

**TERM OF COMMISSION:** February Session of the February Adjourned Term

**PLACE OF MEETING:** Boone County Historical Society Museum Meeting Room

**PRESENT WERE:** Presiding Commissioner Don Stamper  
District I Commissioner Karen M. Miller  
Deputy County Clerk Michelle Malaby  
Public Works Director Stan Elmore  
Manager of Design and Construction Tom Ratermann  
Leo Hake, Division of Design and Construction  
Right of Way Coordinator Karin Carlson

The public hearing was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

Commissioner Stamper briefly summarized the history of neighborhood improvement districts.

Nineteen Bearfield Subdivision residents were present.

Mr. Ratermann stated the Bearfield Neighborhood Improvement District was formed in March, 1994. There are 28 lots on Bearfield Road. A variance from road right of way width standards was obtained. The petition circulated proposed a 22 foot wide pavement with a drainage ditch on either side (alternate "A"). The cost estimate is \$69,750. An alternate would be a 28 foot wide street with curbs and gutters on either side (alternate "B"). The cost estimate would be \$110,000. This public hearing is for alternate "A". If the neighborhood decides it prefers alternate "B", petitions have been prepared for circulation. If the Commission decides to proceed with this project, bids will be requested for both alternates and the contractor will be requested to keep his price quote open. If two thirds of property owners sign the petition for alternate "B" another public hearing will be held to determine whether to proceed.

Mr. Elmore explained an aerial photograph of the street, stating a turnaround will be constructed at the end of the road on property owned by the Boone County Regional Sewer District.

Commissioner Stamper submitted a letter from Tom Lata for the record.

Alyce Turner, 2194 Bearfield Road, stated residents want the road improved. Opinions differ on the form improvements should take. What kind of regulations will apply to the neighborhood five years from now? If the street is annexed into Columbia, will curb and gutter streets be required? In five years, will the County require the street have curbs and gutters? She does not want to pay to improve the road twice. She believes a curb and gutter street would be best. She is concerned about losing her yard and trees. Her household was not approached when the first petition was circulated. What kind of interest would be charged if the cost of the improvements is carried by the County for a period of time?

Commissioner Stamper stated it is his understanding a road has to have at minimum laid back curbs with an asphalt depth prescribed by the City in order to be maintained by the City.

Mr. Elmore stated the City has the standard that improved streets have curbs. There are roads without curbs around the fringe of the City, but they plan to improve the roads through tax billing as they have time and as neighborhoods cooperate. Property owners on unimproved streets can periodically be charged \$2 per lineal foot for maintenance.

Commissioner Miller stated the cost of interest is not known. Bonds are sold. The interest rate charged to the County is the rate charged to the neighborhood improvement district.

Randal Clark, 2174 Bearfield Road, stated he and his neighbor Kevin Alleman support alternate "B". In June 1994, he and Mr. Alleman petitioned the County for a variance to narrow the last 190 feet of the road in front of their two homes to 24 feet because they are concerned about the amount of yard and trees which could be lost when widening the road. Their request was denied. Ditches would result in a less attractive look to the neighborhood. There is a good possibility the property could be annexed into the City, which might require the road be upgraded. Does either

plan require the water lines to be moved? After streets are accepted for maintenance, what is the maintenance schedule and are there any additional costs to homeowners. Mr. Alleman noticed the plan shows the road ending at his driveway. There appears to be a two to four foot drop off. He would like to know what type of barricade will be used there and how convenient will it be for him to back out of his driveway? Where will the water at the end of the road go? Mr. Clark submitted a letter to the Commission summarizing his comments and a letter from Mr. Alleman.

Mr. Elmore replied he does not anticipate water lines will have to be moved. Some water meters may have to be moved. The street with curbs and gutters would have a finished surface about where the road is now. A road with ditches has to be built up. Once the road is accepted, the County will be responsible for maintaining the road. If the road is built with ditches, the County has to periodically clean them out. They have a tendency to silt in. Cracks in pavement are sealed. At the end of the road, posts will be installed. The road will extend a little farther west than current plans indicate in order to provide room for the last resident on the road to back out. There will not be a drop off. Fill will be placed at the end of the road if necessary. Riff raff will be placed six to eight feet beyond the pavement to break up the flow of water and slow it down.

