in the program for a number of years.
- The grant does include enforcement in the City of Oakland.
- The approximate number of hours the grant covers is between 200-300 hours.

Council expressed support for the program and signed authorization allowing staff to submit the application paperwork.

### **WATER SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBER**

Motion was made by Council Member Schaefer and seconded by Council Member Zimmer to appoint Jeff Theerman as a member to the Water Sub-Committee. The motion passed with all in favor.

### **TREE ORDINANCE DISCUSSION**

City Forester Brandon Sly and Director of Public Works Chris Krueger presented the draft Tree Ordinance updates to the City Council. Some of the discussion that took place is as follows:

- Staff has worked with the Urban Forestry Commission and the City Attorney on updates to the Tree Ordinance to preserve the tree canopy in Kirkwood.
- **Item #1 – Purpose language revision.** Staff explained wording change was administrative. Change is stylistic with no policy impact.
- **Item #2 – Expanded purpose statement highlighting urban forest benefits.** Stormwater management, property values, and neighborhood character impacts



were discussed. Questions were raised on whether additional language strengthens enforcement intent or serves educational value.

- **Item #3 – Definition of CLEARCUT.** Discussion took place regarding the 75% threshold, 0.25-acre baseline, and 24-month timeframe. Question was raised regarding how tracking would occur and whether developers could stage removals to avoid thresholds. Staff explained enforcement mechanisms and canopy tracking methods.
  - Question was raised regarding if a resident were to want to clear cut their property if the City of Kirkwood could provide arborist services to the resident.
- **Item #4 – Heritage Tree definition.** Discussion took place regarding whether DBH threshold of eighteen inches was appropriate and whether Urban Forester discretion should be limited or remain flexible for historic specimens.
- **Item #5 – Updated invasive species definition referencing state agencies.** This would allow the Missouri Department of Conservation to define invasive plants.
- **Item #6 – Small canopy tree definition correction.**
- **Item #7 – Tree Manual definition update.** Discussion took place on this item giving governance authority of the Urban Forestry Commission and ensuring council oversight remained intact through ordinance adoption.
- **Item #8 – Removal of ‘TPP’ abbreviation.**
- **Item #9 – Reference updates within public tree section.** Edits align with broader ordinance restructuring.
- **Item #10 – Authority for City to plant trees in right-of-way.** Discussion took place regarding property owner expectations versus public benefit. Question was raised regarding if trees would be planted in the right-of-way. Currently trees are planted in the right-of-way, but this item gives the City the official authority to do so.
- **Item #11 – Updated language in tree preservation section.**
- **Item #12 – Added functions encouraging preservation of mature trees and regulating clearcutting.**
- **Item #13 – Expansion of projects requiring tree protection plans.** Question was raised regarding how demolition-only permits would be affected and whether small residential projects might face new administrative burdens. It was noted that a tree protection plan would be required for clear cutting a lot.
- **Item #14 – Creation of Tree Clearing Permit.** Discussion took place regarding fees, enforcement triggers, and fairness to property owners. Question was raised regarding how often clear cuts occur locally. Staff referenced recent tree studies showing only a small number would qualify.
- **Item #15 – Heritage Tree canopy credit of 150%.** Discussion took place regarding potential unintended consequences if credits reduce overall planting requirements too significantly. Question was raised regarding if language should be included in regards to how many years a heritage tree should be required to be kept alive. Staff can explore different warranties and timeframes.



- **Item #16 – Updated canopy coverage values for planted trees.**
- **Item #17 – Reference number updates.**
- **Item #18 – Increased replanting fee for damaged trees.** Discussion took place on deterrence versus fairness. Questions were raised about enforcement thresholds and inspection processes during construction.
- **Item #19 – Increased replanting fee when planting requirements are not met.** Discussion took place whether higher fees would incentivize planting rather than fee buyouts and how collected funds would be reinvested into the urban forest.
- Question was raised regarding the cost for a resident to hire an arborist. It is dependent on lot size.

After the proposed recommendations and changes are presented back to the Urban Forestry Commission, this topic will be placed on a future City Council work session agenda for further discussion.

