MINUTES PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING June 6, 2013

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Mr. Andy Lee Ms. Ann Peters Dr. Ray Puri Mr. Steve Reichlin Mr. Anthony Stanton Mr. Rusty Strodtman Mr. Bill Tillotson Mr. Matthew Vander Tuig Mr. Doug Wheeler

II.) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. WHEELER: All right. Everybody good with that? Everybody in favor, say aye. Opposed, same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

III.) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. WHEELER: May 9th and May 23rd. Are there any corrections needed?

MS. PETERS: Yes. Let me see if I can find them quickly. Adjustments on -- corrections on Page 2 of May 23, 2003 [sic] minutes: First sentence from me, Had an attendance report either -- report should've been in attendance and either. Second line -- I can hand you this to look at when I'm done.

MR. VANDER TUIG: Okay.

MS. PETERS: Of should've been for attendance, and on the fourth sentence down, the second that was it. Those are the corrections, and if there aren't any other adjustments, I'd move for approval.

MR. WHEELER: Any other corrections needed? Motion's been made for approval. Second? MR. REICHLIN: Second.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Reichlin. Motion's been made and seconded. Everybody in favor, say aye. Opposed, same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. WHEELER: Before we begin this evening, let me welcome our newest member, Anthony Stanton. Mr. Anthony Stanton will be our newest member. Welcome, sir.

MR. STANTON: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Picked a good evening to start.

IV.) SUBDIVISIONS

13-66 A request by Dell Jones, LLC (owner) for a variance from Section 25-48.1, which requires sidewalks to be constructed on the abutting side of any street adjacent to plats approved after January 1, 2001. The subject site is located on the southwest corner of Waco Road and Brown Station Road. (*This item has been carried forward from the May 23, 2012 meeting, due to a lack of quorum.*)

MR. WHEELER: May we have a Staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Steven MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the following variances, subject to the applicant installing an eight-foot wide sidewalk along the southern approximately 287 feet of Lot 201, Dell Jones Plat 2, to connect the existing five-foot wide sidewalk to the southern property line:

(1) Variance from Section 25-48.1 of the Subdivision Regulations

(2) Variance from Section 24-35 of the Streets, Sidewalks, and Public Places Ordinance

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of Staff?

MR. STRODTMAN: I have a question. The proposed sidewalk is going to be an eight-foot sidewalk. And then the existing sidewalk is four feet?

MR. MACINTYRE: There's an existing sidewalk; I believe it's five feet wide.

MR. STRODTMAN: Five feet?

MR. MACINTYRE: And that was done in an earlier platting phase. They actually had a plat one to -- Dell Jones Plat 1, which originally created that center lot, and then he came back and replatted the property or required more -- included more into that plat. And it was after that plat, which was, I believe, finalized in 2005, that the sidewalks were never constructed along Brown Station Road. So there was that existing sidewalk in place at the five-foot standard already. That would need to be widened as part of a future city road project. And, again, it's, if I recall correctly, a six-year project estimated timeline on that road project for the entire length of the property on Brown Station Road, and it goes down quite a ways.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any additional questions of Staff? Seeing none, this is not a public hearing, but it has been our practice to open it up if you have any --

MR. MURPHY: Kevin Murphy with A Civil Group, offices at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court; I'm here representing Dell Jones, LLC. And, again, I think that this is something that -- we've had several issues out here and how to build this so it didn't have to get torn out with the upcoming road project, which would be intersection improvements at Waco and Brown Station, and then a future project, which still isn't quite funded, which would be the remainder of Brown Station south to Stark Lane, where it's been improved previously, and then north to Route B. It's just really given our client heartburn that he would have to pay to put something in for the City to come back and tear out and -- pay to tear out and reconstruct again. So we've been doing our best to come up with a reasonable option here, and we've worked with Public Works to -- or are working with them to come

up with an elevation for this pedway that we're proposing on the south half, to get it in so hopefully it won't have to -- anything would have to happen to it in the future. There may be some utility relocations, so I'm not guaranteeing that it's going to be there for -- all part of it are going to be there throughout the project, but -- yes. And the Public Works Department has a pedway planned on this north and west side of Brown School, so it ties in to the pedway on the south side of Waco that eventually goes west down across the park property and towards the school.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. Any questions of the speaker? Thank you, Mr. Murphy. All right. Commissioners, discussion? Who wants to lead off this evening? Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: I think it seems to be pretty clear and common sense not to ask the applicant to install something and then the City come along later, six years, and tear it out, so I plan on supporting it.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: I just echo that sentiment. I think it's pretty cut and dried as far as I'm concerned. I'll support it.

MR. WHEELER: Was that a motion that I heard in there?

MR. TILLOTSON: Make a motion. Or Ann's finger was first. She can do it.

MR. WHEELER: Ms. Peters, do you have a comment you'd like to make? I'm sorry.

MS. PETERS: I'd be happy to make a motion unless Mr. Tillotson would like to.

MR. TILLOTSON: No. You go right ahead.

MS. PETERS: I would move for approval of 13-66, a request by Dell Jones, LLC for a variance from Section 25-48.1 and for a variance from Section 24-35 of the City Code, which requires sidewalks --

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. PETERS: Let me --

MR. WHEELER: If I may --

MS. PETERS: Yeah. Go ahead.

MR. WHEELER: I'm assuming -- is that -- I'm asking, is that subject to Staff's recommendation, installing an eight-foot sidewalk for 287 feet on Lot 201?

MS. PETERS: I was getting there.

MR. WHEELER: Oh, sorry. I rushed you.

MS. PETERS: It's complicated. That would be with Staff's recommendation of approval of the following variances: Subject to the applicant's installation of an eight-foot sidewalk along the southern border, approximately 287 feet, of Lot 201 Dell Jones Plat 2, to connect to the existing five-foot sidewalk to the southern property line.

MR. WHEELER: All right.

MR. TILLOTSON: I'll second.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson. Motion's been made and seconded. Discussion on the motion? Did you get all that, sir?

MR. VANDER TUIG: I think so.

MR. WHEELER: All right. When you're ready.

MR. VANDER TUIG: We have a motion and a second for approval of a variance on Case No. 13-66, approval for a variance to Sections 25-48.1 and 25-35, contingent upon the applicant installing an eight-foot wide sidewalk along the southern approximate 287 feet of Lot 201.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Lee, Ms. Peters, Dr. Puri, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Vander Tuig, Mr. Wheeler. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WHEELER: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

13-72 A request by The Crossing-EPC of Columbia (owner) for approval of a three-lot resubdivision to be known as The Crossing-EPC, Plat 2. The 24.14-acre subject site is located on the south side of Grindstone Parkway, west of Rock Quarry.

MR. WHEELER: May we have a Staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Steven MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the final minor subdivision plat.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of Staff? Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: Just a quick one: There's a house on that one piece that butts up to Rock Quarry. Are they -- is that planned to be torn down as well or is it --

MR. MACINTYRE: I believe they do have plans to tear that home down and put a driveway entrance onto Rock Quarry Road, along with additional parking.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any other questions of Staff? Seeing none, this is not a public hearing, but if there is someone with tidbits of wisdom -- seeing none. Commissioners, discussion? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: This seems pretty straightforward to me, and unless there's some conversation that other Commissions would like to have, I would move for approval.

MR. REICHLIN: I'll second.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Reichlin. Motion's been made and seconded. Discussion on the motion? When you're ready.

MR. VANDER TUIG: We have a motion and a second for approval of Case 13-72 for approval of a three-lot resubdivision to be known as The Crossing-EPC, Plat 2.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Lee, Ms. Peters, Dr. Puri, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Vander Tuig, Mr. Wheeler. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WHEELER: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

V.) PUBLIC HEARINGS

13-79 A request by Collegiate Housing Partners, LLC to rezone approximately 1.25 acres from R-3 (Medium Density Multiple Family Dwelling) to PUD-90 (Planned Residential Development maximum 90 unites per acre), to approve a PUD Development Plan to be known as "The Residences at Fifth and Conley", and to grant variances to maximum building height, minimum perimeter setbacks, minimum landscaping/open space, required parking, and required public right-of-way width on adjoining public streets. The subject site is located on the northern half of the block bounded by Conley Avenue, Fifth Street, Turner Avenue, and Fourth Street.

MR. WHEELER: May we have a Staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Patrick Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the requested PUD 90 rezoning request and PUD development plan, subject to their revisions as stated below, as well as action on the five requested variances as stated below.

1. Variance in the required number of onsite vehicle parking spaces. **Denial.** However, if the Commission supports the request, it is recommended that:

a. A parking space agreement be executed securing 50 additional parking spaces and the SOI be modified to specify that **no less than 165 spaces** will be provided in a combination of onsite and offsite spaces. Such agreement is to run with the land and to be finalized prior to second reading at Council.

