

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
AUGUST 19, 2013**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, August 19, 2013, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA and THOMAS were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 5, 2013 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

**APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA**

Mayor McDavid noted R166-13, which would extend the sidewalk closure in front of The Broadway Hotel for a couple more weeks, would need to be added to the consent agenda.

Ms. Hoppe asked that R159-13 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with the moving of R159-13 from the consent agenda to new business and the addition of R166-13 to the consent agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions.

**BOARD OF ELECTRICAL EXAMINERS**

Rose, Mike, 11101 W. Highway 40, Boone County, Term to expire August 1, 2015

**BOARD OF HEALTH**

Phillips, Lynelle, 2004 Katy Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire August 31, 2016

Sohl, David, 4800 Newcastle Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire August 31, 2016

**BOARD OF PLUMBING EXAMINERS**

Glass, Mike, 128 N. Cedar Lake Drive West, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2015

**CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD**

Fisher, Andrew, 400 Ridgeway Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire November 1, 2015

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Earney, Patrick, 113 West Boulevard North, Ward 1, Term to expire September 1, 2016

Prevo, Paul, 15451 N. Tucker School Road, Boone County, Term to expire September 1, 2016

Treece Brian, 101 W. Brandon, Ward 5, Term to expire September 1, 2016

**PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMISSION**

Hamilton-Hill, Lisa, 14 Clinton Drive, Ward 1, Term to expire March 1, 2015

Price, Cheryl, 511 Parkade Boulevard, Ward 2, Term to expire March 1, 2015

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Tim Waid - GetAbout Columbia Phase II Priority: Rollins-to-Bluffdale Trail connector to establish MU East Campus connector to MKT Trail System.**

Mr. Waid did not speak as he rescheduled his comments to the September 3, 2013 Council Meeting.

**Shari Korthuis - The People's proposal and plan for renewable energy solutions.**

Shari Korthuis stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and noted they were asking the Council to consider implementing the "Renewable Energy Plan for All." She explained People's Visioning wanted the Council to make quick and immediate shifts in energy to cleaner, distributed renewable energy for all, as they felt this plan would bring about a more socially equitable solution, be protective of the environment, public health and safety, and would economically be supportive for all individuals and the local economy. This involved additional funding for low-income, special needs, disabled and elderly customers so they could obtain an energy audit and pay for the necessary energy-saving upgrades. Other customers could participate in the program as it already existed. Once customers met energy efficiency guidelines, they could then install solar energy equipment, and the People's Visioning proposed an in lieu of exchange of customer energy production arrangement to interested and qualifying customers to finance renewable energy. Participating customers would experience greater monthly savings and eventually no electric bill. They also suggested the City partner with local credit unions for low-interest lending services. In an effort to convince landlords to participate, they recommended a website highlighting the utility costs of rental properties, so those with more energy efficient units were rewarded. They also felt neighborhood solar sites would be beneficial as renters could purchase a section of solar energy production from those sites. She provided a handout of the plan and asked those in the audience in support of renewable energy to stand, and about 25 people stood.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**B161-13 Adopting "Columbia Imagined - The Plan for How We Live & Grow".**

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted this item to be tabled to the October 7, 2013 Council Meeting, and explained that while these additions from the work session were valuable, she

felt the document was still unfinished since a reference index was missing, some of the elements and words were used inconsistently, definitions were lacking, etc. She gave the example of the phrase “best and highest use” and believed “best and most appropriate” use was meant. She suggested a professional or staff edit to finalize it so it was in a form the public could use and easily reference.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to table B161-13 to the October 7, 2013 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought they should move forward with this plan because the document had been developed through a widely publicized and massive participation process. He felt they were now in the realm of nitpickery and stated he would not vote in favor of tabling this item.

Mr. Skala stated he did not believe they were in the realm of nitpickery. He explained he was in favor of tabling this as he understood two groups of citizens were reviewing the document in an attempt to clarify some of the issues and language. In addition, he did not believe the amendment sheet addressed the issue of the sewer extension that had been brought up at the work session to the extent necessary. He thought asking for a short delay was prudent in ensuring they had a good policy document.

Mr. Thomas explained he had hoped they would move forward in adopting the comprehensive plan today, and understood most of the reasons for the delay involved technical writing issues. He favored adopting the policy and making the technical changes later as long as those changes did not change the content of the plan. He commented that he was also concerned about the change in the annexation policy in terms of whether annexation should be required if attaching to City sewer and did not see that addressed by the amendment sheet. He asked Mr. Teddy if there was a proposed change on the amendment sheet relating to that issue. Mr. Teddy replied content had been added regarding a cost-benefit study. He did not believe this needed to be used for each and every parcel being considered for annexation, but could be used for large projects. Mr. Thomas asked in which amendment it was addressed. Mr. Teddy replied A8. Mr. Skala understood a constituent had raised issues relating the cost-benefit analysis and the relationship of the sewer extension with the urban service area, and that was not on the amendment sheet. Mr. Teddy stated a greater clarification could potentially be made. He noted there were recommended procedures for continual review of the plan with in the document, and it included reviews by citizens, so he recommended approving the plan with the already identified text changes and then submitting it for further review and amendments. He believed this should be thought of as a continuous process, and not necessarily something that needed to be perfected prior to adoption. He reiterated his suggestion to approve the plan if they were generally satisfied with it and referenced page 148, which discussed annual reporting and the analysis of development data to determine if they were tracking with the development projections, how the plan was performing, etc. It also indicated citizens, the Council and commissions could request changes to the plan.

Mr. Schmidt understood the Council could adopt this and continue to amend it over time. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He noted it would be helpful to know which terms were being used inconsistently and whether the persons that were now working on the plan

were the original participants or a new group of people, as there had been a process where various councils had appointed individuals to be on the Task Force. In addition, the Planning and Zoning Commission had reviewed it. Staff felt this was ready for approval, but did not want to deny anyone to critique and point out items that might be misleading within the document.

Mr. Schmidt commented that he had been convinced by examples provided by Dan Cullimore that postponing this might be worthy even if it might be aggravating for those that had been involved in the process. He noted he was leaning toward delaying this vote to October.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to vote against the delay with the understanding they could discuss the sewer annexation issue prior to adoption since it was listed as an individual amendment. He agreed this was a high level document and pointed out his constituents had a general positive feeling for it.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Skala to table B161-13 to the October 7, 2013 Council Meeting was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Trapp, Mr. Thomas and Mayor McDavid voting against it.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor McDavid continued the public hearing to the October 7, 2013 Council Meeting.

**B215-13 Authorizing construction of the Grindstone Creek Trail Phase I project between the Grindstone Nature Area and Maguire Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood this would not compromise funding for the Hominy Creek Trail project. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct as that project was almost complete. Mr. Skala understood some large dead trees were being preserved and cabled in some areas to prevent liability in terms of federal requirements due to bats, and asked if this was an ongoing policy or if guidance was necessary. Mr. Griggs replied that would be done depending on the time of the year. He pointed out the only reason trees would be removed was if they were in the way, as staff normally did not do anything with dying trees in the natural parks. Mr. Skala noted they would not want a dead tree to fall on a trail. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct, and explained they would remove the tree if it was a safety hazard.

Ms. Hoppe commented that the trail alignment shown in the slides made it appear as though the trail was not in the creek, but understood the creek bed would be disturbed.

John Holmes, an engineer with Allstate Consultants, who helped prepared the plan, agreed it was hard to tell in the picture, and explained it would be in what was typically referred to as the channel and would be 2-3 feet above the low flow line of the creek in terms of elevation.

Mr. Schmidt understood it was far enough out of the creek bed for the Corps of Engineers to be agreeable. Mr. Holmes stated that was correct, and noted that although the Corps of Engineers had verbally agreed to it, the appropriate paperwork still needed to be

submitted. He explained the Missouri Department of Conservation had looked at it as well and were satisfied.

Mr. Thomas understood there would be a maintenance easement off of Old Highway 63 on the northbound side, and asked if it would be possible to make it an actual trail access when the project was completed so cyclists and pedestrians traveling north on Old 63 could get straight onto the trail. Mr. Griggs replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe understood, per the Bluff Creek Neighborhood Association President, that the Association had agreed to a possible donation of easement and access because they were told it was inevitable this trail would be constructed and asked for clarification. Mr. Griggs replied he did not say that to the Association. He had been invited to a meeting and had only explained the project. At that meeting, one of the Association Board Members commented that they needed to work out the best deal they could because if they did not, and the project was approved, they would not have any leverage.

