

CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC COMMISSION September 14, 2016

At the Traffic Commission meeting of University City held in the Heman Park Community Center, on Wednesday, July September 14, 2016, Vice Chairman Curtis Tunstall called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. In addition to Vice Chairman Tusntall, the following members of the commission were present:

- Jeffrey Mishkin
- Eva Creer
- Mark Barnes
- Bob Warbin
- Jeff Hales
- Derek Helderman

Also in attendance:

- Angelica Gutierrez (non-voting commission member Public Works Liaison)
- Sinan Alpaslan, Director of Public Works and Parks
- Police Department Sergeant Shawn Whitley (non-voting commission member Police Department Liaison)
- Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson (non-voting commission member—Council Liaison)

Absent:

• None

4. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Hales made a motion to move item 3, the Election of the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary to the bottom of the agenda to accommodate all those in attendance for other agenda items. The motion was seconded by Mr. Barnes and unanimously approved.

Mr. Tunstall asked for a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Hales moved to approve the agenda as amended and was seconded by Mr. Barnes. The amended agenda was unanimously approved.

5. Approval of the Minutes

A. July 13, 2016 Minutes

Mr. Barnes made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 13, 2016 minutes, and was seconded by Mr. Helderman. The motion was unanimously approved.

6. Agenda Items

a. <u>Centene Corporation Development Project – Forsyth Blvd.</u>

Ms. Gutierrez presented two traffic request forms from George Stock on behalf of Centene Corporation, requesting that the commission review and



comment on the Traffic Impact Study and the Parking Impact Study prepared by the CBB dated 7/26/2016.

Larry Chapman addressed the commission on behalf of Centene Corporation. Mr. Chapman presented the scope of the Centene project. He presented visual representations showing that the eastern end of the project in "tract 3" is partially in University City. Mr. Chapman explained that tract 3 was designed to provide parking for all of the proposed office space, provide 1.5 spaces for the residential units with overflow space from the office parking spaces and hotel parking spaces as well as 500 parking spaces for a 1000 seat auditorium. He indicated that the project accommodates auditorium use while other facilities are also in use. Mr. Tunstall then asked for questions from the commissioners and citizens.

Commissioner Hales asked if the proposed design as presented had changed since the University City Plan Commission meeting in July to include additional parking garage access to and from Carondelet Plaza as recommended in the Clayton Traffic Study. Mr. Chapman confirmed that an additional entrance and exit was added to the design accessing Carondelet Plaza. Mr. Hales asked if it was still being requested that a signalized intersection be installed at Forsyth and the Ritz Carlton service drive. Mr. Chapman confirmed that request is unchanged and they have agreed to widening the exit from Forest Parkway to Forsyth.

Ms. Gutierrez introduced Mr. Srinivas Yanamanamanda from CBB Transportation Engineers and Planners to present the traffic and parking study.

Mr. Yanamanamanda presented a summary of the CBB's findings. He noted that the CBB is also performing the traffic studies for the City of Clayton. Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that the estimated parking demand for the entire project will be anywhere between 4800 and 5500 spaces. The proposed parking structures provide a bit more than the projected need and the CBB believes the plan provides for adequate parking.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if there would be any on street parking changes on Forsyth where parking is currently restricted on the south side. Mr. Yanamanamanda indicated there would not be any changes. Ms. Gutierrez asked if there was available parking overflow during times of high demand to ensure that nearby neighborhoods would not be affected by excess parking. Mr. Yanamanamanda explained that when they calculated the parking demand, they add between 5 and 10 percent to that calculation and that from his perspective the available parking exceeds projected demand.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if parking would be open to the public for use by Metrolink users, Washington University, and members of the public. Mr.



Chapman responded that the garage would be paid parking and open to the public and noted that the garage was designed to have one space for every two seats in the auditorium which is more than usually recommended. He indicated that they have made a conscious effort to provide ample parking.

Mr. Hales said that he recalled from the University City Plan Commission meeting or Clayton Plan Commission meeting that the parking garage in subsector 3 would not have enough parking to accommodate demand during peak times and that during those peak times, overflow parking would be required to go to the subsector two garage and asked if that was still the case. Mr. Yanamanamanda indicated that the office building in subsector 3 would be served by the parking structures in both subsector 2 and subsector 3. Mr. Chapman said that the parking garage can only be so big that it becomes unusable. He indicated that the employees in the office tower in subsector 1 would be parking in the garage in subsector 1.