2. Variance to the 25-foot perimeter setback. Denial.

a. Staff would support, based on the infrastructure upgrades:

- i. 0-foot front (along Conley)
- ii. 1-foot side (on Forth Street)
- iii. 4-foot (on Fifth Street)
- iv. 5-foot rear (south property line)
- 3. Variance in the amount of required landscaping and open-space. Approval.
- 4. Variance in structure height. Approval.

5. Modification of the SOI to correct the maximum number of units based on the revised "net" acreage after right-of-way dedication.

6. Building permits be withheld until additional pedestrian impact analysis has been provided to the City Traffic Engineers.

MR. WHEELER: Are there questions of Staff? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: Can Staff tell me what the University has for parking, whether or not they have available parking in the evenings, on weekends?

MR. ZENNER: That I cannot, Ms. Peters.

MS. PETERS: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: I have a similar follow-up question. Do we know how many parking stalls are provided for the Mark Twain dorm that's next door to the --

MR. ZENNER: That is actually surface parking, and there is surface parking to the north and the west of the building, but I do not know the total number and I don't know the total number for Lewis and Clark either. They definitely are not enough to support their resident populations.

MR. STRODTMAN: So we don't know if they have a 70 percent ratio or any logical approach to that?

MR. ZENNER: To the University, no. I think what I understand at least peripherally is if you're a student, you may be given a parking pass, possibly as part of your activity fees to either the football stadium, to the Hearnes Center, or somewhere else where you are during season, if I am correct, required to remove your vehicle from those parking facilities in order to be able to leave space for the visiting alum and folks that are coming for sporting events. The Conley parking garage, I'm not sure what the capacity is left within it either, but I can tell you some of the other University structures that we typically would see folks going to we have been told are full. Now, they're probably not much different than the City, that we overbook parking facilities, because not everybody drives every day. Therefore if you oversell the facility, unless you're all going to descend on campus at the same time for the same parking space, you're likely always going to have some parking space available.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Additional questions? Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: Was it City's recommendation to implement the mini roundabout or was that out of the traffic study?

MR. ZENNER: That was actually something, if I am correct, that came out of -- I believe it came from the City because I think the traffic study referred to -- and I didn't review the traffic study personally. I think the traffic study referred to the fact that there may have been needed a signal. The volumes associated with it from a traffic perspective were considered low. Due to a death within CBB, who was the traffic engineer contracted for the study, there was a shift in the responsible engineer for the traffic report that was actually produced. And the discussion that occurred prior to that death occurring actually did specifically request that the pedestrian analysis be done. In the transition of the project, the following -- the passing of one of their staff's children, that did not quite get conveyed and that was the omission that was left. Now, our traffic engineers identified that. The mini roundabout was an idea that Richard Stone, one of our traffic engineers, had discussed with me and it was included in the comments provided back to the applicant for second-round revisions, which is what precipitated the additional road right-of-way being given.

MR. VANDER TUIG: Is it my understanding that's the reason for the setbacks is for the inclusion of a mini roundabout, should that be --

MR. ZENNER: That would be -- it would be actually -- it would be more for sidewalk -- tying the sidewalks in on the southwest corner of the intersection. There is enough land to the northeast, towards the parking structure and towards Mark Twain and the parking lot that is immediately to the east, that the traffic circle itself could be shifted over to be accommodated within the area. It's the tying in of the sidewalks, as it was conveyed to me, which was more of a concern and that's why the building -- they wanted the building to be pushed back as far as possible from the future road right-of-way so the tie-in and all of the elevations could be more easily accomplished. Originally, it wasn't for the full frontages, either Conley or Fifth, either. They were asking for an increased setback actually for the first 50 feet from the intersection on Conley and the first 80 feet along Fifth. The parcels are much longer in both directions and it was just to accommodate where, because of the flaring out of the road right-of-way, they were going to need that additional land area. Quite honestly, this is another one of those areas the judgment of the Commission is going to guide what we get in the way of setbacks. As it was conveyed to me, there was room for the roundabout to be shifted to the north and to the east, which would take the alignment of Fifth out of its current straight-line alignment and it would just shift it over. But coming into a traffic circle, I was led to understand, that does not present as much of a problem if we were trying to create a real 90-degree geometric intersection, if we were going to try to do signalization.

MR. VANDER TUIG: Thanks.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any additional questions of Staff? I had requested -- is this the R-3 count?

MR. ZENNER: Yes.

MR. WHEELER: Parking in that 264 is if it were --

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. 264 is the actual total amount. You take the bike parking credit out and you get down to the 249, which is the requirement. So that is the R-3. That's the standard R-3, so when we looked at making the variance -- when we produced the variance request, the variance request was based on the maximums and the require -- and the minimum provided and the maximum required by R-3. So that is where you get the variance of 134 parking spaces.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you. Any other questions of Staff? All right. We're going to open public hearing, however I want to discuss our rules of engagement first. The first speaker will get six minutes; subsequent speakers will get three. The applicant has asked for some flexibility with the first two speakers; we'll split the nine minutes, and so we'll just time that out as nine minutes and you guys can use that as you want. Our first speaker, if there is opposition this evening, will get six minutes and subsequent speakers will get three. With that, we'll open the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. HOLLIS: Robert Hollis, The Van Matre Law Firm, attorney for the applicant. May I pass out some handouts?

MR. WHEELER: Absolutely. You're going to have to give us your address as well.

MR. HOLLIS: It's funny. I just told Brandt, I said, You have to give them your address. MR. WHEELER: And you still haven't.

MR. HOLLIS: 1103 East Broadway. I apologize for the poor print on the changes. Excellent, organized, thorough presentation, as usual, by Staff, makes it a lot easier for us and hopefully we can get to questions sooner rather than later. Obviously, I'm here, Tim Crockett's here, Brandt Stiles is here. Also, two other members of the developer are here: Chuck Gillham and Tim VanMatre. There's just a whole load of details and minutia that it's really easy to get caught up in and I would like to attempt to focus on the big picture just for a couple of minutes and bring it up to speed as to how we got here. And as you're probably aware, this is the developer that basically saved the Niedermeyer property and was part of that process. After that occurred and while that was occurring, they listened to concerns, were searching for other properties, and they found this one. Based on that feedback, they chose this property. It's downtown, but still it's on -- or it's on campus basically, but still it's close to downtown. After finding the property, they initially worked with Staff rather than putting together a plan without consulting Staff, reached the plan in its initial stages and then continued to meet with Staff, contacted all of the adjacent neighborhood associations and then some as well as the adjacent property owners. They did it right is what they've done so far. The red star is the location. It really is basically on campus. The shaded area around the red star, the darker shaded area, is MU. It's also part of the city center and that's a designation that's in the Metro 2020 Comprehensive Plan, which you happen to be looking at the modifications to that. And I'll point out now, the modifications that are proposed don't change what we're presenting this evening. In general, everyone that I've spoken with and that I've heard that's been approached thinks that what's been proposed, that student housing in this location makes sense. And I'd be interested to hear why it wouldn't make sense in this location because, again, it's basically on campus, but it's not. So as Pat said, we thought C-2 made the most sense, but wouldn't have had Staff's support because lack of control, to a certain extent, and also probably more importantly because there are commercial uses that are permitted that are difficult to restrict in an open zoning. So we were left with PUD, that's why we have a PUD 90 which you've not seen before. PUD 90 sounds like it's something that's way out of the ordinary, but it's not. If the other student housing developments that have already been put in place were not in C-2, but were in PUD, you would see PUD 90s and 100s and other really high numbers. The variances wouldn't exist but for us having to cram this into PUD. There was just no other alternative. We wouldn't have the variances. As recent as the downtown charrette, which I think was maybe three years ago, and as well as in the updated comprehensive plan, it remains in the city center. A couple of highlights from how the city center is described in the comprehensive plan and will be described in the comprehensive plan even if it's amended as proposed, it's a quote: High density residential uses will be encouraged. That's part of what you're supposed to encourage in this area. Supposed to be pedestrian oriented and bicycle friendly; 90 spaces being provided, which is 75 more than would be required. What I thought was interesting, I'd never seen before, is

that it states that it's important to maximize residential opportunities because it enlivens the area, leads to wider variety of uses, safer streets, and less crime. That's pretty strong language in the comprehensive plan. It also speaks to parking and some other really helpful issues that are completely consistent with what's been proposed. And back to the big picture: The concept here is sound, and the concept, I believe, most reasonable people would agree with. It fits what is described in the comprehensive plan perfectly. Staff approves the land use. We have variances and, again, there's a whole bunch of minutia to talk about if you chose, but they only exit because it's crammed into PUD and we don't have anything else. They wouldn't exist if it was C-2. They don't exist because the plan is defective in any way. It just does. I'll pass it off to Brandt. And happy to answer any questions if you have any.