Terry Schler, 2336 Bearfield Road, stated he favors alternate "B". After the road is paved, how will the approach to the driveway be handled?

Mr. Elmore stated they will probably recommend a five inch high mountable curb. Driveways will not be built unless residents request the work be included in the project.

Barry Poulton, 2210 Bearfield Road, stated Mr. Hake visited the property recently. He talked about lateral culverts off the south side which will alleviate drainage on the road by splitting it into three parts. One concern he and his neighbor have is when the culvert is put in, it will require removal of fence and part of a new driveway. Will the fence and drive be returned to their original condition? The plan does not show the lateral culverts extending much farther than they do now. Where the water comes out now, it spreads out in their yards and damages certain homes. They would like to make sure the culvert extends to a point where it will not damage their property. He is generally in favor of alternate "B". Mr. Hake indicated the road would either be at its present elevation or a little higher. Houses on the south side of the road are considerably lower than the present road. Will residents be responsible for any additional fill material to make yards contiguous with the top of the curb? Can the street be lowered so that water on the south side of the street will go toward the road rather than toward the houses.

Mr. Elmore replied where pipe is placed across property, whether it is on an existing or new easement, the County will describe in writing what it is going to do, provide the document to the property owner, and request acceptance. Fences and driveways will be restored to their original condition as part of the project. A curb and gutter street has a lower profile than a street with ditches. If the street is lowered on the south side, yards on the other side will be encroached upon and their driveways will become steeper. The proposed elevation is a compromise. Yards will slope from the curb at a "mowable" slope. Residents on the south side may want to slope their yard down in order to have it come back up toward the house.

Tom Lata, 2194 Bearfield Road, stated he favors alternate "B". He believes it is a better value. He did not sign the current petition. He believes the cost estimate on alternate "A" is low.

Mr. Elmore stated the estimate may be low, but it cannot be changed once it is in the petition.

Commissioner Stamper stated the estimate cannot be exceeded by 25 percent.

Mr. Lata stated he works for the State of Missouri and looks at a lot of roads. Ditches are often silted in. It was mentioned that the project would be bid while the second petition is being circulated. Can a petition be accepted after the bid is known?

Commissioner Stamper stated that has not been their practice. If alternate "B" is selected, a new petition will have to be submitted and certified and another public hearing held prior to bidding.

Denise Ferguson, 2209 Bearfield Road, stated Mr. Hake came by a few days ago to discuss the drain pipe that would run along side their house. There are three trees and a neighbor's fence there. If the trees are damaged or killed, who is responsible? They are concerned loss of the trees would lower the value of their home. Mr. Hake prepared another proposal which would place the pipe under the ground close to their home. It would extend to the middle of the yard to an open ditch. They do not want everyone's stuff flowing through the middle of their back yard.

Commissioner Stamper asked where does the water go now?

Ms. Ferguson replied there is a pipe that drains through a ditch along the side of their house.

Mr. Elmore asked is that where they would like it to continue to go?

Ms. Ferguson replied yes, but it would mean taking out the trees and a fence.

Mr. Elmore stated they discussed the situation this afternoon to try to arrive at a solution. Answering Ms. Ferguson's earlier question, if it is necessary to pay for the trees, the cost will be added to the project cost.

Ann Quick, 2227 Bearfield Road, stated her household favors alternate "B". Ms. Quick inquired what will the time frame be for the second petition?

Commissioner Stamper stated the petition is ready for circulation. The County will proceed as soon as the petition is returned.

Mr. Elmore commented the County will proceed with some work to put in the road with ditches in case the second petition fails. They do not want to delay the project. It should be possible to build either road this Summer.

Margaret Satterwhite, 2211 Bearfield Road, stated she is opposed to both plans and always has been. She wants the road to remain as it is. She does not want to lose her trees. She cannot afford to help pave the road. She would rather contribute a small amount toward grading and gravel for the road.

In response to a request for a show of hands, three households indicated they oppose alternate "A" and "B". One household favored alternate "A" and eight households favored alternate "B". One household was undecided. Those present agreed to circulate another petition.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Don Stamper  
Presiding Commissioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Wendy S. Noren  
Clerk of the County Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Karen M. Miller  
District I Commissioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda Vogt  
District II Commissioner