Ms. Hoppe understood construction was not allowed within 100 feet of the stream buffer except for trails, and asked if there was any reason the trail could not be eight feet instead of ten or twelve. Mr. Griggs replied no. He explained they did not want to go to twelve feet, which was recommended in the guidelines, so they went with ten feet since it was the minimum. He noted eight feet would work and they had only planned for ten feet since more people would potentially use it once it was built out.

Ms. Hoppe asked how often staff checked for vegetation, debris and damming at each of the low water bridges after a rain event. Mr. Griggs replied the next working day. He thought the priority in that review would be the MKT, Bear Creek and then this trail.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Annette Triplett, 104 Edgewood Avenue, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition, a non-profit organization that promoted active transportation through advocacy and educational programming. They worked to make it easier for people to walk, bike, use wheelchairs and public transit, and represented over 7,000 members. She explained PedNet was founded with a vision of a comprehensive active transportation network throughout Columbia, and the Grindstone Creek Trail was the next crucial piece in the City's network of trails, bike lanes and pedways. This trail was a crucial trail link for the growing east side of the City and the employers concentrated in the LeMone Industrial Park area. It would have two forks that would allow connections to it as east as Battle High School and Old Hawthorne. It would allow people to walk, bike or use a wheelchair from Battle High School in the northeast to the Katy Trail in the southwest. Without the Grindstone Trail, much of eastern Columbia would remain cutoff from the City's trails. She pointed out the PedNet Board of Directors had unanimously approved a resolution supporting and recommending the Grindstone Trail be built in full according to the currently planned alignment.

Steve Spellman explained he was the PedNet Coalition Board President and noted various aspects of this trail were very important. This trail had been planned for a long time, as the City's 2025 and 2030 long-range transportation plans, the Metro 2020 greenbelt trail plan and the Columbia trails plan for 2002, 2008, 2010 and 2013 all included it. In addition, the 2010 park sales tax ballot issue had passed with 60 percent of the vote and had included promises from the Council to use some of those funds to build the Grindstone Trail. There

had been a lengthy public process and the environmental and eminent domain concerns had been addressed. He believed this was the best solution and would provide a connection to the Columbia trail system for those in Crosscreek, LeMone Industrial Park, etc. It was the trail for the east side as indicated by Ms. Triplett. He explained he had participated in the Visioning process a few years ago, and noted a network of attractive and safe parks and recreational amenities, connected by trails and greenways, to provide area residents access to nature, recreation and facilities for active play, indoors and out, was vision statement number twelve of the Vision Plan. One of the strategies below that statement was to achieve trail connectivity in new and existing developments. He reiterated this had been approved by the voters and the City needed to fulfill its promises. He pointed out the director of the local IBM office had e-mailed the Council in support of this project as well.

Sharon James, 2304 Bluff Pointe Drive, commented that the Waters-Moss meeting had been held in August in a small room when it was 92 degrees and a lot of the neighbors were on vacation, and that the survey was questionable. During the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting on October 18, 2012, eminent domain was still on the table and the neighbors were against it, and the Commission did not vote on the issue because they felt they lacked information even after a two hour discussion. Four weeks later, a revised map was presented to the Commission and eminent domain was no longer a part of the project. This new plan called for four ten-foot concrete bridges to be placed in the creek and the removal of trees. She noted the former mayor and the former PedNet Coalition Executive Director had attended and spoken in favor of the new plan, and wondered if that was a conflict of interest. The Commission voted 4-3 for the proposed plan. She explained she had purchased her home in a beautiful and secluded location, and had been told a floodplain was in the area so nothing would be built behind them. She commented that she liked trails and had used them many times, but was concerned with the plans for the Grindstone Trail since a ten foot concrete road trail would be placed behind her and her neighbors' homes. She pointed out there had been ten other options that were reduced to five that would not have disturbed people's privacy or the natural beauty of the land, but the decision had already been made by Parks and Recreation to place it beside the Grindstone Creek. She wondered if they wanted to remove 60-70 year old trees for a road trail and if it would be constructed in a similar manner as the Hinkson Creek Trail where many trees were removed. She stated there were many trails in Columbia and the average citizen had access to those trails. She wondered if money would continue to be available to maintain the existing and new parks and trails, or if another tax would be needed. She understood they were voting for the maintenance of parks and trails as part of the 2010 park sales tax ballot and not for the construction of numerous new trails that would need to be maintained indefinitely. She did not believe another trail that detracted from the natural beauty of the Grindstone Creek would tip the competitive balance in Columbia's favor for businesses, and thought there were better uses for the money. She wondered if \$2.17 million needed to be spent for one more mile of recreational trail or whether these funds should be used for sidewalks along Clark Lane. She suggested the funds for the Grindstone Trail project be transferred to the Clark Lane sidewalk project.

James Pursifull, 2212 Bluff Pointe Drive, stated he and his wife had lived in piece and tranquility at this location for the past 23 years and that this tranquility would soon end since they lived close to the proposed trail and it would be visible and audible to them. He understood there were many trail proponents tonight, but did not believe any of them lived near the Grindstone Creek where this trail would be constructed, and as a result, would not be respectively impacted during trail construction and subsequent usage. Those opposed to the trail lived close to the creek and would be greatly impacted. He commented that Mayor McDavid had publicly stated, last year, that the Grindstone Creek area was a beautiful and pristine area and was one of the best kept secrets in Columbia. He wondered why they would not want to keep it that way. It was the last refuge along the creek for birds and wild animals. In addition, the vegetation in the area was unique. He pointed out a ten foot wide swath of solid concrete would impact it and wondered if they had reached a point of riding bikes over the benefit of the environment. He did not believe this project was necessary for the greater good of the community as it was a bike trail being built in the floodplain that would be unusable during high water. He felt the money set aside for this project should be used to fund a number of other projects on the Parks and Recreation Department list that were for the greater good. He pointed out the Grindstone Trail was not specifically included in the ballot, and felt it would have been voted down if the citizens were able to vote again with all of the specifics and costs spelled out. He noted he would not vote for it as he had done before, and asked the Council to not fund this project.

Sutu Forte, 627 Bluffdale Drive, commented that the City needed to strive for balance in terms of growth and development, and noted she had voted for the 2010 park sales tax to support parks and open spaces, but had not voted for cement trails. She stated she thought the Council had learned specific plans needed to be analyzed and questioned because many trails looked great on paper but not in reality. She explained she live next to the Moon Valley – Hinkson Creek Trail project and heard the construction equipment all day long along with noise pollution from Broadway due to so many trees being removed. She noted impervious surfaces tended to poison streams and flood homes. She stated she had walked the Grindstone Creek area twice and felt transportation and recreation needed to be separated. She believed the Waters-Moss area could be used for a scenic trail that would accommodate wheelchairs, bicyclists and pedestrians, but understood the trail would instead be in the creek in an effort to avoid eminent domain. She suggested a trail in the Waters-Moss area for recreation and enjoyment and for the concrete trail to end at the Westhues residence. A more natural walking trail could then go through the neighborhood with their permission. In terms of transportation to the LeMone Industrial Park, she suggested Stadium be utilized as it could be made safer for those in wheelchairs and cyclists. She thought the area around the Grindstone Creek should remain pristine.

Ron Westhues, 2305 Bluff Pointe Drive, commented that when the Grindstone Trail was presented to the neighborhood, they had been told trails were an indicator of quality of life, but many citizens felt quality of life meant having a comfortable home, enough income to feed and clothe kids, having a reliable way to get to work, etc., and he believed sales tax affected quality of life. He felt the affluent citizens believed having a network around the community was a good measure of quality of life and was needed to attract large

corporations and jobs to Columbia when tax abatements and other financial considerations were the truly enticing factors. Trails were just an extra amenity and not needed. He listed all of the recent sales and property tax increases and the other tax and fee increases that would soon be considered and noted these increases had a cumulative effect hitting those on fixed incomes the hardest. He suggested prioritizing the use of these funds to complete other projects or for a project like the Clark Lane sidewalks, which was more prudent and would increase the quality of life of many citizens.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluffdale Drive, asked the Council to table this in order to consider an alternative route. She noted greenspaces were valuable and referred to Central Park in New York, which was cherished by the citizens and not in danger of being sold. She thought they needed to respect the riparian corridor and reiterated this trail would be located in the creek, which was dangerous as floodwaters rose quickly. She explained her neighborhood had been promised a minimally invasive plan and displayed photographs of what it looked like today. She noted all of the vegetation had been removed and rock riprap had been installed. It was horrible as they now had a twelve foot wide road for recreational purposes in a sensitive area. She thought this was what the neighbors in the Grindstone Creek area would experience as well. She understood there had been violations of the Clean Water Act as a part of the project and urged the Council vote against the Grindstone Trail project.