MR. STILES: Brandt Stiles, Collegiate Housing Partners, 7711 Bonham Avenue. Pat, thank you for the introduction. It was very detailed, and I appreciate all the hard work that City Staff has put into this so far. I'm director of development for Collegiate Housing Partners, and I just want to go over a couple basic items. One, student housing demand, also address the parking issue, and sort of identify how we see our development in Columbia and how we are really trying to identify with smart growth and promote some smart alternatives to encourage a pedestrian friendly environment. From a perspective of student housing demand in Columbia, I think everybody knows we've seen some enormous, rapid growth with the University and the population over the last ten years. That's expected to slow down, but not expected to decrease. We're still expecting growth over the next five years at a steady pace. Currently, the purpose-built student housing market the previous year was 99-and-a-half percent at least. We're seeing a strong preleasing for this next upcoming school year. Projected enrollment is increasing over the next five years. A good example of demand right now is the Domain property that was approved by the City and is coming online for August of 2014, and they were 100 percent leased in December of 2012 for an August 2013 opening. So we still feel that there is significant amount of demand and lack of supply for student housing in adjacent-to-campus locations, specific to those adjacent-to-campus, real, true, walkability locations. From a parking perspective -- and we all know this has been a hot topic. And we are doing as much as we possibly feel that we can to appease everyone involved in this. What we're proposing right now we feel I more than adequate. We're proposing the parking -- we proposed our initial parking based on what our demand expectations were; 124 parking spots meets right at 50 percent of the current requirement in the R-3 zoning. We've reached out to the City and we're working through an agreement right now to secure 15 [sic] parking spots in the Fifth and -- the large garage. That gets us to 174 parking spots or 70 percent of the requirement, as it is today. One of the concessions that we provided last minute to the City was additional right-of-way and additional street improvements. And those additional street improvements or expansions allow for us to have some off-street -- or on-street parking that, you know, we can't include in our calculation, but if you do look at that and include that in the calculation,

it gets to 77 percent of the required parking for our site. If you look at some of the student housing sites down to the south, one to two, three miles away, they're looking at -- they're typically not 100 percent parked. Columbia student housing parking is right about 80 percent, non-downtown stuff. So we're right -- we're right there. We're really, really close. And what we're proposing from a city parking perspective is giving the students the ability to store their cars in the city garage and provide a premium for onsite parking that, to date, no one has done in the downtown area. And we're doing this because we do know that there is a parking need, but we feel that the 50 percent parking requirement is where the market demand is right now. A little bit of extras on parking, and I think we're trying to promote smart growth, is I think our location is critical to the site. I don't think we could propose what we're proposing right now without the location. So some of the smart alternatives we're providing is the WeCar partnership with Enterprise Rent-A-Car. We'll have one to two, based on demand, parking cars for a shared car service, FastCat subscription, a minimum of 100 subscriptions to the FastCat, 90 bicycle spots, and an agreement to secure the additional parking with the City. Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Pardon me. Hang on just a second. Are there questions of this speaker? Actually, I'm sure we're going to have questions for you. I do have a question. You mentioned the parking pass. It was our understanding, or at least the way I read the Staff report, that there was an option -- or the applicant was holding an option to opt out of that bus pass. Is that, in fact --

MR. STILES: Not opt out of the bus pass, but we're purchasing a minimum of 100, and if there is excess demand above that 100, we'll give the students the opportunity to buy additional FastCat passes.

MR. WHEELER: But you're going to buy 100.

MR. STILES: We're going to buy 100. We're going to guarantee the --

MR. WHEELER: For what period of time?

MR. STILES: -- purchase of 100 spots.

MR. WHEELER: For what period of time?

MR. STILES: As long as there's demand for it, we'll continue to subscribe to it.

MR. WHEELER: All right. Are there additional questions of this speaker? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: I'm not very familiar with the We program. Is that what it's called? Are there age limits on that for drivers? I know rental car companies, you usually have to be 25 years --

MR. STILES: No. There's -- I know there's additional insurance requirements for anyone under 21, but it does allow for students over 18 to allow to utilize the WeCar program.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Can you give your definition of your purpose built student housing? You have a 99.5 percent occupancy. What is purpose built student housing?

MR. STILES: Student housing that was -- apartments that were specific to student housing. Typically, they'll have additional amenities and typically they're owned by larger institutions that we've looked at over the last ten years. We've seen about 70 to 100 [sic] student housing -- purpose built student housing beds go up; 6,500 of them are down south and about 1,000 of them are in downtown area.

`MR. STRODTMAN: Was there any factor considered for duplexes, single-family residences, all the other types of --

MR. STILES: The available market data was based on purpose built student housing.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Stiles, good to see you. These sound great. Are these amenities for the duration or basically the lifespan of your building or is this just to get your foot in the door and then, like, three years later all this stuff kind of disappears? What is your --

MR. STILES: Specific to the most recent items on --

MR. STANTON: WeCar, FastCat, and I heard something about the bike sharing kind of rental process.

MR. STILES: Sure. Bike share program, we're looking into and working with PedNet right now, the City, and if we can't work out a deal with them, we feel that we're going to bring a bike share program in internally. Will these last the lifetime of the project? If they're successful and if they're useful, absolutely. If there's no demand for these, we will not keep them. But we are going to make a very conscious effort to include this in all of our marketing material, to promote the FastCat system, to promote the WeCar program, and encourage people to bring bicycles. So we're going to do everything we possibly can to help promote smart growth and help promote these specific smart alternatives.

MR. STANTON: So are these options in the rental agreement, your lease agreement with your tenants? Are these options or are they baked into your price?

MR. STILES: The FastCat is going to be first come, first serve. The WeCar will be a third party that we'd be partnering with that they can contract directly with the third party. The bicycle spaces will be free; they'll be included in the pricing. And the bike share program will be through a third party.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Just to expand on Mr. Stanton's question, how long is your contract with the City for those 50 additional stalls?

MR. STILES: We're working through the agreement right now. We're comfortable with a twoyear agreement and the agreement will have an opt out if we can quantify lack of demand for those spots. If it's not being used -- if those spots aren't being used by the students, then we'll have the ability to opt out.

MR. WHEELER: Are there additional questions? Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: In regard to the WeCar, who's paying for the additional insurance? You or the student?

MR. STILES: The student will be.

MR. LEE: The student will. Are you charging the student for the parking in the garage -- I mean, in your building?

MR. STILES: Yes. Absolutely.

MR. WHEELER: Additional questions? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: What is the fee that you have for parking with the City? What's the rental fee per stall?

MR. STILES: It's anywhere from -- it ranges depending on if we want a dedicated parking --

MS. PETERS: Do you have an average?

MR. STILES: -- spot or not. Let's just say it will probably be right around \$60.

MS. PETERS: Sixty a month?

MR. STILES: (Nodded head.)

MS. PETERS: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: This is the second time I've seen your rendering, elevation, and so I'm just going to tie you to it. Is this what we're going to see if you get your way?

MR. STILES: This is what we have right now. We don't have architectural drawings. We're prohibited from having architectural drawings because we didn't know where our setbacks or our right-of-ways were going to be. We are encouraged to and we do plan on having a predominantly brick facade. I can't bind ourselves to this specific. We spent a lot of money on these designs and I think it's absolutely beautiful and we're going to do everything we can to bring something to Columbia that's as comparable to this as we possibly can. I'd love to see this exact one.

MR. WHEELER: Any other questions? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: To follow up a bit on this, one of the reasons that we push this point is because we get shown pretty pictures a lot and the final result is -- it appears to be a bait and switch on many occasions. Can you tell me what the flying saucer is on top?

MR. STILES: As we said, it's conceptual. I've had a couple comments on that too and it's --I'm not saying that it's final.

MS. PETERS: The reason I ask is I'm concerned about safety of students when they're on the roof. And I don't know if they have access to that from --

MR. STILES: No students will have access to the roof. The pool and the amenities will all be on the second floor.

MS. PETERS: Oh, okay. Good. I was worried about them having a little too much fun and --MR. STILES: Yeah.

