

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**DECEMBER 10, 2015**

**IV) PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Case No. 16-18**

**A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (agent) on behalf of the City of Columbia (owner) to rezone 1.89 acres of property from C-1 (Intermediate Business District) to C-P (Planned Business District), and for approval of a Statement of Intent and a C-P Development Plan on 5.15 acres of land, to be known as "Mill Creek Substation C-P." The subject properties are located on the west side of Peach Court, approximately 600 feet south of Nifong Boulevard, and are also known as Lots 14-16 of Rockbridge Subdivision Block IX.**

MR. REICHLIN: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approval to rezone Lot 16 to C-P, and adopt a Statement of Intent for Lots 13, 14, and 16,
2. Approval of the "Mill Creek Substation" C-P Development Plan with the requested waivers and the associated design parameters.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of staff? Seeing no one. This is a public hearing matter, so I will open up the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody wishing to comment on this, please step forward.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening. My name is Ryan Williams. I'm here representing the City of Columbia Water & Light Department. I am the assistant director for Water & Light. I've been involved with this project since the beginning, and I'm going to give you a little bit of a brief history. The purchase of the substation property in 2007, the need for additional transmission lines and substation was identified through our transmission planning processes that we're required to do from a federal transmission planning standard perspective. In September of 2009, a work session was held with the City Council on the selection process for the substation. In January of 2009, ten possible sites were identified by our consultant for the use of a substation. An interested parties meeting was held at the Columbia Water & Light administration offices which were at that time located in the old Williams-Keepers Building. In the spring of 2009, an interested seller approached the City about selling land in the Peach Court area. In September of 2009, the Water & Light advisory board recommended to the City Council to acquire the property on the Peach Court site. And then in February of 2010, a pre-Council work session describing the factors associated with building a new electric substation was held. And then finally in March of 2010, the City Council approved Council Bill B5410, adopting an ordinance to acquire the Peach Court site for a

substation. I'll answer any questions that you guys may have.

MR. REICHLIN: Do we have any questions of this speaker? Seeing none, thank you very much. Anybody else wishing to comment on this matter?

MR. FARNEN: Good evening. My name is Mark Farnen, 103 East Brandon, Columbia, Missouri. I am here on behalf of numerous property and homeowners who could be impacted by the design, the configuration, location of the new high-voltage transmission system, which this is part. We have read the proposal. We understand why this rezoning request may be a proper course of action. Also believe that the request for variances are based on very logical engineering ideas. We are not sure about the aesthetic impact of the variances requested or that the C-P plan as currently submitted will not have to change in the very near future. Here's why I say that. We all know there's a big fight about this whole thing that's bigger than just this substation. More hearings are scheduled on this in front of the City Council to determine what the system will look like definitively. During those earlier discussions that we have been having, the applicant has indicated that if a different route or configuration is selected, the equipment and the nature of the substation could change significantly, or maybe it won't change at all. When that decision is made, that's when the P & Z should consider -- make a definitive determination about whether there is sufficient space to install lighting at a shorter height, or whether more or less shielding is actually needed as per their request for variance. The applicant has also indicated that until this larger discussion on the transmission project is settled, this whole thing is on hold. Here is the recent report in the Columbia Tribune: "As of last month, all work had stopped on the project to accommodate the additional public hearing and the possibility of a significant transmission line route change." I would assume that that applies to the substation too. This makes it the wrong time for this to come before Commission. So rather than drag you all into it, I am going to suggest a different solution, and that is that the applicant may want to voluntarily withdraw this request at this time pending the outcome of the Council's hearings on the transmission line route. Pulling this back tonight does not preclude them from bringing this forward in the future at a more appropriate time with more definitive information. If the applicant is not amenable to that suggestion, then I think the Commission should view this request as ambiguous, incomplete, and inconsistent with the City's idea that the project is currently on hold and you should recommend against its approval. Thank you for your time. I would be happy to answer questions.

MR. REICHLIN: Do we have any questions of this speaker? Seeing none, thank you very much.

MR. FARNEN: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else wishing to comment?

MR. WILLIAMS: May I speak again?

MR. REICHLIN: Yes, you may. Just give us your name and address again.

MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Ryan Williams; I'm the assistant director for Water & Light, speaking on behalf of Water & Light. And I would like to address some of the comments that Mr. Farnen just made. As far as the -- the controversy between the route selection and the nature of the either 161 or 69 kilovolt lines that we're currently in a re-public hearing process for, the nature of the substation itself will not change. The boundary of the substation itself will not change. Our desire to put in 35-foot mounting

height lighting poles will not change. The equipment inside this substation itself will change from nature from being either 161 kV equipment or 69 kV equipment, however, there will still be initially two transformers installed with two lineups of switch gear. Whether they're at the 161 kV level or the 69 kV level really won't matter in the configuration of the substation itself. There will still be associated breaker switch gear and transmission towers that take the -- the transmission lines into and out of the substation. Regardless of the voltage level, all of that particular equipment will be necessary. And so I see no reason in delaying the zoning request that we have in front of you this evening.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you. Any questions? Mr. Stanton? All right. Sir?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR. REICHLIN: We have a couple questions. Sorry.