Mr. Hales asked Mr. Chapman if when the sub district 3 garage is full that they are confident that the overflow will park in the sub district 2 garage and not on Forsyth, or Del Lin or Northmoor or other nearby neighborhoods. Mr. Chapman said there would be two types of parkers, those attending an event and those working in the office tower and that those working in the office towers would park in their assigned garage. Mr. Hales stated that he had no doubt that the employees of the office tower with assigned parking spaces in that garage would be parking in that garage, but it was previously presented that the when sub district 3 was at full capacity, the sub district 3 garage would not have enough spaces and would require overflow parking in the sub district 2 garage. Mr. Hales asked if he was misunderstanding that. Mr. Chapman stated that sub district 3 does not have enough parking for all of the office building, all of the hotel and all of the auditorium but that the office parking would be split between two garages.

Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that they calculated the worst case scenario for demand.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if there is any proposed bicycle parking for the structures. Mr. Chapman said there would be 46 spaces for bicycle parking for the entire campus.

Citizen Katie Sprung (7358 Stanford Ave.) expressed concern about the number of bike spaces and pedestrian focus as well as overflow parking and traffic going onto narrow neighborhood streets nearby.

Dr. Warbin stated he had a question more about flow rather than the number of spaces. He said he hadn't seen any models related to traffic flow in and out of the campus with regard to Forsyth, with regard to the exit from the Forest Park parkway modeled on the activities that are going on throughout



the entire day and that impact should be considered. Dr. Warbin stated the reason he brought this up was that in the beginning of the summer, the Traffic Commission was asked to consider prohibiting left turns from the gas station on to Forsyth at Bland because it posed a potentially dangerous traffic problem. He indicated that the intersection is a chaotic mess at times. Dr. Warbin asked how the projected flow has been modeled in the interest of safety and traffic capacity.

Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that their focus for University City included the area east of Jackson on Pershing to the Forest Park Parkway and Forsyth to Big Bend Blvd. He stated that the exit to the Forest Park Parkway to Forsyth would have an additional 350 vehicles per hour during the morning rush hour and that represents the biggest increase projected in the study. The projections for traffic from westbound Forest Park Parkway to Pershing and Jackson is estimated to be 125 additional cars per hour during the morning rush hour. He stated an anticipated 65 additional vehicles coming to the Centene Campus via westbound Forsyth during the morning rush hour. He indicated that most of the traffic would be in the morning and evening. Mr. Yanamanamanda indicated that Bland at Forsyth would require being widened with a second left turn lane to accommodate the additional traffic. At eastbound Forsyth at Big Bend, he indicated they were recommending implementing a second right turn lane onto southbound Big Bend.

Citizen Eleanor Jennings (7055 Forsyth) expressed concern about the number of children in the neighborhood who regularly cross Forsyth and many of whom attend Lourdes. She also expressed her concern and observation that it is very difficult for cars to exit the gas station at Bland and Forsyth during the morning hours because of the existing traffic volume. She also expressed concerns about the difficulty pulling out of her driveway on Forsyth during the morning rush as well as the weekly trash pickup where trash cans are placed in street for pickup. She also noted that during the morning rush, Forsyth has a lot of parents dropping off children at Lourdes. Mrs. Jennings stated that 65 extra cars added to the existing rush hour traffic is a lot.

Mr. Hales asked how far back the two left turn lanes from the parkway extend and would they both be dedicated turn lanes. Mr. Yanamanamanda stated there would be two dedicated left turn lanes and one dedicated right turn lane.

Citizen Katie Sprung (7358 Stanford Ave.) asked what was being done to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian safety. Ms. Gutierrez explained that the plan presented is presented for comments, question and feedback and many of the concerns raised at the public hearing would be addressed by city staff and the Traffic Commission as the project progresses and included in the final design.