MS. PETERS: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: All right. Any other questions of this speaker? Thank you, sir. We appreciate it.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett with Crockett Engineering Consultants, 2608 North Stadium. I'm going to talk really quick here. I apologize. Mr. Wheeler's only giving me three minutes, so I'm going to cover several items. The first one of the things I'd like to talk about is we have met with the University. We think it's very important that we include the University in our planning for this project, given that we're -- you know, basis that we're providing to students of University and they're so close. We want to make sure that our traffic study and our overall master plan or our plan fit in with their master plan. We met with representatives of the University. They gave us, basically, a thumbs-up. They liked our idea, liked our concept, and said that it did fit in with their overall master plan for the area. Furthermore, they shared with us their traffic model for the entire campus. That's important for our traffic engineer to incorporate in our traffic study so that we can get a very comprehensive traffic analysis for the entire area. So we think that's very important to make sure we included that, as well as what the City had with regard to the counts as well. Pretty much the traffic study came back -- it came back really well. One of the main concerns that they had was how are the adjacent intersections in the subject area going to be -- how are they going to be impacted? When it came back, all the intersections within the study area were going to operate at a level of service A or B. A is the highest, and seldom do we have a lot of level of service As. We had all As or Bs in this area after the development took place. One important thing to note that they noted was that the movements and the traffic patterns from this development do not conflict with -- or do not compile with all the other traffic movements in the area. Basically, it's going to be in opposite directions. If we have -- in the early morning, if we have students leaving the site, it's going to go against the traffic coming into the downtown area. So we're not going to put a lot of additional traffic on top of the problems that already exist, unlike a development that would be further out in the outlying areas of Columbia. That traffic would be compiled on what already exists. I would like to briefly talk about some variances. Of course, talk about the 80-foot structure, the setbacks -and this is one thing I want to talk on quite a bit here is that the setbacks that we're asking for -- we would ask for that we have the variance as requested. We believe that this is an urban style development. Given that additional setbacks -- understand -- respectfully understand where Staff is coming from by adding one additional foot on Fourth Street, a few extra feet on Fifth Street, and then, of course, no setbacks on Conley. We feel that we can work together within the parameters of the additional right-of-way that we are granting and the land that we have left to accommodate any additional improvement, mainly the addition of the roundabout, as well as the additional pavement that's being placed. That additional pavement in place will create 18 new parking spaces. We're going to install that. Given that, we can work within that parameter with that back of curb with the sidewalk and our building, to be copasetic so we don't need additional setbacks. We feel very strongly with that. Fourth Street's the same way. We're adding one foot. We feel that we can work within those parameters very well, as well as with Fifth Street. Fifth is the big item because it is the wider street. It does have the additional roundabout. And the concern that Staff has with regard to

trying to tie the sidewalks back into our development, I think we would feel a little bit more agreeable to Staff it we didn't already grant an additional ten foot of right-of-way. Typically, we'd only grant five foot additional right-of-way, given that that would be a 50-foot total cross section for the total width of right-of-way. In this case they've asked for some additional width; so by granting the additional width, allows for the offsite improvements to take place as well as the construction of our building, with the associated sidewalks. So we feel very strongly that we can incorporate all parameters of this project with the setbacks that we've requested. Again, you've seen the plan. I think it's fairly straightforward. I think there has been some concerns with the area is -- and I see Mr. Wheeler is cutting me off there. So with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MR. WHEELER: I got so involved in your explanation, I let you run over. Laying down on the job. Are there any questions of this speaker? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: Some of the other developments that we have -- most recently have a few traffic flow problems with loading zone and that kind of stuff. Is there any plan on the first floor parking to have, you know, the ability to drop people off so that the flow is better and --

MR. CROCKETT: Right. I believe there's going to be some internal locations where we can do that. If you come in, you can drive through the parking structure. It's not going to have dead ends to it; it's going to flow through so that you're always going to have that through movement. It is limited access. We only have one access coming into it. The second access shown on the plan is for the dumpster location. I think there's a little misconception early on about what that was. That was for our dumpster enclosure. It's internal to the development. But there are some locations inside the building with regard to internal circulation of the parking structure.

MS. PETERS: On student load out and load in, is there the ability to do that within the parking --

MR. CROCKETT: With regard --

MS. PETERS: Meaning there's usually a lot of activity on August 1st when they're moving in and --

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. The stalls are going to be wide enough so we can dual lane traffic. We're always going to have high volumes on move-in and move-out days. We can put additional parking inside the structure for larger vehicles that's going to come and load and be there for a minimal amount of time while they load and unload. Yes, absolutely.

MS. PETERS: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: I'm curious. The Statement of Intent says 115 stalls and yet we've been told there's 124.

MR. CROCKETT: The plan right now, Mr. Wheeler, is for 124. We fully believe that we can get that 124. The Statement of Intent we put 115 just as a lower number just in case something took place that we needed to lower that slightly. But we have full intentions of going the 124 if at all possible. That's what our plan is right now. That's what our layout is right now, is for the 124.

MR. WHEELER: All right. Any additional questions of this speaker? Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: Can you speak to the concern by City Staff with regards to the pedestrian traffic --

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. Absolutely. That was not something that we necessarily overlooked or something that we wanted to neglect. I believe Mr. Zenner briefly alluded to it. Our traffic engineer had a tragic death of the loss of one her small children in the middle of this project and so it's kind of passed on to another engineer. We fully concur with the Staff recommendation that we'll work through the pedestrian connectivity with this development and the adjacent walkways to campus and get those concerns ironed out with the traffic engineers for the city of Columbia before we apply for a building permit.

MR. VANDER TUIG: The level of service though, that does not take into account pedestrian movements?

MR. CROCKETT: It does. I believe the level of service does take into account pedestrian movements to some degree. I think that what they're really looking for is they want to see our traffic patterns and just make sure that, you know, we have adequate crossings marked, adequate locations, and then, of course, adequate sidewalks in the areas as well.

MR. VANDER TUIG: And what's your feeling on the mini roundabout, because it's my understanding that that's not necessarily the best situation for pedestrians.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. We don't -- it's not our -- it's not our choice of controlling that intersection. We would prefer -- I mean, even -- I think Mr. Zenner alluded to a signalized intersection. I don't think that was the case. I believe it was just a full stopped intersection. We feel that would probably be the best route, given the low volume of traffic, for that intersection; however that's going to be a call on the City's behalf on that mini roundabout. That's not something that we're installing or we're being asked to install. That's going to be a call at the City level, but we would prefer another method. But, again, it's not our -- not our call.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any other questions of this speaker? I have a question. I'm just going to direct it at you guys and whoever wants to answer it. But as I understand Mr. Crockett's presentation here tonight, you are -- you do not -- or are requesting that we, I guess, not follow Staff's advice on the setbacks.

MR. CROCKETT: That is correct. We -- you know, correct me if I'm wrong, if you would, but it's my understanding that we would like to ask for approval of the plan, subject to the conditions that Staff has put on us, except for the setback requirements. We would like to have the setbacks that we had originally proposed, which is four foot instead of five foot across the south property line, and then zero-foot setback -- no setback or zero setback across the street -- the three street frontages. And that's basically because of the additional right-of-way that we have granted. I think that on our view we originally had a request in there to grant a variance for not granting additional right-of-ways across, well, all three streets. And we have conceded that, granted additional right-of-way. And

given that, that's tightened our box even further, and so we feel that we can work within the parameters with no setback, if allowed.

MR. WHEELER: Just trying to get an idea how somebody ought to frame this.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MR. WHEELER: If that were the case. So the other one would be that 165 spaces, which includes 50 spaces that you're to lease from the city, which we haven't pinned down how long yet, but that 165 spaces, you're not arguing that. I just want to get a clear picture for whoever comes up --

MR. CROCKETT: No. No. I don't --

MR. WHEELER: -- and speaks next.

MR. CROCKETT: -- believe we're arguing with that at all.

MR. WHEELER: All right. So -- you can't do it there. You can come up. No. I'm just saying you have to come to the podium and you have to tell us who you are again because for some reason we can't remember.

MR. STILES: Brandt Stiles, Collegiate Housing Partners. In regards to parking on the contract with the City, it would be a long-term agreement and it would be contingent upon us being able to prove that there is no demand for those parking spots.

MR. TILLOTSON: Don't go away yet.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: I just wanted to clarify: So if the setbacks that the City's asking for is not granted, you'd still have the 18 parking spots on the street.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

MR. TILLOTSON: So now we're at 192. 124 plus 50 is 174, plus 18. Okay.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. Are there any other questions of --

MR. TILLOTSON: I have one more question.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. Mr. Tillotson.

MR. TILLOTSON: Have you been approached by the University to rent any of those spots, like a block of rooms?

MR. STILES: There is essentially an opportunity.

MR. WHEELER: Any other questions of this speaker? Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: It's probably for Mr. Crockett. And I'm still trying to get a grasp of whether the setbacks that are being requested by the City are because of the envisioned mini roundabout or would the roundabout fit within the right-of-way that you have given at the Fifth and Conley.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Vander Tuig, we have not been provided any information regarding the mini roundabout. However I'm very confident that the City has installed similar type mini roundabouts within a 60-foot right-of-way before. Typically, a road such as Fifth would require 50-foot total right-of-way. The City wants 60 foot of total right-of-way, which we have -- we originally asked for a

variance to leave it at the existing 40 foot; however, we have conceded and given an additional ten foot of half right-of-way so that the overall width of that could be 60. It's my belief and understanding that a mini roundabout could be installed within the 60-foot right-of-way. The exterior sidewalk, the urban style sidewalk, placed on the back of curb, and still be in conformance and we could still build our building in the appropriate location and still not have any impact.