Michelle Windmoeller, 705 E. Rockcreek, stated she lived near the County House Branch Trail and would live close to a new trail connection in the future. She was excited for the new trail as she understood what it meant for her and the neighborhood. She did not believe these were recreational trails and noted they were transportation trails. She explained she had two children and her sixteen year old had a girlfriend that lived on the northeast side of town. He did not have his license and she reviewed bus schedules to try to figure out how he could visit her. A trail would make it easier for him to visit her. She hoped the trail would soon lead to job transportation for her son as well. This was not a matter of riding a bike for exercise. It was about people living in Columbia being able to access the community for jobs and to visit people in a safe and friendly manner.

Don Emery, 1804 Muirfield Drive, explained the cost of \$1 million per mile bothered him as it was expensive. He noted he had recently traveled Providence Road and two people were walking in the road because the sidewalk was too narrow and thought there were issues greater than this trail. He commented that many areas of the downtown had private sewer lines that were the responsibility of the property owner if a repair was needed and wondered how many square acres of drainage went in the creek. He believed this was excessive as there were other higher priority projects.

Joe Salsby, 1105 S. Glenwood Avenue, stated he was not impacted directly by this new trail proposal, but the MKT ran next to his neighborhood. When he had moved to this location, he did not think he would use the trail since he was a recreational road rider, but ended up using it to get downtown. He explained a family of four that lived in his neighborhood was able to go to one car since one of them could use the Greenbriar Trail, which was recently completed, to get to and from work. He had another friend that took her daughter to tennis lessons via the trail. He noted other people were using the trail for things he had not even considered for himself. He believed any trail that was built would be used



and agreed it was a quality of life issue for Columbia. He encouraged the Council to vote in favor of the project.

Homer James, 2304 Bluff Pointe Drive, commented that he was concerned with the amount of money Columbia was spending on trails and parks. He understood the City had received two federal grants totaling \$28 million. He questioned whether the City was playing games with the project budgets so this project would appear to be cheaper. He understood about 8,000 people would utilize this \$1.75 million trail, which was only a little over seven percent of the current population. He believed the usage of trails in Columbia was minimal and only about 3.5 percent of the population used them. He explained he voted for the 1/8 sales tax for parks, but this trail had not been on the ballot. If he had seen it on the ballot, he would not have voted in favor of the tax. He commented that he did not believe people would ride to work if the temperature was above 80 degrees or below 40 degrees. He understood a survey was done at IBM and only one person had indicated they would use the trail. This was an expensive project for only one person to use and there were other priorities. He asked the Council to vote against this project.

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, explained some people did not have a car and others only had wheelchairs to get around, and they were afraid to be in the roads, so they used the trails to get around. She asked the Council to vote in favor of this trail so people could live a normal life.

Kathy Ritter, 2611 Vista View Terrace, stated she was a trail lover and a biker, and had seen the incredible increase in trails and landscaping that went along with it. She believed this trail was forward-thinking and knew it would be used. She noted it would also open this pristine area to people who would not have otherwise been able to see it. She encouraged the Council to vote in favor of this project as she believed it was beneficial for the future of Columbia as it added great value to the community.

Janice Harder, 1806 Bluff Pointe Drive, stated she used the Grindstone Nature Area Trail quite often and its extension would be a wonderful addition to the trail system. She had walked the area in which this trail would be located and believed it was beautiful. She noted the benefit of a trail system was to allow everyone to get out in nature and walk in these beautiful areas. She explained she had two grandchildren who could not ride their bikes outside of the neighborhood and the trail would allow them access to other areas. She believed this would benefit the neighborhood and the entire City.

Lawrence Simonson, 2706 Hillshire Drive, explained five years ago, his wife had been given the opportunity for a lateral promotion in three different communities and they had chosen Columbia due to its trail system. When they first moved to Columbia, they had made the mistake of living in the east part of town where there was no access to trails and very little infrastructure for cycling. He pointed out he chose to ride a bicycle to work, to get groceries, to pick up his child from daycare, etc., but there were people that did not have choice based on their situation. In addition, he and his wife had decided to move closer to the trail system for safer routes, but many others on the east side of town did not have that luxury. He noted they had even looked at the Bluff Pointe Neighborhood, but chose not to live there because it was cutoff from the local trail system and the rest of Columbia. He commented that he was

big fan of trees and felt they needed to open up the nature areas so everyone could view them, to include those in wheelchairs.

Joan Wilcox stated she loved trails, but noted they needed safety along Clark Lane and safe routes in Columbia for wheelchairs. She thought priorities needed to be revisited as other projects were needed prior to this one.

Dan Harder, 1803 Bluff Pointe Drive, noted his subdivision had essentially been landlocked since Stadium was such a busy road. In addition, those riding in the road were always concerned about vehicles, but when on the trail, they could enjoy the beauty and have a more pleasant ride. He asked the Council to support this project.

Brian Worley stated he came to Columbia in 1999 from Springfield, Missouri to attend Mizzou and had chosen to stay in Columbia since it was a vibrant community. He believed the trail system bound the community together and was more of an investment in progress and wellness than an expense. He noted lived on the south fork of the Grindstone Creek and had a vested interest. It was an important connection for him and he hoped it was extended to his backyard.

Jim Olson, 5555 W. Driskel Road, commented that he loved trails and did not live near this area, but was concerned about spending. He suggested a cost comparison for dirt and gravel trails as they were generally cheaper and still provided accessibility.

William Wise, 2308 Bluff Pointe Drive, stated he and his wife were opposed to the extension of the trail through their backyard and were supportive of directing these funds toward other projects. He explained they purchased their property in 2002 and thought they were moving into an area that was stable and quite with nice greenspace around it. They did not expect any development to take place and felt the area would stay the same. They also had not expected the Parks and Recreation Commission to swap property with the Department of Conservation in the Waters-Moss area and had not known the greenspace on the other side was owned by the Neighborhood Association. He commented that the plan for this trail had not been posted anywhere and his wife had to go to the Parks and Recreation Department offices in order to obtain the plan, which had taken a half hour.

Toni Kazic, 2308 Bluff Pointe Drive, showed a photo of what people often thought of when they heard “trail” and believed what was being proposed as part of this project was a truck capable concrete road in a creek bed. She commented that they had a reasonable good faith expectation of their land, proximity and the environment, and the Parks and Recreation Department had not been in the picture when they purchased their house. This extension would harm the natural environment of the creek bed and the built environment of the neighbors. Documented poor construction practices had occurred recently in the building of trails, and if this was not a trail, it would violate all of the City guidelines for construction in stream beds. She showed the view of their yard and noted the trees and vegetation that held the stream in place and provided habitat for various animals that would be removed in order to construct the concrete trail. She suggested this money be used to build other things that helped more people and pointed out there were many non-controversial trails wanted by people in other neighborhoods, GetAbout projects, projects along Clark Lane and recreational facilities for at-risk populations. She stated the resources they currently had were irreplaceable.

Richard King, 109 W. Parkway, stated he used the trails a lot and recalled controversy when the City purchased Stephens Lake Park as many felt it was a waste of money and a terrible endeavor, but it was a beautiful park for Columbia. He pointed out most of the photos shown tonight were photos of construction or areas that would be destroyed. He had ridden on trails, even ones that had been constructed recently, and had not seen big piles of sand, dirt, etc. He believed this would be a beautiful trail running through a beautiful part of Columbia when completed.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, stated she was in support of constructing this trail. She explained her neighborhood had a lot of rental properties and recently a trail was completed nearby and three homes were purchased by homeowners in her neighborhood. She believed it was due to the proximity of the trail and that trails provided economic benefits in addition to physical fitness benefits.

Darwin Hindman, 1223 Frances Drive, commented that he believed this was a comparison of public benefits versus the perceived detriment to private effects. Similar arguments were made with the MKT Trail, but the Council, at that time, felt the health, recreational and connectivity benefits were so great that they should move forward, and the results were wonderful. He pointed out the University had done a recent survey and 94 percent of the people had indicated they liked living on the trail. This trail would provide a tremendous public benefit since a beautiful space would be opened up to the public. It would also provide health, recreational and transportation benefits for thousands of people. He believed those living there would eventually like it as well. He asked those in support of this project to stand and about 30 people stood.