Dr. Warbin asked if the curve of Forsyth west of the parkway has a limited line of sight from the exit ramp and coming down Forsyth and that traffic eastbound on Forsyth has a difficult time seeing traffic at the Parkway/Bland exit which raises a safety concern that Dr. Warbin asked be considered. Mr. Yanamanamanda explained that the exit would be reconfigured to include another set of signals west of the Ritz Carlton service drive that would be coordinated with the signals at Bland creating a new much larger intersection area that would more or less function as one intersection. He indicated that would result in minimal traffic queueing. He expressed that he had no concern of making no right turn on red at that intersection.

Ms. Gutierrez asked Mr. Yanamanamanda to further explain how the traffic signal at the service drive would be coordinated with the Bland/Parkway exit signal. Mr. Yanamanamanda explained that when the light turned green to turn left from the parkway, it would be timed in such a way to allow for all traffic turning left to clear the intersection and turn left onto the service drive or clear the intersection. Ms. Gutierrez asked if the signals would be timed to allow adequate time for pedestrian crossings. Mr. Yanamanamanda confirmed that they would be timed for adequate pedestrian crossings.

Dr. Warbin gave the example that the yellow warning light that flashes for eastbound traffic on the Forest Park Parkway is helpful as to give a warning to oncoming traffic that the oncoming traffic signal which cannot be fully seen is either red, or about to change to red. He thought there would be insufficient space to provide a warning to eastbound traffic that the light is going to change on Forsyth at Bland/Forest Park Parkway. Dr. Warbin also expressed concern over the intersection of Pershing and Pershing where the old Pershing Ave. meets the larger Pershing with the median. He stated that traffic heading west from the neighborhood on Pershing connecting to the two land Pershing has a very awkward angle which requires a driver to turn almost completely around to see oncoming traffic and believes that presents a dangerous problem, particularly with additional traffic coming off the Parkway.

Mr. Hales agreed with Mr. Warbin that the intersection of Pershing and Pershing is a problem and he has observed on several occasions traffic from old Pershing westbound from the neighborhood failing to yield at the yield sign and asked staff if yield markers could be painted on the pavement.

Mr. Hales asked about the accuracy of the predictability of additional traffic on Jackson in particular, but the accuracy of their projections for additional traffic in general. Mr. Hales noted that he recently visited a woman who lived in Northmoor and noticed that traffic on Forsyth eastbound at 4:40 pm was backed up to Lee Avenue. When speaking with the resident on Northmoor she brought up the Centene project and he told her that after travelling on Forsyth, he understood why Northmoor closed the two eastern exits to the neighborhood and that they must have had a lot of traffic trying to cut through.



Traffic Commission 6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8560, Fax: (314) 862-0694

He stated that the Northmoor resident said that traffic continues to cut through Northmoor to Big Bend regularly, making illegal right turns onto southbound Big Bend. Mr. Hales stated that the reason he's asking about the accuracy of the CBB projections is that people will find the easiest way to where they are trying to go and the project will change the southern end of Clayton with office buildings and garages where there has never been that kind of density. He noted that while Famous Barr used to have considerable traffic at times, it wasn't the kind of peak-hour traffic that offices bring and asked how accurately the CBB can project these increases given the nature and location of this development. He asked how much traffic would decide not to use Hanley from the north to access Clayton and instead use Jackson between Delmar and Forsyth in the mornings and evenings and noted the residential character of Jackson Ave.

Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that they used the square footage of the offices, with the percentage of vehicles per person, and demographics and stated that he is very comfortable with the numbers provided in their projections.

Mr. Hales cited another example where Kingsbury Blvd. used to connect Hanley Road to Brentwood Blvd and it was a huge cut through which the City of Clayton ultimately closed at Meramec. He expressed concerns that the with all of the traffic volume to all of the other office buildings that Jackson may become an easier route not just for those headed to the Centene Campus but for other vehicles headed to other office buildings on the east end of the business district and that could change the character of what is a neighborhood street.

Mr. Yanamanamanda informed the commission that the projection for Jackson currently is 125 cars per hour during peak hours. He thought the intersection of Jackson and Pershing could operate with a 4 way stop up through about 200 cars per hour during rush.

Ms. Gutierrez asked Mr. Yanamanamanda to explain why they are recommending an additional lane on Forsyth near Bland. Mr. Yanamanamanda explained that the additional eastbound through lane would be proposed from Clayton east to Del Lin, where it would terminate as a right turn lane to Del Lin. He indicated this would help move traffic through the intersection at Forsyth and the Forest Park Parkway.