MR. VANDER TUIG: To your understanding, that's the reason for the request?

MR. CROCKETT: I don't nec-- I don't think it's the -- I don't -- it's not why -- Mr. Zenner can correct me if I'm wrong. It's my understanding that the request is not so the mini roundabout could be built. It's just so that they have assurances that everything could coincide outside of the right-of-way if the mini roundabout is built. Not necessarily to actually build the roundabout. It can be built without the additional setbacks. They just want to make sure there's additional space for tie-ins.

MR. VANDER TUIG: I see. Thanks.

MR. WHEELER: Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: Would Staff like to do a follow-up on the reasoning behind Staff's --

MR. ZENNER: Setbacks?

MS. PETERS: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: I think Mr. Crockett has adequately expressed what our engineering staff had informed me. And it's nothing to deal -- it had everything to deal with the tie-ins of the improvements outside of the road right-of-way, based on the construction of a mini roundabout within the current -- or within the dedicated right-of-way that we will be obtaining.

MR. CROCKETT: And we feel that we can build within the piece of property without the setbacks and still achieve that same goal.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you. Are there any other questions of this speaker?

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you. Additional speakers?

MS. FOWLER: Hello. My name is Pat Fowler; I live at 606 North Sixth Street. I'm actually speaking in favor of this, so I know my time will be limited. I just want to start out by saying a lot of the questions that you have a parking and the car sharing, I can answer because I work at the University and I am a member of the current car sharing arrangement that they have there. But first I want to say a couple of things that I have concerns about. The first is I have on occasion -- I don't drive an automobile every day. I ride my bike, I car share. But the times that I do drive to campus, what concerns me from a citizen's perspective and from an employee's perspective is those 18 off-street parking spaces. I think you actually make a situation more perilous for our students and our drivers. There's this delightful 20 minutes whenever classes change on campus. I obviously enjoy the students, and as they come out in mass from all directions, heading wherever they're headed, the fact that there are cars there will block our view to be able to see them. And we, as drivers on campus, know we need to slow down for them, we know that there's times when the classes change.

So if there's some way for you to revisit the placement of those 18 spaces when you do your pedestrian study, I would encourage you to do that because I don't think it's a good idea. I think you create a pedestrian friendly environment going back and forth. I don't like the space ship. I've told the gentlemen about that before. And the reason why is because, having worked at the University with our young people, if you build it, they will come, and someone will think that's a fascinating place to shoot their own YouTube video from the top of and they will find a way to get there. So I hope that you will rethink the space ship. We have other names for it, but we'll just leave it at that, the flying saucer. As far as the concern that I have talked with the developers about is whether or not the rest of that block will go to a second building, and if it does, I'll be back here expressing a lot more concerns than I will tonight. Because I think that it's the same size as a residence hall. It fits in perfectly. You can't get more on campus for an off-campus location. That is perfect to meet the needs for the students. As far as the swimming pool, I spoke with them because the report said it was going to be on the roof. I expressed my concerns about our students' safety, particularly when they're under the influence of alcohol, and they've reassured me that that pool will be on the second story. So I would like to see that memorialized in the documents, that that pool won't be on the roof. And then I am sad about the trees. I know they have to be moved. All of us feel some sadness about this, but we're also realistic. So now let me talk about the parking. There is not a better opportunity to promote and encourage a low car development for our students than this. They are uniquely positions, not only with Conley Parking Garage across the street and Turner Parking Garage across the street, but also with the cost-effective nature of what the University charges, compared to the City and compared to what the competitive price will be space inside this building, for our students to utilize their commuter parking passes at a modest cost of \$120 per year and move their cars in to Conley and Turner on the evenings and weekends, where everyone knows -- or they should know -that the University doesn't police those lots. It's a little hectic on football Saturdays, but the other times anybody can park there. The Newman Center does that. So as far as location-wise, they're also right across the street from the new Mark Twain dining hall, and there's a large number of our students that buy off-campus meal passes. And for a student who doesn't feel like they can get their food needs met, they walk across the street. They're also within walking distance of Lucky's market. As you know, there's a new market coming in. So I am pleased as a member of this community for an opportunity to have the perfect location for a low car development. And I'd be happy to answer your questions about parking on campus because I know the answers.

MR. WHEELER: Are there questions of this speaker?

MR. STRODTMAN: I've got a question.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Strodtman.

MR. STRODTMAN: So can you answer my question? If the University was to build a 354 resident hall, how many parking stalls would they provide?

MS. FOWLER: Well, let me talk about Mark Twain, because that was your question. There is some surface parking. You have to be -- have some pretty special reasons why you would be granted a permit for that. I, as a staff person, could not get a space there. If you were a person with disability or some other restriction -- our students are based on their number of credit hours. A sophomore has the least likely chance of getting a place on campus, and then it goes juniors and seniors. There are very few, if any, students parking in that lot adjacent to Mark Twain because the campus has already provided all those commuter lots and commuter lots closest to the buildings are for us, the employees, so we get to work on time, and then the other out lots, the satellite lots at Trowbridge and other places -- and it goes beyond the Hearnes Center. It goes beyond Faurot Field. There's lots of parking for our students in remote locations that are reasonably priced and they have a little shuttle called the Tiger Line and it runs them back and forth to it. So they do not provide parking for Mark Twain for the students that live there.

MR. STRODTMAN: So if they were to add a new dorm or they're remodeling a dorm or anything like that, how do they know they're giving ample parking?

MS. FOWLER: Well, I think Mr. Joy -- you probably know who Jim Joy is in the parking because he sat as one of our representatives on the Public Transportation Advisory Commission when I was a member of that -- and he will tell you that they have various strategies. They're trying to manage the existing parking they have. I don't know the answer to that. I don't work in parking and transportation. I'm a member of this community. I work at the University. I care about the safety of our students. And because I answer the phone and talk to moms and dads most of the time for the last three years, that's how I know so much about parking and housing and everything else.

MR. STRODTMAN: I understand. I was just asking because you said you knew parking, so --

MS. FOWLER: Well, I understand how it works at the University because I answer those questions for moms and dads.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: Yeah. I have a number, if I can read my handwriting.

MS. FOWLER: Please ask me about WeCars. I have a good answer for that.

MS. PETERS: Is that the car share?

MS. FOWLER: It is. It's changed its name and I can't remember even though I still use it. WeCar started in the fall of 2010. I am proud to say I was the second person to sign up for it. I use it regularly. Sometimes it's very popular and I have to plan ahead for when I reserve my hourly use of the car for \$8 an hour, which includes gas. It doesn't get any better than that. I have other car sharing arrangements, so it's not my only option. For students who are under the age of 25 or 21 or whatever their magic number is, they're relying on their parents' automobile insurance to cover that. For me, who has a non-owner's policy, because I'm over 25, I have to pay \$1,000 deductible if I do something bad to the car, but other than that, they have sort of a bridge relationship with the parents' automobile insurance to cover that and to come to -- to reassure the parents on that.

MS. PETERS: Where is the WeCars located?

MS. FOWLER: Where are they located?

MS. PETERS: Yeah.

MS. FOWLER: Right now there are two -- when the students are on campus, there are two at the student center and there are two behind Memorial Union. When the students are gone, they put them down to one car for those off times. But I have relied on it almost -- the only time -- they used to have hybrids and the batteries would die in the winter, and they got rid of the hybrids. Thank goodness. But the regular cars are -- it's a fabulous opportunity and they're used by the students. Again, I have to plan ahead, further ahead than I used to, in order to rent one.

MS. PETERS: What's the process for becoming a member or where do you go to get the keys? How does --

MS. FOWLER: The first year you pay \$35 and they credit it back to you for use in rental. The second year they make you pay the \$35. You have a magnetic system. It's a satellite. You swipe it over the glass, the door magically unlocks. You reach in, you get the key, you get the gas card to refill it, and you return it to its space within ten minutes of when you said you would or you will pay a fee.

MS. PETERS: Can you explain a little bit more on the University parking? I know I see a lot of it behind Hearnes, but I'm not real familiar with the system that they have for student parking. Can they park there on football weekends? Can they, you know --

MS. FOWLER: I used to work for the athletic department and they -- Friday, midnight, before the game, they put out a prohibition and they start towing cars if they're not out of those places where they've sold those spaces as part of the athletic department experience. So as far as -- but these remote lots, the students pay either a commuter permit, a garage permit, or a surface lot permit. And for a student, I have those costs: \$120 for a commuter permit, and that would be Trowbridge or one of the remote spaces.