There being no further comment, Mayor McDavid closed the public hearing.

Mr. Skala referred to the memo associated with this item and noted that after the decision on the Grindstone Trail was made, other projects would come forward for Council consideration. Two of those projects were Clark Lane sidewalks on the north side from Ballenger to Woodland and Clark Lane sidewalks on the north side from Eastwood to Paris. He pointed out the Clark Lane projects would be funded regardless of the outcome of the vote on the Grindstone Trail. He commented that he felt connectivity through trails were important in lieu of being able to make repairs on major roadways, such as Clark Lane, which was multi-jurisdictional, and noted they would likely have to wait until at least 2015 to fund the complete Clark Lane road project. In the meantime, the Hominy Trail and the Grindstone Trail would open up the east and northeast side of the community, which was growing due to Battle High School. He thought it was essential to have this kind of safe connectivity for those walking or bicycling. It would also allow people to see areas of the community that had never been seen. He pointed out they had received money from the federal government for trails and pedways, and it was within the context of those funds that Clark Lane sidewalks would be funded. He noted he had been outraged when he had discovered a high water bridge was part of the Moon Valley Trail project as it had caused the unnecessary destruction of a lot of old growth in the riparian area due to the equipment needed to build the bridge without touching the Hinkson Creek. As a result, he and others on the Council had insisted there be low water bridges for future trails if it could be done, and the plan for the Grindstone Trail included low water bridges. He stated he had also offered a letter on May 19, 2013 to

the Council, City Manager and the public of his lessons with regard to the Moon Valley project to ensure the Grindstone Trail project design took some of those issues into consideration. His letter addressed oversight, process, restoration, bridge crossings and trail surfaces, and with regard to oversight, he felt private contract oversight should be identical for the Public Works Department, the Water and Light Department and the Parks and Recreation Department. He believed the initial plans and any subsequent changes should be reviewed by the City Arborist, the Environment and Energy Commission and a citizen advisory tree board, and their findings should be reported to the Council. He was confident staff would oversee the execution of this trail so that it was better than it had been in the past.

Ms. Hoppe explained she had worked with others in helping to pass the first park sales tax ballot in 2000, been a member of the PedNet Coalition for years, and was a strong supporter of trails as it resulted in a healthier community and helped the environment since people were using cars less, but believed there were issues as well. She felt consideration should be given to trails depending on new areas versus existing neighborhoods, alternative trails, trails through backyards and in the creek, especially when there might be reasonable alternatives. When the Grindstone Trail was first being designed, she had worked with the neighborhood and the neighbors had walked possible alternative trails in the Waters-Moss property, which was adjacent to the neighborhood, in order to avoid the privacy issues of the trail going through people's backyards. She understood a concern was eminent domain, which was not applicable any longer, but the privacy concerns were still there. Eminent domain would technically not be used, but this trail would be in backyards and the neighbors had a reasonable expectation of privacy when they had purchased their homes with a bluff on one side and the Waters-Moss conservation area on the other side. In addition, they had been told they owned the property to the middle of the creek. Even though the trail would not technically be on their property, she did not believe they could deny this would have a profound effect on their expectations of privacy and the natural area. By approving this route, the City would be imposing the community's view on the neighbors for transportation when there were alternative routes. She noted the neighbors walked the alternative routes and were never told the Department of Conservation would not allow paved trails. She felt the crux was that there were alternative routes that did not go through the creek or people's backyards while still providing the required connection. She explained she lived on the Hinkson Creek and owned property to the middle of the creek, and a trail was being built behind her backyard. Although she loved her privacy and the natural area, she and her neighbors made the decision to sacrifice their privacy for the community good, but she did not believe she could make that decision for other people, and felt a different approach was needed for existing neighborhoods when there were alternative routes. If an alternative solution could not immediately be found, other trail needs could be funded, and when homes came up for sale, easements could then be purchased for the preferred route. She felt it was arrogant and presumptuous for her to say the neighbors would like the trail in the future because some people would never like it. She believed there were options and noted she would vote against the project.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to vote in favor of this project as it was part of a network and vision created decades ago with the first trails master plan, and was a critical

connection to a lot residential and commercial buildings in east and north Columbia. The trail system, which was developing and getting better, was a hallmark of the City and something they should continue to emphasize, similar to emphasizing quality of life, economic development and being a healthy community. He noted that the MKT Trail had been packed these past few weeks because people loved the trails. They were used by families, senior citizens, people with dogs and transportation trail users. Trails helped reduce the environmental impact of vehicles and improved the quality of life and health of citizens. He explained he had done a straw poll of citizens he was connected with in regard to the eighteen policies within the comprehensive plan draft recently, and the one in which trails fell under came in second out of those eighteen with four out of every five respondents saying they strongly approved or just approved that policy. It was something the people of Columbia liked. He was sympathetic to the people that had purchased property in the area whose expectations would not be met and noted he would have supported an alternative route if there had been a good one. He thought it made sense to create the trails along the creeks and felt there was an argument that the community benefit for so many people trumped the private concerns of a few. He stated he believed people did grow to love the trails when they initially opposed them, and gave the example of three homeowners along the County House Branch Trail that he had spoken with when campaigning that had initially been opposed to or concerned about the trail, but now loved it. He commented that he agreed Clark Lane was extremely important and noted he would strongly support sidewalks along it as well since it was also an aspect of the non-motorized transportation network.

Ms. Nauser noted this reminded her of discussions several years ago regarding the Greenbriar Trail as many neighbors were concerned about the potential disruption behind their homes and in the neighborhood. She had attended the dedication for the Greenbriar Trail this summer and many of those in attendance thanked her for voting in favor of the trail as they had grown to like it for transportation and recreation. She commented that there were a lot of priorities in the community, and many of those priorities were expensive, but pointed out that there was dedicated funding for many projects, which meant different government functions were funded through different sources of revenue. This project would be funded with park sales tax and those funds could only be used for parks and recreational items. She believed the City was transparent in that they made an effort to hold public hearings, televise council meetings, work sessions, etc., and many meetings had been held with regard to the 2010 park sales tax initiative. She noted it was up to the citizens to participate in and watch the meetings, and pointed out this project was included in the list of projects the Council agreed to fund if the park sales tax passed. She stated she believed it was important to fund projects promised if they expected the citizens to pay those taxes. She pointed out this same process was used for roads, sidewalks and other capital projects, which was why it was vital for the citizens to participate. She believed people would be accepting of this trail in the future, and was happy staff had made the effort to place it as far away as possible from the neighbors. She explained this trail was in the master plan and was also included in the resolution indicating it would be funded with 2010 park sales tax funds, and as a result, she would support it.

Mr. Trapp commented that trails were the most used part of the parks system and benefited the quality of life of citizens, which was a key economic driver for the City, and one of the reasons he chose to live in Columbia. He noted he had experienced a similar situation in that many of the people that had opposed the Bear Creek Trail were strong proponents and loved that trail now. With regard to trail surfaces, he believed a concrete trail would cost the least overall when considering maintenance in floodprone areas and was better for commuters. He stated more places were including showers in their facilities so people could bicycle to work, especially the more progressive businesses with high quality jobs and a higher tax base. He noted he planned to support this project.

Mayor McDavid thanked staff for its unprecedented civic engagement with this project. He understood some people purchased homes for privacy and would feel intruded upon if they had an expectation. He explained his property line was about fifty feet from the Hominy Trail, and noted that although he did not share that feeling, he respected those that did. He pointed out it was not as easy as saying the City's priorities were wrong and that this money should be used for police officers because it could not be used for that purpose. It had to be used in the parks system as it was a dedicated fund source. He commented that he was a fan of trails, and noted he and wife recently took a 4,300 mile trip where they rode their bikes on various trails throughout the United States. They had traveled on some spectacular and breathtaking trails and on others that were not so special. He believed Columbia was special and one of the reasons it was special was due to its parks and trails system as it was a great asset. He stated he would support this trail project.

Mr. Schmidt stated he agreed with many of the other speakers and reiterated this was needed as it would create a connection to Battle High School.

B215-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: HOPPE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B221-13     Setting property tax rates for 2013.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if the money generated by the \$0.41 tax rate went into the general fund or if it was dedicated for a particular purpose. Mr. Blattel replied it went into the general fund.