Ms. Gutierrez asked about a need to eliminate parking on Forsyth. Mr. Yanamanamanda indicated that there is not a request and the CBB feels that eliminating all parking on Forsyth is not practical and does not recommend the removal of parking east of Del Lin. Ms. Gutierrez stated that the city has an upcoming project to stripe Forsyth for bicycle lanes and asked if the increased traffic would pose a safety concern. Mr. Yanamanamanda indicated that it would not pose a greater safety concern.



Mr. Hales stated that he had recently been in a line of eastbound traffic on Forsyth that was travelling at a crawling speed that backed up single file all the way to Lee Avenue. He stated that he understands that CBB does not feel 65 additional cars would be a significant impact, but explained for the citizens who live on and near Forsyth and those in nearby neighborhoods who regularly travel on Forsyth, it seems hard to understand how 65 additional cars during peak hours would not make the traffic situation worse, or significantly worse and asked Mr. Yanamanamanda if he could explain that for those who don't understand how 65 more cars would not be a significant Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that most people associate traffic change. performance with queuing. He indicated in the case of Forsyth, there would definitely be queuing. In this case he said, their evaluation uses the average delay to evaluate traffic performance. Mr. Hales followed up to explain that the previous week when he travelled Forsyth at 4:40pm, traffic was backed up eastbound through the intersection of Bland/Forest Park Parkway. He stated the traffic trying to exit the Bland onto Forsyth was blocked by traffic stacked up through the intersection blocking traffic that was trying to turn left on to westbound Forsyth and noted that there is a lot of traffic exiting east bound from the Parkway at that time that is unable to turn due to backups. Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that they would be evaluating the traffic for six months after the project is completed and would coordinate the traffic signals accordingly.

Ms. Gutierrez pointed out that the report indicates the deteriorating traffic conditions on Forsyth is why the CBB is recommending an additional right turn lane from eastbound Forsyth to southbound Big Bend. Mr. Yanamanamanda stated the changes to both the lane configuration and synchronization of traffic signals would help with the traffic flow.

Ms. Gutierrez pointed out that St. Louis County would have to approve changes with the county traffic signals at Big Bend.

Director of Public Works and Parks, Mr. Alpaslan commented that the traffic signals on Forsyth between Bland Ave and Big Bend could be optimized but they cannot be synchronized because the fiber optic infrastructure is not in place connecting them.

Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that the lights could be theoretically be optimized manually.

Mr. Hales thanked Mr. Alpaslan for bringing up the traffic signal at Asbury Dr. and stated that he did not find anywhere in the report that addressed how the school zone and changing speed limits, active pickup and drop offs and traffic turning into and out of neighborhoods along Forsyth during school hours



might affect traffic flow and signal optimization. Mr. Yanamanamanda indicated that they did take into account those circumstances.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if the changing speed limits would affect the signal optimization. Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that one lane without traffic signals or stop signs could accommodate about 1500 vehicles. In this case, he indicated the traffic was under the threshold and could accommodate a change in speed limits, it would make a difference in capacity and the changes in speed limits would have some affect but would not change the level of service.

Citizen Tom Jennings (7055 Forsyth Blvd.) raised concerns about the existing traffic on Forsyth. He notes that he has seen traffic on Forsyth backed up all the way to Hanley Road and said he doesn't understand how 65 additional cars would not make it worse. He expressed concerns about the added left turn lane at the Parkway exit and that those cars would likely be headed to the buildings east of Hanley. He asked if both of those left turn lanes would be competing to turn left into the parking garage. He also expressed concerns about the addition of a left turn lane on eastbound Forsyth and Asbury and traffic going around the turn lane with the number of children that are regularly trying to cross the street. He stated that he lives on Forsyth and lives with the traffic every day and asked how many parking spaces would be eliminated at Big Bend to accommodate two right turn lanes at Big Bend.

Mr. Yanamanamanda explained that far left lane would turn left into the service drive and the second left lane would continue west on Forsyth and noted that each entry would be signalized with the addition of an additional signal between Lyle and Hanley on Forsyth.