MS. PETERS: So they park and they catch a shuttle back --

MS. FOWLER: A shuttle back or they walk or they ride their bike or however they need to do that. For a garage permit, if space is available and they have enough credit hours to qualify, it's \$168 a year. For surface lots it's \$144 a year, if they're eligible to get one. I personally, if I buy a parking pass, \$21 a month, 240-somthing, 52 dollars [sic] a year for staff, which is considerably less than what the City charges and considerably less than what the parking will be here and considerably less -- I've looked into the parking at Brookside, considerably less -- even what Remi (ph.) charges. Mark Stevenson charges his residences \$30 a month for parking adjacent to his places.

MS. PETERS: Do you currently use the city buses? I don't know if they're all called FastCat now or --

MS. FOWLER: I'm glad you brought that up. I do ride the city bus. I've had a pass at various times. I took one of the free passes for FastCat when they were giving out free passes. I really think it's unfortunate that this particular development is having to buy 100 FastCat passes. Now, the reason why is because look where these students are. There's no benefit to them to take a circular ride around campus. Now, I think FastCat is a good idea if it's redesigned. FastCat really would be fabulous if all of us could get to campus and back quickly on express routes. I've ridden FastCat; it is not an express bus. And quite frankly, I didn't feel very well when I got off of it because it kept turning around and around and around. It's not popular. You've heard anecdotally the students are not riding it. It replaced the Downtown Orbiter that I used to take in cold weather when it was icy and rainy, because I live adjacent to downtown. There's far fewer people on FastCat than there were on the Downtown Orbiter, at least the hours that I would be riding it. As an alternative, what I think would be a better idea -- and I don't know how much leeway you have in this, but there's going to be an impact. Even with all of these great opportunities, there's going to be students who think they can game the system and go park in the neighborhoods. Well, we have ordinances in place to keep that from happening. The cars are supposed to turn over every 24 hours. In my neighborhood, North Village and North Central, we have permit parking. I think it would be far better if part of this development agreement was -- because essentially they're asking them for an impact fee to fund FastCat for something that's really not practical for where these students are going to live. Some kind of a way of accumulating resources to improve the parking enforcement in the neighborhoods associated and adjacent to campus would be a far better idea. I don't know that's in your power, but that strikes me as an unfair requirement under these circumstances.

MR. WHEELER: And would probably net us more money.

MS. FOWLER: Huh?

MR. WHEELER: Probably net us more money.

MS. FOWLER: Well, you know, I think that if we are willing to redesign FastCat so it works, it could be fabulous. It is not right now.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you. We appreciate it. Are there any other speakers? Come on down, folks.

MR. ELKIN: My name's Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline Street here in the city. I didn't plan to speak, but when the WeCar came up -- I was hoping she'd elaborate. Is it a two-seated car, ma'am?

MS. FOWLER: Four.

MR. ELKIN: Four-seated. Over here for the developer or anyone interested, Mexico, Missouri, we have the WeCar, and WeCar is an electric car that goes 40 miles at 35 mile an hour on the charge or we have a choice of a 100 mile at 65 mile an hour. I was just thinking, if this was the electric version, they want to make sure that the students are in the 65 mile an hour vehicle, not 35, causing an accident. Because being a part of People's Visioning, we like to hear about electric, hybrid, anything that can change our world, cutting back on gas usage. I'm now driving a 2013 Hyundai

hybrid. This item does not require plugging in. On North Providence we have the Leaf, which is an electric car going 100 miles. We have the Chevy Volt that goes 100 miles. And this example I'm speaking of in Mexico is a 100-mile car. For any of you that might be taking interest in stepping up into the green side, consider these items. I have no other comment. I came in late, but I will say I heard these persons say a lot of negatives. They're presenting themselves. They should be speaking positives. Scrutiny from the past -- I was here when we was fighting the Regency mess -- please, please get the details of this effort going forward. Keep it on the right page so that we can all be proud of it. Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you. Are there any questions of this speaker? Thank you, sir. Any additional speakers?

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. WHEELER: Commissioners, discussion? Who wants to lead off tonight? Ms. Peters, thank you.

MS. PETERS: You're welcome. I'm in support of this project. I think it actually is a true smart growth project. I'm not concerned about having the maximum parking requirements. I think there's sufficient parking across the street and connected with the University. I think there are a lot of options here. I also think that a lot of the younger kids like the option of not necessarily having to have a car. And when you've got one that you can actually rent and not be 25 to be able to do so, I think is an added bonus. I think it's a good option for downtown, and I'm grateful the Niedermeyer is still there. I would, however, support Staff's recommendation. They usually do an extremely thorough job with this and they have been working with Public Works. But I would be happy to approve this.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: I'll jump in. I want to thank Pat Fowler for coming in and speaking because I think some of us up here are kind of on the fence a little bit. I personally love the project. I think we need to promote students coming to school -- I really don't want a bunch of kids coming to town with a bunch of cars, so the more we can do to kind of discourage that -- and that's an educational process, which is what I think Pat was bringing to the table is to -- and I think kids that would -- or young people that would want to live there are more apt to not have a vehicle or understand the need of the satellite parking spaces and utilize those more. When I was in San Francisco, the WeCar was called the Zip Car. There you could just walk down the street and if you seen one, hold your pass up and if it wasn't rented, the door would open and you'd get in and go. So there is a really neat concept. I do know projects like this are important to Columbia. Columbia's going to grow. This is, to me, the best project I've seen come down for student housing that we've approved. I mean, it fits everything. It fits the smart growth, which -- and we've got to think that way. We've got to look that way. And it provides the housing we need and it's obvious right now we're not getting enough housing because everything that's being built is being rented out as fast as its being built. So with that said, rather than ramble on, I would like to approve it, but I personally am not in favor of the

setbacks that's being asked for by the City. So I think we may have to bounce that back and forth here a little bit, but I will support the project.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: I'll follow that and I'll just say I think this is a good smart growth project as well. I don't have any issue with the parking as the applicant even proposed it. I think this is a good opportunity. Staff mentioned that this would be a good opportunity to see if this sort of development would be successful and I think not having the additional 50 -- although it sounds like the applicant is willing to give that a try, at least for a couple years -- would actually probably make that trial test even more feasible and successful. The setbacks, I don't see the need for the setbacks on Fourth Street or Fifth Street. If they can't fit the roundabout and the street sidewalks within that right-of-way, that may not be the appropriate application for at the intersection. I don't necessarily agree that that's the right approach for meeting any sort of pedestrian concerns either. I think a signalized intersection is much safer. The rear setbacks, I can kind of see the need for that, but I'd like to hear what other Commissioners feel about that. And so with that, I'm going to support this project.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Reichlin?

MR. REICHLIN: First, I'd like to thank the applicant for whatever efforts they may have expended in the transfer of the Niedermeyer to another owner. It was -- I don't know if jewel is the right phrase, but it's obviously something that had a lot of sentiment generated with the prospect of it being demolished. And I'm glad also that the applicant didn't just give up on the community and look for another site for their project. I think market analysis has shown that the demand is there. I think it's unique to have this kind of development right on campus. In the real estate business, we all -- one of the first things we all say is location, location, location, and this couldn't be better. And on a historical note, it might be interesting to just mention that the Mark Twain building and the Lewis and Clark building at one point in time were privately owned until they were bought by the University some years ago. So I intend to support this and I think it's a good project. As far as the setbacks go, I really haven't looked at it and I'm kind of on the fence about how I intend to vote on that part of it, but in general I support the project.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: Well, as this Commission knows, I've been concerned about parking since we first started approving these student houses, and in this case I don't think there is enough parking with this project. I applaud them for the WeCar and the FastCat, but the cynic in me tells me that the FastCat passes are going to go away pretty quick and the garage -- or the 50 in the garage are going to go away pretty quick. I heard Mr. Crockett say that they're going to try for 124 spaces in the garage, but there could be 115. I just -- I don't think there's -- I think it's a good project; I just don't think there's enough parking and I think it's going to overload the neighborhood and I think there's going to be issues, as when the North Village -- when the Odle projects came in, there was a lot of people who were very upset because the students were trying to park in front of their house and in

their driveways and everywhere else. So I think this is going to be -- I think parking is going to be a huge issue. It's a great project, but I think we're going to have problems down the road.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll just add a few things. I think it's a very nice project. I thank the applicant for doing it. I think the parking, I'm content with a 70 percent, and hopefully we can get to that 77 percent. I think it's a lot better than what we've seen in some of the other projects. But I will say that similar to Mr. Wheeler and others is we definitely -- you know, I don't expect to see this exact picture, but I hope that we see a pretty close resemblance to this picture, or I would just say for future applicants, don't show us a picture that you have no desire to give us or it's going to become harder and harder for us to approve these deals. My other comment will be -- or two, I've got two comments. But my second comment would be I'm going to support the setbacks the City is asking for. I trust that they've looked at this considerably with the traffic engineers and I would rather be a little bit on the safe side. It's almost -- if the building is up on the edge, we'll never have the option of doing anything, so I'd rather have a setback now and at least give us an option. And then my last comment is I would really like to see the City and the University really try to figure out this parking together. And, you know, kind of going off -- you know, I do think that this project has ample parking, but I think as a whole -- and, obviously, I know that we're working with MU and the City to do that, but I think we really need to understand that together and make sure that as a whole we're providing parking and it's not on city streets for our residents. I plan on supporting the project.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Yes. I also support the project and I also support the Staff's recommendations. It's better to be safe than sorry.