### **PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY RENOVATION**

Director of Public Services Chris Krueger, Roy Mangan with Archimages, and David Lowell with Navigate presented the Public Works facility renovation plans. Some of the discussion that took place is as follows:

- The conceptual site plan and floor layout was presented, which included consolidation of warehouse operations, sanitation, streets, electric, water, fleet, and support services into a coordinated operational footprint, the mezzanine and office configurations, locker rooms, break areas, and support spaces intended to improve workflow efficiency and departmental coordination.
- A summary of the design development budget was presented. The initial design development estimate exceeded the previously identified \$8 million budget target, which prompted a value engineering process intended to prioritize operational needs while maintaining full departmental functionality.
- The revised construction scope is now anticipated to come in just under the \$8 million threshold, inclusive of general contractor markups, insurance, bonding, and core construction costs. Questions were raised regarding what assumptions were included in the revised estimate and whether contingency planning had been incorporated.
- A recommended construction contingency of approximately 10% was discussed. The final contingency levels would ultimately depend on bid outcomes and market conditions. Discussion took place regarding the current construction market volatility and the importance of maintaining flexibility within the project budget. Question was raised regarding if the contingency includes any of the non-construction costs. The non-construction costs have been accounted for as part of the full scope of the project.
- Separate non-construction costs were presented, including approximately \$100,000 in anticipated moving expenses, \$5,000 for appliances, roughly \$902,500 in professional services such as design, commissioning, testing, and owner



representation, and an estimated \$609,000 for technology infrastructure including fiber, surveillance, fire alarm, A/V, access control, and network equipment.

- Discussion took place regarding cost-saving measures achieved through reuse of existing building components. Office finishes, lighting, fire protection systems, HVAC components, elevator infrastructure, and existing furniture would be reused to the greatest extent feasible.
- Relocation logistics were outlined, including transferring existing fleet service bays, lifts, weld shop equipment, office furniture, and departmental tools to the renovated facility. Question was raised regarding how operational disruptions would be minimized during the transition and whether phased moves were being considered.
- The project schedule was presented, including completion of construction documents, permit submission, bid issuance, contract award timeline, construction duration extending into 2027, and projected move-in dates.
- Value engineering focused on maintaining operational functionality while aligning the project with available funding parameters, and additional refinements would continue as the project moves toward bidding.
- Question was raised regarding if there are issues with the current electrical service. The distribution panels and main distribution will need to be switched out.
- Question was raised regarding if space could be provided at the recycling center location for outside organizations to collect glass, aluminum and paper via bins. Staff will look at the layout to ensure it could accommodate the bins.
- Question was raised regarding if there is evidence storage included for the Police Department. Storage would be included in the wash bay building, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the main building could be utilized for additional storage.
- Question was raised regarding if the site proof fence currently site will be replaced. The current site proof fence will remain.
- It was requested that Council receive a cost break down of the non-construction costs of \$902,500 for professional services and \$609,000 for technology infrastructure.
- It was suggested that the gated entrance on Elliott be operational due to possible flooding along Leffingwell.
- It was recommended that the underutilized storm water retention pond be used for something else.
- Question was raised regarding where the Electric Department would store poles and transformers. They are currently being stored at the public works facility, but will be moved to the substations.
- Question was raised regarding if a backup generator was included. At this time one is not in the scope of work, but a transfer switch will be installed.

Staff will return with updated cost projections and operational details prior to final Council authorization.