Dr. Warbin pointed out that the additional signals would amount to having a traffic signal with the distance of a football field between each one. He expressed that he was less concerned about the amount of time a Centene employee was waiting at an intersection in Clayton than he was about the safety of kids and residents along Forsyth and the residents who live along Forsyth. Dr. Warbin stated that his experience has been that as it relates to traffic engineering, if they build it, drivers will overload it and raised the question about possible future development across the street.

Citizen Steve Arnold (7305 Forsyth Blvd.) stated that on a perfectly clear sunny morning, he could set up a stand to sell cigars and coffee to the traffic backed up on Forsyth. He stated he had a five minute conversation with someone sitting in traffic with his convertible top down waiting in traffic. He stated that when the weather is bad, the traffic is much worse and he could not see the reality in the report presented. He said that it was dangerous trying to turn to and from Manhattan Ave and in and out of driveways. He felt the report and their models were not consistent to the reality that residents



already experience on Forsyth. Mr. Arnold also stated that there were 5 other projects going on in Clayton with others planned, but that wasn't discussed in the report.

Mr. Hales asked Mr. Yanamanamanda to speak to the impacts of other developments in Clayton. Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that they project traffic growth through 2036 and stated that the CBB had included in their projections all of the projects in Clayton that have already been approved but not those that have not yet been approved. Mr. Hales stated that there are a number of other projects that are in the approval process and asked if they were included. Mr. Yanamanamanda stated that only those projects that were already approved were taken into consideration, not those which are still pending.

Mr. Hales asked Mr. Yanamanamanda if they had referenced previous traffic studies performed in Clayton to examine whether the projections have been accurate.

Citizen Katie Sprung (7358 Stanford Ave.) commented on the growth of the business district in Clayton and stated that we don't have the traffic infrastructure to accommodate such a large business district and urged them to consider the concerns raised by residents.

Mr. Chapman stated that the reason the came to the commission was to hear the feedback of residents. He stated that this project presents a unique opportunity because one developer is planning the entire project which presents a better opportunity to address parking and traffic in a comprehensive manner rather than the parcels being broken down into smaller separate development projects over time. He stated that they want to be part of the planning process and addressing the concerns that are raised. Mr. Chapman stated that Centene would produce 2000 jobs with an average \$73,000 salary. He stated that if their employees want more bicycle parking, they will install it and that they are working with Metro to improve the Metrolink connections. He urged citizens to take advantage of the planning process to ensure the best outcome. He reiterated that they are here and listening and want to build the very best development possible.

Ms. Gutierrez requested that the traffic commission provide a list of question to present to Centene through the Plan Commission.

b. Disabled Parking System

Ms. Gutierrez presented a proposal and traffic request from Mr. Bwayne Smotherson to change and update the disabled parking system in University City and change the way disabled parking spaces are established for specific residents. The requested change would assign a residential disabled parking space to a specific resident's disabled parking permit. She indicated that the



requested change came about because a new resident began using a space that had been applied and approved for another resident, leaving that resident without a disabled place to park near her home. She stated that staffed recommended approval of the changes as presented.

Mr. Smotherson explained that he had researched disabled parking systems and found that St. Louis City assigns permits for residential parking spaces to ensure that the residential disabled parking spaces are available to the person whom it was provided for.

Commissioner Mishkin clarified that the proposal is to assign specific residential disabled parking space to a specific person. Ms. Gutierrez confirmed.

Mr. Hales asked what would happen if the person with the approved disabled parking were to move. Ms. Gutierrez stated that there would be annual renewals for the spaces and the signs would be removed if no longer needed. Mr. Hales asked Ms. Gutierrez to confirm there would not be any cost associated with the permit or renewals. Ms. Gutierrez confirmed there would be no cost associated.

Mr. Mishkin asked if this would affect residential homes only or city wide. Ms. Gutierrez stated that it would apply to residential neighborhoods and possibly churches.

Mr. Hales asked if staff felt there were any reasons not to make these changes. Ms. Gutierrez indicated there were not.

Mr. Mishkin asked if we did not change the ordinance, that the existing disabled parking system would only allow those who are disabled to park in those spaces.