MR. WHEELER: Dr. Puri?

DR. PURI: I agree with Mr. Vander Tuig on this project. I like the project. I like the building facade, minus the flying saucer, but I think it's a good project. I do agree with Mr. Vander Tuig, I think that the offsets that are required on Fourth and Fifth are not required. I do agree with him, the rear needs to be five feet, front can be zero, and that's what I would suggest. That's how I would like to see it developed. I think landscaping is okay as submitted. The height is good. This project makes sense. Parking doesn't bother me, as we've worked through this before a number of times, and I think the amount of space you're providing and then the garage spaces you're using is sufficient. I went to school here. I went to the -- you know, high school, University, I did my medical school here. I never took my car to campus. I mean, I was always -- you know, tried to keep my car away, so I don't think it's a necessity for you to have, you know, the car there. So even now, the requirement of living on campus for some time, there's other options there. You know, you would park away and then ride the bus into the campus, and that's what we usually did. So I'm okay with this project entirely, I think minus the setbacks, with the addition of the five-foot setback. I agree with the Staff on the back side. That's how I intend to support that.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you. All right. In my usual manner, I'm going to go as I took my notes. So the first thing I want to say is there's been a couple of folks who have mentioned our approval of these student housing projects, and to my knowledge we approved one. We didn't approve any of the others. And so that's off the table in my mind. As far as C-2 being appropriate here, absolutely not. I would agree that there -- this is an urban feel, should be an urban feel, but to say C-2 would be appropriate this far south of the city center -- and I understand the definition of the city center -- it is not appropriate. I would agree that the density is appropriate and this is exactly what we're trying to get. This is a great project, so when I start hammering you in a minute, I want you to know that it is a great project, and I believe it is. The right-of-way setbacks, I agree with what's been said here. I'm torn, but the back, you know, this could easily -- this area could easily -- this could be the opening of the door, so to speak, and we're going to have to be really careful in approval of this project that we don't see a domino effect here and have absolutely, you know, these -- just a few trees sticking up in a sidewalk. And so we are going to have to be careful. The back line for those trees, I think that's going to be necessary. So the elevation, this one is big deal for me. You know, we have -- as a community, we've been shown that we were going to get something every nice and, in my opinion, did not get what we were promised. Height, normally this would be a big sticking point. I find it interesting that we're talking about 80 feet over here and no one's -- it's like, yeah, it's okay, and I think it's okay. But I just think it's interesting that that hasn't come up. My sticking point on this thing is the WeCar thing, from what I heard, is there's four cars. During the off season, there's two. So that's not much, in my opinion, for 354 beds, which equates to 354 people, in my world. 264 parking spaces is probably overkill, frankly. However, we are talking about very -- you know, these students aren't your average broke student coming to town. I mean, \$750 a bed, if you can afford that, you probably have a car. And, in fact, I would argue that the likelihood, that ratio is probably higher for this particular segment of the student population. However, I believe that over a period of time we can educate our students and we can convince people that they don't need vehicles. But unfortunately, that three- to five-year window is going to get us, in my opinion. And so I'm really torn. I think you've put together -- you've done everything right, everything. We couldn't ask for more from an applicant to come in and do -- or try to do what you've done. There's some shortcomings that I just want to bring up because they got brought up. The bus system downtown, that thing's not working. In fact, I'd say mass transit in Columbia, Missouri is not working very well and needs to be rethought. University parking, I don't think that's a very good example. And I'm not picking on that example, but they don't follow any of our other rules, why would they follow this one? So it's just -you know, I'll probably make up my mind how I'm going to vote when Mr. Vander Tuig calls my name, but the parking is a big sticking point for me, as I've told the applicants that. So I'm interested to see how someone's going to frame this motion this evening with the setbacks and Staff recommendations, but I will leave that to one of you, and so who wants to --

MR. TILLOTSON: I just wanted to add a little --

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: -- something just real quickly. I don't know too many colleges that -- any housing around these colleges that has parking for students. I mean, it's -- you talk about the kids coming with cars, yeah. But their parents went to college and their parents tell the kids, You're not going to have a place to park, so you're going to have to work this out. You're going to have to work out a bus system. You're going to have to use satellite parking. That's part of living in a college campus area. That's just fuel for thought because we've got kids in college and I know what it cost to have my son park, so just a little added thought there.

MR. WHEELER: Who wants to give it a whirl? Dr. Puri?

DR. PURI: I'll try it.

MR. WHEELER: All right.

DR. PURI: Make a motion to approve Case No. 13-79, Collegiate Housing Partners, LLC rezoning PUD-90 and PUD Development Plan. Approval subject to modify SOI to require 165 parking spaces, 115 onsite and 50 offsite per agreement with the City; setbacks as zero, front, zero on Fourth and Fifth Street, rear five feet; approve landscaping variance to allow 9 percent landscaping; approve 80-foot max on building height; modify SOI to correct max units not -- due to change in net acreage; and restrict the building permit issue until the pedestrian impact analysis is approved.

MR. WHEELER: Motion has been made.

MR. TILLOTSON: (Indicating.)

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson seconds. Discussion on the motion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Did you say zero setbacks on Fourth and Fifth Street?

DR. PURI: Correct.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

DR. PURI: Because they have 60 foot of right-of-way that they can do that in and five foot on the rear is required because of the tree line.

MR. WHEELER: Any additional discussion on the motion? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: Comment from Mr. Zenner on --

MR. WHEELER: Oh, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Just want to make sure that Dr. Puri's motion is inclusive of making appropriate modifications to the development plan, which is also included with this. Or if you want to take that as a separate motion, as you have previously, we will need a motion on the zoning action to establish the Statement of Intent and the zoning, and then we'll also need a motion on the development plan, unless you desire to include it all together as one.

DR. PURI: Put it all together as one?

MR. WHEELER: You're making the motion.

DR. PURI: Okay. We'll include it.

MR. WHEELER: And, Mr. Tillotson, was there a second? Are you seconding his --

MR. TILLOTSON: (Indicating.)

MR. WHEELER: Okay. Discussion on the motion?

MS. PETERS: Yes.

MR. WHEELER: Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: I really like what they're doing here. I think it's a development that's very needed, but I am in support of Staff's recommendations, so based on the motion, I will be voting no. But it's not because I don't like the project, it's because of the detail

MR. STANTON: Yeah.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would agree. That's the only thing. If it's -- I support the Staff's recommendations, so I will not support it if it's as --

MR. WHEELER: Ms. Peters?

MR. STANTON: -- going out.

MS. PETERS: I would do a follow-up that if this motion fails that another motion be made.

MR. WHEELER: That's normal. All right. So motion's been made and seconded, unless there's additional comments on the motion.

MR. VANDER TUIG: A motion's been made and seconded for Case 13-82 -- oh, I'm sorry. That's the comprehensive plan. Not quite there. Case 13-79 --

MS. PETERS: I think this case number is 12-79. That's what my sheet says.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thirteen.

MR. WHEELER: Thirteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thirteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thirteen.

MS. PETERS: Okay. Typo. Thank you.

MR. VANDER TUIG: For Case 13-79 for a request by Collegiate Housing Partners, LLC to rezone approximately 1.25 acres from R-3 to PUD-90 and to approve a PUD Development Plan to be known as "The Residences at Fifth and Conley", and to grant the following variances: To modify the Statement of Intent to require 165 parking spaces, 115 onsite and 50 offsite per parking agreement with the City; setbacks as follows, front - zero, Fourth Street - zero, Fifth Street - zero,

rear - five feet; approve landscaping variance to allow 9 percent landscaping and open space;

approve 80-foot maximum building height; modify the Statement of Intent to correct maximum units allowed due to change in net acreage; and restrict the building permit issuance until pedestrian impact analysis is provided; as well as make the appropriate modifications to the development plan per the listed recommendations.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Dr. Puri, Mr. Reichlin,

Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Vander Tuig. Voting No: Mr. Lee, Ms. Peters, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Wheeler. Motion fails 4-5.

MR. WHEELER: All right. We get to frame another motion now?

MR. ZENNER: You can.

MR. WHEELER: Yes. Ms. Peters --

MR. ZENNER: But you just voted.