Ms. Nauser asked how long the tax rate had been at \$0.41. Mayor McDavid understood it was \$0.81 in 1976. Mr. Blattel replied it had been at \$0.41 for at least ten years.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor McDavid closed the public hearing.

Mayor McDavid pointed out only six percent of the property taxes paid by citizens went to the City.

B221-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

- B222-13 Adopting the FY 2014 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.**
- B223-13 Amending Chapters 4, 13 and 28 of the City Code relating to license and permit fees.**
- B224-13 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code relating to Public Health and Human Services Department fees.**
- B225-13 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code relating to parking fees for unmetered off-street facilities and parking meter rates in the campus area.**
- B226-13 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code relating to Parks and Recreation fees.**
- B227-13 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code relating to water rates.**

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Amy Camp stated she was the Chair of the Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission and explained the Commission was charged with making annual recommendations to the City Council and the Boone County Commission regarding the purchase of social services in the community. She noted the Commission was currently reviewing proposals and would provide recommendations in December based upon pre-established priorities. She listed reasons for the City to continue to invest in social services, which included the increase in the need for social services when resources for social services were diminishing. In recent years, Columbia had experienced its most difficult economic situation in decades, and while the unemployment rate was improving, the current five percent rate was still more than double the 2000 rate. She explained nearly one in four people in Columbia lived in poverty, which was about 25,000 people, and while they recognized the fact the poverty rate was affected by college students, the rate of child poverty was troubling. She noted about 38 percent of Columbia Public School students qualified for the free and reduced lunch program and 16 percent of children were living below the poverty level. In addition, due to the economic downturn, many people who had never needed help were accessing social services creating unprecedented needs. She pointed out social services funding from the City had been reduced by five percent in 2009 and had been held flat since then. It was less than one-quarter of one percent of the City's overall budget. Also of great concern was the persistent social, economic, health and educational disparities among races. African-Americans experienced disproportionately high rates of poverty and unemployment and low rates of home ownership and educational attainment. As a result, the Commission's performance measures and analyses were intentionally inclusive of affected subpopulations and their respective inequalities. She pointed out the City's social services funding allowed for the leveraging of additional resources to deliver services that were greatly needed, so for every \$1 the City invested, an addition \$58 was generated. In addition, this investment could result in a cost savings in areas such as public safety, especially if invested in prevention type services, as the cost to mentor a young person for one year was \$644 versus \$19,000 per year to incarcerate the same young person. She asked the Council to continue investing in social services at level funding at the very least as it was critical in the social and economic well-being of the community.

Lynn Barnett-Sleeper, 2012 Dearborn Circle, explained she was the Chair of the Commission on Cultural Affairs and provided a summary of the 2013 arts funding process.

They were again recommending using almost one-third of the Office of Cultural Affairs' annual budget for local arts agencies to provide artistic and cultural programming for the citizens of Columbia. They had received nineteen applications with requests totaling \$160,000, but only \$92,677 would be used for annual funding and another \$3,000 would be set aside for the small request funding process. She noted the arts played a part in strengthening the community as funding provided to local arts agencies was crucial in enhancing the lives of the citizens and the growing economy. These funds allowed organizations to bring high quality arts programs to the City, help provide cultural and educational opportunities to underserved populations, leverage other outside funding, bring visitors to the City and create economic development. She pointed out a recent study showed individual participants in arts activities would spend an additional \$26 outside of the cost of the ticket to the event. In addition, these activities strengthened quality of life making Columbia a more desirable place to live and do business. The Commission commended the Council for recognizing the importance of actively supporting the arts locally, and hoped they would continue that tradition.

O.U. Ukoha stated he was the Vice Chair of the Columbia Community Development Commission and explained the Commission made recommendations for the funding received from HUD to improve infrastructure, renovate buildings, etc. He pointed out that although the federal government had been cutting funding since 2010, the City of Columbia had been fortunate in that funding had increased for the City since they had shown a commitment to the five year plan. In addition, most of the agencies the City funded had a history of completing projects in a timely manner. He described the application review process and listed the recommendations for the upcoming fiscal year. He noted they could not fund every agency, so the Commission made the effort to look at the agency's record, how the service would benefit the community, etc. in making its recommendation. He stated he hoped the recommendations of the Commission would be followed.

Jennifer Erickson explained she was the Director of Columbia Access Television (CAT) and asked those in support of CAT to stand. Approximately 20 people stood. She commented that zeroing the CAT budget would result in lost community value. She stated CAT operated Columbia's public access channel, CAT TV, and that CAT TV was only one part of their full mission. CAT taught the community resume building media skills using cameras, editing software, etc. Members had access to expensive, high tech video equipment at an affordable rate so it was available to people of all income levels and backgrounds. She explained they also collaborated with dozens of non-profits and businesses to produce high quality PSA's and community highlight videos to help them achieve their missions. She noted CAT TV had a full range of programming in terms of high and low production values, comedy, live music, religious programming, public awareness and issue oriented panel discussions, etc. She pointed out CAT was the only channel that had a full local focus. It was the non-commercial, dedicated media outlet for freedom of speech and expression without interference from government or private interests, and it allowed and encouraged community dialogue. She stated they had more active members within the last two years producing more shows, which only added to the number of viewers.



Dan Hood stated he was a member of the CAT Board and noted they were a strong and engaged working Board. In early July, they had participated in a two day retreat and discussed self-sustainability and new funding streams. He believed the City had made a wise decision when it decided to fund CAT TV as it was community media made by the community for the community. If the City were to cut funding to nothing, it would seriously jeopardize all of the services CAT offered the community.

Dianne Lynch, 1209 Locust Street, explained she was speaking as a citizen, former journalist and the President of Stephens College, and noted Stephens College had been a partner with CAT TV for the past five years. She commented that she understood the issues involved when balancing a budget. She pointed out Stephens College had a positive and productive relationship with CAT and CAT had become professionalized under the leadership of Jennifer Erickson in a way that better served the community. She stated CAT gave voice to the voiceless, which other institutions in the community did not provide. She appreciated the fact the City had its own channel, but pointed out it provided an entirely different kind of service. She agreed CAT programming was not always great, but felt that was okay since it was community and people were learning how to have a voice, develop a voice and how to feel strong and good about the voice. She noted Stephens College donated about \$20,000 in space, utilities and support to CAT and would be delighted to continue providing those services, but pointed out they could not do it alone. She felt it was the City's responsibility to remain invested in and committed to CAT and hoped it was still thriving years from now.

Jim Loveless, 2116 Nelwood, explained he was the President and CEO of Job Point and noted he was supportive of the recommendations made by Community Services Advisory Commission and the Community Development Commission. He stated Job Point was one of the non-profit organizations that had benefited from the services of CAT TV as well.

William Donald explained he was a member of CAT and urged the Council to support CAT TV by opposing the elimination and reduction of funding for it. He noted he had been a member for less than two years, but had taken all of the film making and editing classes. He was impressed with the programs and facilities CAT and Stephens College provided Columbia residents and the helpfulness, competence and friendliness of the staff. He knew nothing about video production until he worked with the knowledgeable staff. He stated CAT TV had educated him on the process of making video television and had shown him the reality beyond what was seen on television. He believed the Council should be proud of the programming CAT provided citizens. He explained he videotaped the performances of comedians and made those videos available to performers free of charge so they could share performances with friends and learn to become better. His short videos aired on television and the internet. He stated CAT TV was an excellent venue for making the community aware of local artists, and noted it had helped him enrich his retirement and give back to the community. He asked the Council to support CAT TV.

Ben Jacob, 1 Liberty Plaza, stated he agreed with comments made to not take money from existing programs to fund buildings, the airport, improvements to Rangeline, etc. He hoped the City would continue funding CAT as it was only \$200,000 per year and benefited the community.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he disagreed with the recommendation to not fund CAT TV with money from the cable franchise fee, which was a dedicated fund source. He did not believe a survey indicating citizens felt crime and road improvements were important necessarily indicated public communication was less important. He also believed it was problematic to divert cable franchise fee revenues to other items since they were not in a triage situation as roads were not collapsing, etc. He pointed out many organizations relied on the functions CAT TV provided and asked the Council to not pull its funding.

Neil Miller noted he came to Columbia in 1962 on a baseball scholarship and had taught at Stephens College, Columbia College and the University of Missouri. Video was doubling each year and knowing how to produce and make video was a key to any community and its access to a worldwide stage. By eliminating funding for CAT, Columbia would lose the only place it had where people were taught to create and sell video on a worldwide market. He believed this was a skill the community wanted to keep.