Councilman Smotherson explained that recently experienced situation is unique. He reported that a couple had requested and received two disabled spaces across the street from their house on a narrow street that only allows for parking on side of the street. He stated that a resident moved into an apartment across the street and began parking in one of the two spaces leaving the couple who applied for the disabled spaces with no place to park near their home. He indicated that he had made several attempts to work with the new resident so that she could apply for a space as well, but his efforts were unsuccessful.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that the city had made contact with the new resident and asked that the resident consider parking in the vacant lot next to her building.



Dr. Warbin expressed concern that this proposal has been proposed as a punishment and over the conflict of a disabled person parking in a disabled parking space that was installed for the couple across the street.

Mr. Hales stated that he didn't see the proposal as a punishment, but as a way to address this problem and similar problems that may arise in the future. He noted that in residential neighborhoods, the only disabled parking spaces that generally exist have been placed there because a resident has requested it for their own usage. He stated that the average person who is disabled and driving down a residential street does not have an expectation of a disabled parking space being near the residence they are visiting, but the resident who requested the sign or signs have the expectation that those disabled space are for their use and this proposed change would codify that. He also stated that if the new resident would like to apply for a disabled parking space, he saw no reason why the commission would not recommend approval of that request.

Dr. Warbin retracted his use of the word punishment and stated that it represents a power assertion from the government against a single individual that has implications for other citizens within the community and Dr. Warbin found a problem with that.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that most of the applicants who apply for a residential disabled parking space are under the assumption that the space is provided only for their use. She stated this would give those residents peace of mind that the space they requested will be available for them.

Dr. Warbin asked if there are other ways of solving this problem that do not involve a change in the law that might be helpful for the residents.

Mr. Smotherson stated that he had looked at every option including speaking with the new resident's landlord. He stated that the proposal is not being made against one person, but to ensure that the people who requested the disabled spaces be able to park in front of their homes.

Dr. Warbin asked if the new resident was given the opportunity to attend the Traffic Commission meeting.

Mr. Smotherson stated that multiple efforts were made to contact the new resident and she was provided several opportunities to attend a meeting and that Ms. Gutierrez had also made outreach to the woman.

Mr. Tunstall stated that he didn't realize that any disabled person could park in a disabled parking space in front of a home where the residents had requested the disabled parking spaces.



Mr. Barnes made a motion to accept the recommendation as presented. Mr. Hales seconded.

Mr. Mishkin asked if there was any additional cost to the city associated with this change.

Ms. Gutierrez stated the cost to the city would be minimal.

Mr. Mishkin asked what would happen after implementation if the new resident parked in the assigned space.

Sgt. Whitley stated that the police would start by issuing warnings before ticketing after the implementation process.

Mr. Mishkin asked if there had been a similar situation to the one being discussed. Ms. Gutierrez stated this was the first.

The commission voted to on the motion to accept the recommendation as presented. The motion passed 6 to 1 with Dr. Warbin voting Nay.

c. 7000 Block of Lindell

Ms. Gutierrez presented the previously discussed parking permit petition change request to change the hours of the parking restrictions of the 7000 Block of Lindell. She stated that staff had become aware that additional parking permit signs had been installed years ago beyond the area requested in the original parking permit petition. She stated that the new petition only covered the area that was part of the original petition and not the area with signs posted beyond the petition. She indicated that all of the properties to the west of the affected area were also informed of the meeting and proposed change.

Citizen J. Patrick Reilly (7015 Lindell) stated that the neighbors were requesting that the parking restriction hours be changed from 10am to 2pm Monday thru Friday to 9 am to 9pm seven days a week because of the impact on the neighborhood from individuals parking on the block and going to Washington University. He also stated that they have residents parking on the block and walking to the Metrolink for sporting events.

Mr. Hales asked if the commission was being asked to change the parking restriction for the entirety currently marked residential permit area including the homes with residential parking permit restrictions that are not included in the code.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that upon review of the ordinance, that the ordinance calls for residential parking permits on the 7000 block of Lindell and that it does not match the addresses that were originally part of the petition that only



span half of the block. She stated that she did not know why the ordinance as approved was not consistent with the petition and asked if the residents in attendance knew why the original petition was not inclusive of the entire block. Mr. Reilly stated that the original parking permit petition was implemented before he lived on Lindell.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that the city would be removing the signs west of 7044 that were not included in the petition. She stated that she was contact by one resident who was upset by the parking permit restriction being removed.