MR. WHEELER: -- do you want to try to frame another motion?

MS. PETERS: Yes. I will make an attempt. Move for approval of Case 13-79 with Staff's recommendation of approval of a PUD-90 zoning and a PUD Development Plan, subject to the revisions as stated below, which are variances required for the number of onsite parking spaces is denied, however, if the Commission supports the request, it is recommended that -- with 115 onsite and 50 onsite per parking agreement with the City. Got that? This is difficult. Okay. Variance to the 25-foot perimeter setback is denied, but Staff's recommendation is a zero-foot front along Conley, a one-foot side on Forth Street, four-foot on Fifth Street, and a five-foot rear, south property line. Approval of the landscape variance, a variance for the structure height, and modification to the Statement of Intent to correct the maximum number of units based on the revised net acreage after right-of-way dedication -- or deductions. And a building permit would be withheld until pedestrian impact analysis has been approved.

MR. STRODTMAN: For simplicity, the only change was the setbacks?

MS. PETERS: Yes.

MR. WHEELER: Per Staff recommendation.

MS. PETERS: Per -- yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: On a previous -- I second it.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. A motion's been made and seconded. I have broke protocol here, I think, by doing this, but I think this is where the Commission wanted to go. And so is there a discussion on this motion? Mr. Vander Tuig.

MR. VANDER TUIG: We have a motion and a second for Case 13-79 for rezoning from R-3 to PUD-90 and to approve the PUD Development Plan to be known as "The Residences at Fifth and Conley", including a modification to the Statement of Intent to require 165 parking spaces, including the 50 offsite per the parking agreement with the City; setbacks as requested by City Staff, zero on the front, one foot on Fourth Street, four feet on Fifth Street, and five in the rear; approve landscaping variance to allow 9 percent landscaping and open space; approve 80-foot maximum building height; modify Statement of Intent to correct maximum units allowed due to change in net acreage; and restrict the building permit issuance until pedestrian impact analysis is provided; and including the appropriate modifications based on these recommendations.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Peters, Dr. Puri,

Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Vander Tuig. Voting No: Mr. Lee, Mr. Wheeler. Motion carries 7-2.

MR. WHEELER: Recommendation with Staff's modifications, I guess I'll call it, will be forwarded to City Council.

MS. PETERS: Question?

MR. WHEELER: Yes, ma'am?

MS. PETERS: This goes to the consent agenda? Am I correct in that?

MR. WHEELER: Yes. I believe there was seven votes for approval, so it will go on the consent agenda. But I have not doubt that there will be discussion on the Council level. But, yes, it would go on the consent agenda, should they just decide to move forward.

13-82 A request by the City of Columbia to adopt a new comprehensive plan entitled "Columbia Imagined - The Plan for How We Live and Grow". This plan will replace Metro 2020, adopted in February 2001, and will provide land use and policy guidance for residents, professional staff, and appointed and elected officials. The plan period extends through the year 2030. The document may be amended from time to time in response to changing conditions.

MR. WHEELER: May we have a Staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Patrick Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the plan.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. You ran over.

MR. ZENNER: By how much?

MS. PETERS: Ten minutes.

MR. WHEELER: No, more like 20, but who's counting. Questions of Staff? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: My first involvement in city affairs was being a part of the visioning process and I worked on land preservation. And I'm sorry I didn't do this sooner, but it occurred to me today that I should probably compare the action steps and potential roles or stakeholders in it. Can you tell me if in the plan the actions and the participation of stakeholders that have been listed in here have been compared to what was listed in the visioning process?

MR. ZENNER: We have not directly compared them at this point, Ms. Peters. That can be something we would look at. What I can tell you is when we developed the policies that really framed the implementation table, we went back and did the comparison of the goals and the objectives of Imagined Columbia's future as it related to all of the elemental areas. The task force had actually compiled that for us. And then we looked at the responses received from the public through our goal and objective setting phases. And we believe that there is a pretty strong -- there is a very strong correlation between the two documents. The actors and the participants to facilitate our action steps, we would imagine are very closely aligned, but we have not specifically done that at this point. What we believe necessary is we wanted the public to help us define the priorities and then basically

provide the Commission with this document in a form that was almost fully complete. And this particular element is obviously one that may be the final touch that we need to just make sure that we haven't overlooked a particular group that may need to be related to a particular plan element that we need to try to implement.

MS. PETERS: I did look through it since I had some more time just recently. I would like to commend Staff for the incredible job that they've done. Obviously, I've been involved in this since the visioning and it didn't occur to me, because this has been an incredibly long process, to actually compare. One of the things that pops out is there was the request to form a land preservation authority and it talks about funding and that kind of stuff. And as I was involved in the visioning, I know how much work the citizens put into it. There was significantly greater turnout for the visioning than there has been for the comp plan, and I can personally say I think it's community fatigue. So with that in mind, I think it might be a big boost to the people that participated in the visioning and I think it's fair to compare that. So if Staff could, I would greatly appreciate that.

MR. ZENNER: We'll do so.

MS. PETERS: And it's just the implementation chapter. Everything else is, you know, good. MR. WHEELER: Are there any other questions of Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. WHEELER: All right. Commissioners, discussion? I think we have before us what, you know, has been a long time coming. Staff has done a very good job for us, I believe, with the exception of that one text change I pointed out to you guys a moment ago. But other than that, I think our staff has really worked their tails off and we've done everything we can to include all of Columbia's citizens. And so you guys want to discuss this or you just want to vote on it and go on home? Dr. Puri?

DR. PURI: I just want to make a comment. I applaud you guys. When I asked you and recommended we get this plan out sooner rather than later, I think you guys did a wonderful job, and here we have a plan in June instead of waiting until October. And I think that goes a long way and I'd like to commend all your staff in accomplishing that. As much as it's painful to hear you for 50 minutes, the plan is much pleasure to look at, so I encourage all the community to look at the plan. Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Any other comments? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: I would move for approval if no one else has comments.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

MR. WHEELER: There's about eight seconds there, so I think Mr. Reichlin had his hand up first. So a motion's been made and seconded. Any discussion on the motion? When you're ready.

MR. VANDER TUIG: All right. We have a motion and a second for Case 13-82, a request by the City of Columbia to adopt the new comprehensive plan entitled "Columbia Imagined - The Plan for How We Live and Grow".

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Lee, Ms. Peters, Dr. Puri, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Vander Tuig, Mr. Wheeler. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WHEELER: All right. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. It will be on the consent agenda, although they'll probably discuss that too.

VI.) COMMENTS OF PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

VII.) COMMENTS OF STAFF

MR. ZENNER: Sorry. You don't want to hear me anymore. Yeah. I see the red light. Next meeting's June 20. You got your work session and a regular meeting on the 20th. And then the July 4th meeting, due to the fact that that is the next Thursday that you will have, if you will make motion to cancel that meeting due to the holiday, we won't be doing anything that day. Hopefully shooting fireworks off. Your agenda for June 20th however includes the Delta Delta Delta subdivision plat number one as a subdivision item. And then we have two public hearings, an annexation and a rezoning request, and then a rezoning request itself. Your maps for your rezonings, the Delta Delta Delta plat and then our RDM development limited parcel. This is out off of St. Charles Road, directly across from our boat dealer and some other development in this particular area. And then, of course, we have the rezoning here of the Waterford Building, which is off of Forum. This is basically the rezoning of the last parcel. This is a brand new building that was built at the end of Chapel Plaza Court, seeking to have that rezoned from O-P to C-P to allow for an art gallery that will be doing more retail services on the lower level of the building, which is currently not occupied. The upper level is an actual orthodontist's office. And unfortunately in the O-P zoning district, we do not allow retail uses, hence the reason for that rezoning itself. And this annexation is proposed to be brought into the city as a C-P plan -- as a C-P zone. We have C-3 directly across the street, C-3 and C-P across the street from it over here. That is the --

MR. WHEELER: Sonic.

MR. ZENNER: Sonic, thank you. It's the Sonic and the gas station is down here towards the interstate. That is all we have on the 20th. So if you will take a motion to cancel your July 4 meeting, we will make sure that the public will know that that is not occurring and we'll take it off of our calendar.

MR. WHEELER: You need a motion for that, huh?

MR. ZENNER: I do need a motion.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Lee, would you like to make that motion?

MR. LEE: I will make a motion that we cancel the July 4th meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission based on that July 4th is a holiday.

MR. STRODTMAN: I second it.

MR. WHEELER: Motion's been made and seconded. Is there any discussion on that motion? Everybody in favor, say aye. Opposed, same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

VIII.) COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

MR. WHEELER: Any comments? Again, welcome, Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: I'm sure you can see that we have lots of fun every Thursday -- or every other Thursday.

IX.) ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

(Off the record.)