Brent Lowenberg, 210 Russell Boulevard, stated he was the Treasurer of the Columbia Interfaith Resource Center, which served the Interfaith Day Center on Park Street and the Room at the Inn Winter Shelter. He hoped the City would continue to fund social services at its existing level or increase funding to it. Prior to his volunteer work as Treasurer, he had spent 30 years being a social service worker and had used services from various agencies, such as Meals on Wheels, the Voluntary Action Center and Phoenix Programs, and they were all vital in keeping people in their homes and off of the streets. He noted a reduction in services would increase the number of homeless in the community and hoped the City would provide help to all of those that needed it in the community.

There being no further comment, Mayor McDavid continued the public hearing on these bills to the September 3, 2013 Council Meeting.

**(A) Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Route K, approximately 2,000 feet south of the intersection of Providence Road, Route K and Old Plank Road.**

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood this annexation was contingent upon approval of the PUD zoning at the next meeting. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala asked if the request for this property to come in as a PUD characterized any future action. Mr. Teddy replied the annexation was motivated by development. Broadly speaking, there were two reasons for voluntarily annexing property into the City. One reason was the desire for sewer for an existing building or buildings and the other was to develop a property. This subject property was vacant. The County zoning was R-S, which was equivalent to City R-1, and A-1 on about four-fifths of the property, which had a ten acre minimum lot size.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor McDavid closed the public hearing.

**R165-13 Authorizing a contract amendment with the State of Missouri Department of Economic Development – Division of Business and Community Services as it relates to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program budget; authorizing the purchase of**

**property located at 9 Pendleton Street using Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds for land bank acquisition.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood some in the community felt the City had the wrong priorities and was spending its funds inappropriately. He asked why these funds were not being used to hire police officers. Mr. Matthes replied the City was not permitted to hire police officers with this funding source.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor McDavid closed the public hearing.

The vote on R165-13 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**OLD BUSINESS**

**B201-13 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southeast corner of St. Charles Road and Demaret Drive (700 Demaret Drive); establishing permanent R-1 zoning.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

CJ Dykhouse, 3805 Bedford, explained he was the Boone County Counselor and noted the Boone County Commission was supportive of this annexation petition.

B201-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B202-13 Voluntary annexation of property located on the west side of Scott Boulevard, between Brushwood Lake Road and Bellview Drive; establishing permanent A-1 zoning (Jay Dix Station).**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

CJ Dykhouse, 3805 Bedford, stated he was the Boone County Counselor and noted the Boone County Commission was supportive of this annexation petition.

B202-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B203-13 Changing the uses allowed on PUD-30 zoned property located on the northeast corner of Garth Avenue and Sexton Road; approving a revised statement of intent; approving the PUD Site Plan for Kinney Point; allowing a reduction in the required perimeter setback; setting forth a condition for approval.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood there were attendance issues at recent Planning and Zoning Commission meetings, and asked for clarification to be provided on what the unanimous vote meant as part of the staff report. Mr. Teddy replied it was 6-0 in this case.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend B203-13 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Tim Crockett explained he was an engineer with Crockett Engineering, 2608 N. Stadium Boulevard, and pointed out they were asking for a setback variance to the north as there was a public alley that would provide additional screening and tree coverage, which they would try to preserve if possible, and for a variance to the building line setback to add a pergola in the common space.

Mr. Skala asked if the alley was a part of a City easement. Mr. Crockett replied it was dedicated right-of-way the City owned. An alley had not been constructed and it was currently greenspace.

Phil Steinhaus stated he was the CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority (CHA), 201 Switzler Street, and explained this was a part of their affordable housing initiative as there was a shortage of one bedroom apartments. He noted supportive services would be provided by New Horizons. He listed the number of meetings held on the issue and stated information had been provided on the CHA's website. He noted they had been able to work most issues out with the neighbors and described those accommodations.

Mr. Schmidt commented that he was happy the CHA had solicited public input and had been responsive. He was also happy the setback issue had been addressed as he really wanted the alley space to be used.

Mr. Trapp stated he liked the changes to the plan in terms of the building being three stories, more greenspace being provided and the addition of the pergola. He believed this area was primed for redevelopment and this was a great first step. He agreed there was a great need for one bedroom apartments and thought this would ultimately allow more people to be housed, which helped with the homeless situation. He also liked that New Horizons supportive services would be on-site as they could help integrate the residents in the full community. He commended the CHA for this project.

B203-13, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS.

VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B204-13 Rezoning property located on the north side of the terminus of East Lathrop Road (7 East Lathrop Road) from District R-3 to District R-1.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked for clarification regarding the intent of downzoning. Mr. Teddy replied he was not privy to the specific discussions, but understood there had been a large effort in the neighborhood to purchase R-3 property to the south when its sale was imminent. He thought it was an effort to create better harmony with the dead end street situation.

Mr. Schmidt asked if this was the last R-3 zoned property in the area. Mr. Teddy replied the existing Greek house and its property was zoned R-3. He thought there were

other R-3 zoned properties in the vicinity oriented to Stewart Road. Mr. Schmidt understood everything that was not R-1 or R-2 was zoned R-3 when zoning began and asked if that was correct. Mr. Teddy replied it was not a platted lot and believed it was excepted out of the larger tract that had the Greek house.

Mr. Skala pointed out downzoning was rare and recalled the Planning and Zoning Commission identifying ten properties that had stale zoning for downzoning, but that downzoning never occurred.

Ms. Hoppe noted properties in East Campus had been downzoned in the past, and it was an effort of homeowners to preserve single family and historic housing and create a neighborhood balance.

B204-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B205-13     Approving the Columbia College Master Plan Update.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend B205-13 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Bob Hutton stated he represented Columbia College, 1001 Rogers Street, and explained this had been a lengthy and comprehensive process as they had started this update almost a year ago. He commented that although the Master Plan had changed over time due to changes and other factors, they took great pride in following their Master Plan. He pointed out there had been a public phase to the planning process in which a fair number of neighbors had participated. He understood they were enthusiastic for the plan and supported it even though he thought there might be some concerns.

Mr. Skala asked what aspects of the plan he felt the neighbors would not like. Mr. Hutton replied he had been apprehensive regarding the move north of Wilkes as he recalled the North Central Neighborhood Association in 1996 stating they would support Columbia College's plan if the College promised not to take single family residential homes, and as a result they had primarily stayed on the east side. He noted this plan was a deviation from that agreement and he believed the neighbors were supportive because the homes on the north side of Wilkes were in really bad condition. The other concern he had was showing the property on the far west side at Seventh and Hickman Avenue as housing, but they had liked the idea. Mr. Skala thought the neighborhood was supportive because it appreciated the fact Columbia College had been a good neighbor and a lot of the work that had been done around the College had been attractive. Mr. Hutton stated they tried hard to make their improvements attractive.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the traffic calming project on Rangeline from Rogers to Wilkes and asked if it had achieved the goals of the College and whether they had received any positive or negative feedback. Mr. Hutton replied they had received a lot of positive feedback and noted they were not finished. He agreed it had provided traffic calming.

Mr. Trapp asked about the move away from a parking garage and to surface parking. Mr. Hutton replied the College thought they could accomplish their parking goals without a parking garage. The new softball fields had moved northward in this iteration of the plan to the corner of Wilkes and Rangeline, which freed up a lot of parking between the softball field and the buildings that would remain at the south end of the northeast quadrant. This allowed them to accommodate their parking needs without the expense of a garage.

Mayor McDavid stated he thought the City was blessed to have a college that was this successful and committed to being a good neighbor when changing the core of the City. He believed they were doing a great job.

Ms. Hoppe commented that Columbia College was a solid anchor and enhanced the area. They had done a good job for so many years.

B205-13, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS.

VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B206-13 Establishing Columbia, Missouri Sanitary Sewer District No. 170 along Poplar Hill Drive.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

B206-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B213-13 Appropriating funds for electric capital projects.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

B213-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B216-13 Amending Ordinance No. 18197 to remove the Grindstone Nature Area and Twin Lakes from the archery deer hunting program.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe noted one trail had been identified for the Grindstone Nature Area, but there was another trail that could be seen on the aerial in the north part of the area, which was as wide as the trail to the south and used as much without a buffer. She explained she had received a lot communications from concerned people as this was the only off-leash dog park in the area and because more people were using it due to the new developments along Old 63. She noted most of the concerns were during the sunset and sunrise time frames, which were the times hunting in the winter occurred, and involved their safety as well as the safety of their dogs, which were off leash. She pointed out the Water-Moss property allowed bow hunting for an eighth site and was used less. She explained she had spoken with John George, a representative of the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) earlier today,

and he was amenable to removing the Grindstone Nature Area as a bow hunting location this year and potentially reducing the number of days one could hunt there or change the area utilized for bow hunting as that would still allow some hunting in the area along with the benefit of deer removal. She understood only three deer had been killed last hunting season. She also understood training sessions for bow hunting in the City would be held this week and felt it was appropriate to just remove this area this year as there was not time to review whether bow hunting could be allowed in a limited way in order to accommodate other users.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, stated she had hiked and walked her dog at the Grindstone Nature Area for a number of years and allowing archery there in very low light times of day never made sense to her as it was a crowded park area. She explained she and her friends just stopped going there from mid-September to mid-January. She thought the Grindstone Nature Area should be removed from the list for archery this year.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, explained she used to walk her dogs at the Grindstone Nature Area all of the time in the early morning, and had been unhappy when the archery program had started, but it had turned out fine. The bow hunters were trained and she never had an issue when walking her dogs there. She noted she had never seen a hunter there and had been looking for them. She explained she did not walk there now since she only had one dog that did not like socializing with other dogs, but had not felt unsafe when she had walked there in the past. She pointed out deer were becoming a problem and Rock Quarry Road was a risk in terms of accidentally hitting a deer since it was more heavily traveled. She understood a deer had recently run across Broadway at Old 63 during the day. They were also in the East Campus Neighborhood as she saw them during the day and night now. She believed there was a deer problem and suggested allowing bow hunting to remain there or only modifying it.

Mayor McDavid asked for the recommendation of staff as he wondered how dangerous deer hunting was at the Grindstone Nature Area. Mr. Griggs replied the Grindstone Nature Area consisted of 199 acres and noted he thought they might be able to allow the lower section to remain as part of the archery program since the dogs were primarily in the upper area. He agreed they had the Waters-Moss property, which was about 100 acres and across the road. He was concerned by the fact other properties, such as Strawn Road and the Smith property, would be removed from the program soon since they would be developed as parks.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Parks and Recreation Commission voted 6-1 in favor of removing the archery program from the Grindstone Nature Area. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe stated she would be amenable to keeping the lower part of the Grindstone Nature Area in the archery program, and noted they could then have further discussions regarding future years in terms of the length of time the program existed, etc. She explained Mr. George of MDC had indicated if they limited hunting to 20 days, the hunters would come out in full force those 20 days and hunt just as much as they would during the four month time frame. This would give other users the confidence and peace of mind as to when the hunters were there.

Ms. Nauser commented that she knew a lot of hunters and did not believe they would mistake a dog for a deer, especially when bow hunting, as they would be shooting down versus across a field. Even though only three deer were removed from the area, there were three less deer that were reproducing and running in the streets.

Mr. Skala thought this was an issue of balance as the hunters were serving a useful purpose since the deer were overpopulated. He relayed a story of exploring the wooded area near his home about twenty years ago, and as he was coming back out of the area, a bow hunter was drawing down on him. That experience made him think about mixing bow hunting with dogs and people. He believed it was reasonable prudent to allow hunting in the southern part to provide a balance with those that had dogs due to the deer population.

Mr. Trapp stated he preferred to maintain hunting throughout the area. He explained he walked his dog off-leash in that area quite often, and if he dog had a similar look to a deer and he was concerned, he would avoid the times hunting was allowed. Ms. Hoppe pointed out that was four months out of the year and around 5 p.m. when many people walked their dogs.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend B216-13 by not removing the entire Grindstone Nature Area, and by adding “Lower” in front of “Grindstone Nature Area” so bow hunting could still occur on the lower portion of the Grindstone Nature Area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mayor McDavid stated he planned to support the bill as amended.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend B216-13 by not removing the entire Grindstone Nature Area, and by adding “Lower” in front of “Grindstone Nature Area” so bow hunting could still occur on the lower portion of the Grindstone Nature Area, was approved by voice vote with Ms. Nauser and Mr. Trapp voting against it.

B216-13, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS.

VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B219-13 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to automated traffic control systems.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine provided a staff report.

Mr. Schmidt understood the issuance of tickets for red light camera violations was down 22 percent for the five intersections with cameras. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

Mr. Schmidt asked what cities that had the 80-90 percent drops did and whether staff had thoughts on the issue. Mr. St. Romaine replied he only looked at other Missouri cities and could not find another Missouri city that was requiring a clear and identifiable photo of the violator. He explained Columbia chose to do facial recognition was because state legislation was unclear about 3-4 years ago. Court cases had since been adjudicated and it had been established that cities had the authority to participate in red light camera programs and to treat the violations as infractions rather than moving violations. In addition, it was



established the owner of the vehicle could bear the responsibility. Staff was suggesting changing the program in Columbia to match what case law had established.

Ms. Nauser asked if it was a moving violation if the photo of the driver was available. Mr. St. Romaine replied no. He explained the City did not assess points. Tickets were sent to the State Court Administrator and their position was to treat red light camera tickets statewide as non-moving violations, so they chose not to assess points.

Mr. Schmidt understood the goal was to reduce the number of red light violations so they did not care if points were assessed. They only wanted to affect behavior. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood no citations were issued more times than citations were issued each year due to the requirement of having a clear photo of the driver. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala pointed out the behavior could also be changed by moving the cameras around to different locations. Mr. St. Romaine agreed.

Mr. Skala noted he thought it was important to have an identifiable photo of the person if it resulted in a moving violation, but did not feel it was necessary if only a citation was given to the owner of the vehicle.

Ms. Nauser asked why the money generated from this program was not earmarked for public safety if it freed up officers from sitting at intersections and handing out citations. Mr. Matthes replied it could be earmarked for that purpose, but if what they had seen continued, there would be less revenue each year as people stopped running red lights. At this time, the money was not programmed for a specific use, but it did go into the general revenue. He thought they could dedicate any increase to public safety.

Mr. Trapp asked if the fine would go down with a change in the program. Mr. St. Romaine replied no, but pointed out it would change behavior over time. He noted they could move forward with installing the cameras at additional intersections as well.

Mayor McDavid understood the focus tonight was whether to change the criteria for infractions and the case made was compelling.

Mr. Matthes reiterated they were not proposing a change to the fine. They were only proposing to change the basis on which the fine was issued.

Mr. Thomas thought this was an important program and believed there would be a more pedestrian hostile environment without it. He understood it cost \$100,000 to install the equipment at each intersection. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct, and pointed out these were fairly elaborate systems with facial recognition cameras. Mr. Thomas asked if any cities simply installed cameras to capture the license plate. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes and noted it was cheaper. He explained some cities owned and operated their own equipment as well. Mr. Thomas stated he had concerns a private, third party provider was making a profit and had a different motive. Mr. St. Romaine agreed they received a percentage of the ticket, but noted they could not do anything to increase their revenue. In addition, the City did not have a capital investment and did not have to be out any money for the cameras, wifi, etc. Mr. Schmidt noted the City also did not have to have the IT people to support it, which could be costly. Mr. St. Romaine agreed. Mr. Thomas commented that if

the ordinance were changed as proposed, the City could use a less sophisticated system. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

Mary Hussmann, 5306 Rice Road, asked the Council to really think this through. She did not believe new regulations should be passed to charge red light violations to vehicle owners regardless of the driver. Many Columbians were opposed to and still skeptical of the red light cameras as this had been initiated by the City and not the citizens in 2009, and the citizens had not been provided the chance to vote on this major shift in enforcement policy. She stated many residents were irritated by the red light camera and felt the green and yellow light time lengths had been shortened to increase the number of violations. In addition, the signs notifying people of the red light cameras were hard to find and small. She believed many Columbians felt the use of red light cameras was to make money instead of protecting people, and this proposed change would produce more money for GATSO and the City. She felt the \$120 fine was a lot for many Columbia families and did not believe title holders should be penalized, harassed or charged because GATSO could not consistently produce a clear picture of the driver. She thought the policy should remain the same and a driver should only be cited if identifiable. She believed it was unfair to issue a citation to a vehicle owner without knowing the owner was the offender as they would be ticketing innocent people. In addition, it would create unnecessary quarrels between friends, families, etc. in terms of who should pay. She believed only the person who broke the law should be held personally responsible.