Mr. Hales asked to clarify that the city code applies the existing residential permit parking restriction to the entire city block and asked the additional signs, not covered by this petition could be left in front of those homes since they are technically covered by the code?

Ms. Gutierrez said that could happen, but the new petition does not extend the entire length of the block where signs are currently posted and she indicated that she wanted to leave it up to the commission.

Mr. Helderman asked if the signs would be changed or if they would be replaced. Ms. Gutierrez stated they would be replaced.

Dr. Warbin asked if the commission was being asked to extend the requested change in hours beyond what was requested in the petition and expressed concern of extending the changes beyond what was requested. He asked if the commission has the latitude to extend the change in the restrictions beyond the requested changes.

Mr. Hales stated that he agreed with Dr. Warbin's concern and stated that if the city was to follow the code, the commission should approve the recommended changes as requested on the petition and the city should install residential permit parking signs restricting parking between the hours of 10am and 2pm for the rest of the 7000 block. He noted that it would be strange to have two different sets of restrictions on the same block, but it would be consistent with the code. He also expressed concern that if new signs were erected to conform with the code for the rest of the 7000 block that some residents may not like them, but he said he didn't think the existing signs west of the current petition should be removed because they are part of the ordinance. He also stated the commission was not aware in September of 2015 when this request first came to the commission that the city ordinance covered the entire block.

Ms. Gutierrez explained to the commission that if signs were to be installed to reflect the current ordinance, it would require every house to come to city hall and register their vehicles to be in compliance with the ordinance.



Mr. Hales suggested that the city could leave the existing signs west of 7038 without erecting new signs for the rest of the block.

Dr. Warbin agreed that he believed that the existing ordinance and petition request required the commission to treat it that way.

Dr. Warbin made a motion to accept the petition and recommendation as presented and was seconded by Mr. Barnes. The motion was passed unanimously.

d. Stop Signs at Groby and Glenside Place

Ms. Gutierrez presented the traffic request form from Richa Rathmore (7920 Glenside Place). She stated that there had be no reported accidents in the last three years but reported that there is a limited sightline. She stated that staff did install a yield sign at that intersection. She indicated that staff has recommended the installation of a stop sign at Glenside Place at Groby as well as speed limit signs on Groby approaching Glenside.

Citizen Richa Rathmore (7320 Glenside Place) stated that traffic on Groby doesn't stop at Glenside and stated that the intersection has a very limited sightline of the intersection until you are about 15 meters from the intersection. She stated that while the speed limit is 25, cars regularly speed on the road because it does not usually have a lot of traffic. Ms. Rathmore also presented insurance paperwork related to a traffic accident she was involved in in May of 2015. She stated that to make a left turn out of Groby, you have to pull out through the crosswalk with the front of the car on Groby to be able to see oncoming traffic. She clarified that she was not requesting a stop sign on Glenside at Groby, but was requesting stop signs on Groby at Glenside Place.

Mr. Hales asked Ms. Gutierrez to speak to the limited sightline and explain that a bit more.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that there is a visibility problem from Glenside at Groby and that is why staff recommends the installation of a stop sign on Glenside. She also stated that there was vegetation that would cut back to improve visibility.

Mr. Hales asked if the limited sightline is caused by the vegetation or the concrete wall of the bridge on Groby.

Ms. Rathmore stated that it is the bridge that blocks visibility of oncoming traffic. She also asked that if stop signs cannot be placed on Groby if a sign could be placed to show a blind drive or limited sightline approaching Glenside.



Mr. Barnes stated that he drives this road regularly and agreed with the petitioner that there is a need for a stop sign on Groby Rd..

Mr. Smotherson stated he is very familiar with this intersection and stated that you cannot see Glenside while approaching on Groby Rd. and that he believed the petitioners concerns were valid.

Mr. Barnes made motion to recommend the installation of all-way stop signs at the intersection of Groby Rd. and Glenside Place. Dr. Warbin seconded the motion. Mr. Tunstall asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Hales asked staff to explain why staff does not feel this solution was appropriate. Ms. Gutierrez stated that the MUTCD standards establish the guidelines for intersections with stop signs and this intersection did not fit those standards.