## BUDGET DISCUSSION

Interim Chief Administrative Officer David Weidler and the City Council held discussion regarding the proposed FY26/27 budget. Some of the discussion that took place is as follows:

### **Capital improvement and street project:**

- The updated projections showed an imbalance within the proposed fiscal year infrastructure program of approximately \$14 million. Staff outlined two primary options for addressing the gap within the street construction and reconstruction program.
- Option #1 involved deferring the Kirkwood Phase I roadway project by one year. Option #2 would remove asphalt overlay rejuvenation work, and crack sealing. Staff recommends Option #1, which would align more with long-term pavement management goals.
- Deferring the Kirkwood Phase I project would not create a penalty with East-West Gateway funding and that the City could reapply for future funding cycles if needed.
- Question was raised regarding how delaying certain projects may allow the City to stabilize fund balances while maintaining core infrastructure priorities.
- Question was asked regarding reconstruction versus resurfacing strategies and the long-term impacts of postponing preventative maintenance. Deferrals were structured to minimize long-term roadway degradation while still achieving budget reductions.
- The Grant's Trail Phase I project could potentially be postponed to a future fiscal year while pursuing concurrent planning for later phases.
- Option #1 could reduce the projected deficit by roughly \$2.9 million and shift the budget outlook toward an estimated surplus of approximately \$1.8 million.
- Staff advised against pursuing multiple grant-funded capital projects simultaneously due to administrative and financial constraints.
- Police and fire capital items were discussed. Some projects are funded through dedicated revenue sources such as sales tax or property tax funds.
- Clay Avenue improvements could be delayed to future years, however, deferral could risk losing grant opportunities and would require reapplication.
- The Laverne Del Lane stormwater project remained fully funded through OMCI funds and would continue as planned.

It was the consensus of Council to move forward with staff's recommended Option #1 capital adjustments. Council requested that the revised budget scenario be prepared reflecting these changes.



**FY2026 projections and fund balances:**

- Discussion to place regarding financial projections presented in the FY2026 Projections and Fund Balances memorandum.
- Recent MISO margin calls required approximately \$1.5 million in funding to address Electric Department exposure, which affected projected fund balances.
- Reduced transfers from the Electric Department contributed to projected negative pressure on the General Fund and Capital Improvement Fund.
- Question was raised regarding whether receivables between enterprise funds were current and whether outstanding balances between Water and Electric were contributing to the financial projections. Receivables could be broken down further by aging categories and agreed to provide additional detail if requested.
- Question was raised regarding whether the wind energy contract or related energy initiatives were still moving forward and how those items may affect future financial projections. Planning for future energy strategies remains ongoing and will continue to be evaluated as part of the broader financial outlook.
- Staff presented a recommendation to transfer approximately \$4.302 million from the Water Fund to the Electric Fund to stabilize enterprise operations and maintain required liquidity.
- Discussion took place regarding available fund balance and whether unrestricted reserves could be utilized to stabilize projected deficits.
- Discussion took place regarding overall reserve levels and the projected General Fund shortfall of approximately \$1.2 million. Staff requested direction from Council on whether to consider additional cost reductions, potential service adjustments, or interfund transfers as part of balancing the budget.
- Question was raised regarding if staffing reductions were being considered. No immediate personnel cuts were proposed at that time.

The topic of budget discussion will be placed on the next work session agenda.

**MOTION TO CLOSE THE MEETING**

Motion was made by Council Member Zimmer and seconded by Council Member Schaefer to close the meeting pursuant to RSMo Chapter 610.021 (1 – Legal & 3 – Personnel).

Roll Call:

- |                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Mayor Gibbons              | “Yes”  |
| Council Member Jaksetic    | “Yes”  |
| Council Member Luetzow     | “Yes”  |
| Council Member McLean      | Absent |
| Council Member Rheinnecker | “Yes”  |
| Council Member Schaefer    | “Yes”  |
| Council Member Zimmer      | “Yes”  |



WHERE COMMUNITY AND SPIRIT MEET®

The meeting was closed.

### **MOTION TO OPEN THE MEETING**

Motion was made by Council Member Schaefer and seconded by Council Member Zimmer to open the meeting.

Roll Call:

Mayor Gibbons	“Yes”
Council Member Jaksetic	“Yes”
Council Member Luetzow	“Yes”
Council Member McLean	Absent
Council Member Rheinnecker	“Yes”
Council Member Schaefer	“Yes”
Council Member Zimmer	“Yes”

The meeting was opened. Since no further matters were to come before the council, the meeting was adjourned.

---

Laurie Asche  
City Clerk