MR. STANTON: So to clarify, a substation is going to be there in operation regardless, just how much functions or what its function is may change?

MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct. Right now, there are -- there are three routing options back in front of the City Council for public hearing on January 19th: An option known as Option A, which uses 161 kV lines to energize and power the new substation, an option known as Option B, which uses 69 kV lines to power and energize the substation, and option known as B-2, which also utilizes 69 kV lines to energize and power the new substation.

MS. LOE: Can -- one thing I was missing -- maybe I just didn't see it in the report was the size of the equipment that was going to be included at this location. Is there a difference? If you could tell us what the sizes are for Option A and Option B, I would appreciate it.

MR. WILLIAMS: The design that we currently have is for a lineup of two transformers and two sets of switch gear. Transformers transform the electricity from the transmission level to our distribution level. The two different projects we've got -- or options we have considered at the 161 or 69 kV level. Both of the transformers, either at 69 or 161 kV, are rather large. You could maybe, you know, 20 feet high with the top of the arresters, you know, 10 x 10 x 20 feet high, with cooling fans. They're all connected together with tubular aluminum buss and high-voltage, either 69 or 161 kV breaker -- circuit breakers. The two lineup or switch gear look like little sheds that have lineups of our 13-8 kV distribution gear, and those are the main breakers exiting the substations before they go out onto our distribution system. With either solution, there will be two lineups of switch gear providing up to six circuits -- six new circuits for us to be able to serve load with. And then there will be associated underground equipment going out into the -- into the surrounding area until they reach riser poles where we can send it into our distribution system.

MS. LOE: And how big are the sheds --

MR. WILLIAMS: The switch gear lineups, they're usually around, you know, 25 foot by 25 foot by maybe 12 feet tall.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? Seeing no one, thank you very much.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: At this time, is there anybody else who wishes to comment?

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. REICHLIN: I'll close the public hearing and throw this matter to the Commission for comment. Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. I had reason to be involved or at least interested in this process three years ago. I know the City conducted exhaustive meetings about it. No one -- not everybody is going to be happy in this situation. I know the undergrounding option was considered -- the cost was prohibitive. I know we need our energy needs met at the City, and so I plan on supporting this. My only request would be that we ask for more, not less landscaping around the site. We need to move forward with this. This has been going on for years.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I would like to echo Ms. Burns' comments about the variance with removal for landscaping. I actually had questions about reducing the landscaping because it was a school, and had questions about whether or not we had eliminated landscaping simply because of that use before. I would like to see landscaping maintained on those sides.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would agree with my colleagues on this issue, but I would like to ask the -- Mr. Williams, is there a reason why the landscape measure reduces it -- fire hazard and why -- why would there be a problem with more landscaping?

MR. WILLIAMS: Obviously, vegetation and electricity don't necessarily -- are the best friends, if you will. We just wanted to make sure whatever, you know, vegetative management program that we have, that it's capable of being compatible with whatever lines we get in there, whether they be 161 or 69 kV. Another thing, this is a -- this is a large community asset. We kind of want people to be able to see in there. We want to know if there's people lurking around in there, either, you know, doing bad things. And so we're not opposed to landscaping, it's just we want it to be in an appropriate manner so that it's safely being -- allows us to safely operate our equipment and also allows the community to be able to kind of help us police our own -- you know, our City's asset.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you, sir.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Is there anybody else? Would anybody care to frame a motion on this matter?

MS. BURNS: I will. In the case of 16-18, the Mill Creek Substation, I recommend for approval the rezoning of Lot 16 to C-P and adopt the Statement of Intent for Lots 14 through 16 with the denial of the variance for less landscaping and, I guess, acceptance of the variance for the pole height.

MR. REICHLIN: Do we have a second?

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll second.

MR. REICHLIN: You'll second. That was Mr. Strodtman. Any comments? May we have a roll call, please?

MR. STANTON: I have a comment.

MR. REICHLIN: Oh, Mr. Stanton, go right ahead.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Burns, after hearing the City's reasoning why the landscaping is an issue, I'd play ball if you just left it as it is.

MS. BURNS: I'm going to start throwing that pole height variance back in there, because that was the request of some of the -- so I, Mr. Stanton, will not refrain.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. BURNS: I apologize.

MR. REICHLIN: That said, now is a good time to have a roll call.

MS. LOE: Roll call for Case 16-18.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Reichlin, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Burns, Mr. Harder, Mr. Toohey. Voting No: Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 8-1.**

MS. LOE: The vote is 8-1. The motion carries. It will be forwarded to Council with the recommendation for approval.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you very much.