Mr. Tunstall called for a vote on the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Tunstall called on Citizen Alvin Franklin of 8537 Kempland Place. Mr. Franklin addressed the commission about the meetings not be scheduled at times that were conducive to all residents. He stated that he owns a business and works at night and he had to make special arrangements to be able to attend the meeting. He expressed his desire to have a bus stop moved from in front of his property because of significant trash and alcohol bottles that are left on his property. His main concern to the commission was the accessibility of the commission for those like himself who may not be able to attend the meeting and expressed that he didn't think it was fair for the commission to make recommendations when the petitioner is unable to attend and expressed that his concerns should be considered.

Sgt. Whitley informed Mr. Franklin that he was aware of his concerns and complaint that the police have already observed the conditions in front of his house. He stated that officers did not witness any violations, but did observe the trash at the location.

Mr. Franklin stated that he has talked to everyone he could possibly talk to, including the City Manager and City Clerk and expressed his frustration that little has be done to address his concerns.

Mr. Tunstall stated that he understood Mr. Franklin's concerns and urged him to speak to Councilman Smotherson and attend and speak to the city council.

e. Center Drive – Residential Parking Permit request



Citizen Lori Goodman of 8001 Teasdale Ave. requested to withdraw her request and plans to have more discussion with her neighbors before coming back to the Traffic Commission.

f. 7300 Block of Forsyth – Residential Parking Permit Request

Ms. Gutierrez presented the traffic request form from Mr. Steve Arnold for the 7300 block of Forsyth, continued from the previous meeting. She reported that a staff had concluded that a 1 or 2 hour parking restriction except by residential permit is an option for the commission to recommend. She stated that this plan would be exactly like the residential parking permit implemented in the 200 block of Linden. She asked that if the commission would like to make this recommendation, that staff would like the commission to determine the list of affected households.

Steve Arnold (7305 Forsyth) spoke to his desire to co-exist with the neighboring businesses and spoke about the continued parking problems in front of his property including cars partially blocking his driveway.

Mr. Hales made a motion to issue a residential parking permit petition to Mr. Arnold for 1 hour parking except by residential permit on the north side of the 7300 block of Forsyth Blvd, from 7301 and 7331 Forsyth Blvd. between the hours of 8am to 8pm seven days a week, requiring 75% of the signatures of the property owners of the affected households including 7301 thru 7331 Forsyth Blvd. Mr. Helderman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Council Liaison Report

Mr. Smotherson stated that he shares commission's concern about the traffic and parking related to the Centene project and the concerns shared by residents. He also stated that the council approved a daycare project on Olive which did not need the approval of the traffic commission since the ingress and egress to is to remain on Olive.

2. Election of Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary

Election of the Chair: Mr. Tunstall nominated Mr. Hales to serve as the Chair. Mr. Hales stated that he would be willing to serve as the chair and would be honored to do so, but he wanted to continue in his role as Secretary. He stated that there was nothing in the bylaws that prevented serving in both roles, but that he wanted to continue to serve as the Secretary. Mr. Barnes seconded the nomination. Mr. Hales was unanimously elected Chair.

Election of the Vice Chair: Dr. Warbin complimented Mr. Tunstall on his job as the Vice-Chair and his running of the meetings in the absence of the Chair. Mr. Mishkin nominated Mr. Tunstall to serve as Vice-Chair and was seconded by Ms. Creer. Mr. Tunstall was unanimously elected as Vice-Chair.



Election of the Secretary: Mr. Mishkin nominated Mr. Hales to serve as Secretary. Mr. Barnes seconded the nomination. Mr. Tunstall asked if there was anything preventing Mr. Hales from serving as both Secretary and Chair. Mr. Mishkin indicated that other commissions have one person serving both roles. Mr. Hales was unanimously elected to serve as Secretary.

Mr. Hales thanked his fellow commissioners for electing him to serve as both Chair and Secretary.

Citizen Karen Neilson (521 W. Point Ct.) expressed concern about the traffic from the proposed Centene development from westbound Forest Park Parkway on to Pershing.

8. Miscellaneous Business None

9. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 pm

Minutes prepared by Jeff Hales, Traffic Commission Chair & Secretary