Sue Tillema, 306 Westridge, understood police officers were used to properly identify the driver under the current system. Mr. St. Romaine stated every citation was reviewed by a law enforcement officer to ensure a clearly identifiable photo of the driver and the fact the vehicle ran a red light prior to GATSO mailing the citation. Ms. Tillema understood the changes might bring in more money from more violations, but it might also require more police time, and this was an issue since they wanted more officers on the street. Mr. St. Romaine pointed out the amount of time of the law enforcement officer would be reduced since a clearly identifiable photo would no longer be necessary.

Mr. St. Romaine noted the City issued citations to a registered title holder versus the driver of the vehicle everyday in terms of parking citations. In addition, the vehicle owner could go to Municipal Court and sign an affidavit stating he was not the driver or the vehicle owner could choose to transfer the liability to the actual driver.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline, stated the entire City was against red light cameras previously and he believed there would be rear end collisions as a result of this as more people would stop abruptly if they thought the light might change to red. He thought education was a better option.

Jim Olson, 5555 W. Driskel Road, explained he traveled past the Columbia Mall a lot and many cars ran red lights because they were caught in the middle of the intersection. He wondered how those situations would be handled as it was a result of the traffic flow since the light was green when they went into the intersection. He wondered if there would be any discretion. He also understood there were countdown signals similar to crosswalk signals and suggested those be installed as upgrades to signals were made as he believed that would reduce the running of red lights.

Mr. Thomas commented that he believed driving a vehicle was a privilege and not a right, and that it came with a lot of responsibility. He understood a comment was made indicating drivers would be scared to enter the intersection because they might receive a fine and pointed out pedestrians, cyclists and wheelchair users were scared to enter intersections due to vehicles running red lights. He thought it was essential to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment on the streets if they wanted to be a healthy, active community, and believed the program needed to be improved if they were missing out on 60 percent of the violators. He noted he would support the change, but pointed out he was not a fan of the high technology and the extortionate sounding costs of the cameras. He reiterated he believed it was the responsibility of a car owner to ensure anyone using the car obeyed traffic laws, and if the signage was a concern, he suggested the signage be larger while keeping within the limits of the sign ordinance. He thought they should let everyone know the red light cameras were in operation as that would also deter this behavior.

Mr. Schmidt stated he viewed this as a matter of public safety and noted that no revenue would be raised if everyone obeyed the law so there was not a conspiracy. In addition, the ultimate goal of the cameras was to deter people from running red lights. He thought the comment regarding the countdown lights was interesting and would like to hear more about it for the future.

Mr. Skala explained he was conflicted and noted he had voted against the red light cameras when this issue first came up. He did not want this change to create an incentive to have cameras at all of the intersections, especially those that did not warrant the use of them. He stated he liked the idea this was less sophisticated and cheaper and would bring in more revenue, but he was more interested in the behavior and did not want this accelerated beyond what was necessary to change behavior.

Ms. Nauser stated she had voted against red light cameras when this first came to Council for many reasons and felt there was a big difference between a \$200 fine and a \$15 parking ticket in terms of making the vehicle owner responsible. As a result, she believed that type of fine warranted the need for an identifiable photo of the driver so that person was penalized instead of the vehicle owner. She explained people from government offices and businesses with large fleets had contacted her about their concerns in terms of budgets, etc. She agreed they wanted to stop people from breaking the law, but did not think they could prevent it as they could not monitor all of the intersections. She stated she would not support this ordinance change.

B219-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NAUSER, SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B228-13 Calling a special election relating to an increase in the general property tax rate for the purpose of funding police services, personnel and associated equipment and other related expenses provided by the City of Columbia Police Department.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Bill Samuels, P.O. Box 30084, asked anyone opposed to this like he was to contact him, and noted that if this issue was placed on the ballot and was not passed by the citizens, he did not think it meant the public was not properly supportive of the Police Department. He thought it meant the Council was not supportive of them in terms of setting priorities. He believed the Police and Fire Departments were not intentionally provided everything they needed, and this allowed the City to go to the voters to say taxes were needed to support public safety. He noted there would be opposition to this by many people for many reasons. He also understood the Columbia Police Officers Association had not taken a position on this issue, but they had raised some valuable questions.

Dale Roberts stated he represented the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA), 1301 Vandiver Drive, and thought everyone agreed there was a need for more police officers. The question was how to get those additional officers. He agreed with Mr. Matthes on some monetary issues, but questioned him on others. He understood the need to balance the budget, but questioned whether the funds that had previously been earmarked for 911 were being used for fire and police services as had been implied in January. He agreed it was the decision of Council with regard to how to fund more officers, but pointed out more officers were needed. He noted the CPOA had not opposed the tax. They had only indicated they would wait to see if anything else was available. He stated he appreciated the fact the City recognized the need for more officers and explained they would respond to suggestions accordingly.

Geoff Gunnell, 4006 Iguana Drive, stated he was concerned they were proposing to use a property tax instead of a sales tax as sales taxes had been used in the past to support law enforcement. He noted a lot of people were opposed to this because it would involve a property tax. He pointed out everyone would benefit from law enforcement, and not just property owners, so a sales tax was more equitable in terms of funding. He suggested a 1/8 cent sales tax, which would generate about \$2.4 million for about 24 new officers. This would provide an officer for every beat for 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He thought only school resource officers (SRO's) should be funded with a property tax since they were school security and school issues were generally funded with property taxes, but only a third to a half of what the City had currently proposed would be needed. He pointed out the SRO's could be patrol officers in the summer, which was when there was a relatively higher residential burglary rate and crime rates. He reiterated he believed a sales tax was more appropriate to begin the process of hiring more officers. He also did not feel all of these officers should be hired at one time and suggested beginning with only 18-20 officers.

Don Stamper explained he was a lobbyist with offices at 2604 N. Stadium Boulevard and noted he was representing the Home Builders Association, the Central Missouri Development Council and the Columbia Board of Realtors. The Columbia Board of Realtors was vehemently opposed to a real estate tax increase. He applauded Mayor McDavid for creating the discussion on this issue, the Council for being open-minded on the issue and City Administration for working on this issue. The Central Missouri Development Council was interested in this issue as they wanted to live in a safe community and believed additional resources were needed. They did not have a strong opinion on how those resources were created, but felt something needed to be done to make the community safer.

He was uncomfortable with this proposal moving forward as he did not believe they had the support of the community. He suggested they step back from this proposal and work with the community to find a common cause to solve the problem. He noted they were not afraid of discussing an increase in revenue, but pointed out they wanted a well thought out, concrete plan instead.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline, stated he agreed with the comments of Don Stamper and noted community input was needed in this discussion. He was not supportive of a property tax increase.

Jim Olson, 5555 W. Driskel Road, commented that he appreciated everything the Police Department did and preferred a sales tax over a property tax, but noted he was also concerned about using this amount of money for this type of activity as it would no longer be available for other efforts. He explained he was concerned about pension costs as well as those costs were not foreseeable, and suggested they not be available for new employees. He also suggested the use of more volunteers as a bigger presence was needed.

Mayor McDavid commented that asking for a revenue increase was a fairly complex issue and thought it had been overly simplistic for him to propose it. He believed everyone agreed there was a need for more police officers, and noted he was pleased with how effective the Police Department had been with the number of officers they had as they had solved a lot of bad crimes. He explained public safety in the City was primarily funded through sales tax and the numbers were down from \$94 per capita in 2002 to \$80 per capita last year. He noted they had cut basic services due to this financial distress by not hiring the necessary number of police officers. He suggested they not move forward with this proposal as he did not believe the citizens had enough confidence in them and believed they should ask the community to determine how to solve this problem as there were some options. He noted the citizens would come through if they saw a need and felt the City needed to better articulate the need. He stated he would vote against this bill.

Mr. Skala stated this was a complicated issue and agreed feedback was needed from the public. He noted a property tax and sales tax had been mentioned, but the property tax amount was likely too high and they were at the ceiling in terms of sales taxes. In addition, they were competing with other entities in terms of sales tax. He suggested they consider the cost of growth. He agreed growth was needed, but the cost of that growth had not been calculated and was not covered by the new tax revenue. He believed they should consider the cost of growth of new development since new development was a driver of growth, and pointed out police and fire were infrastructure as well. He suggested a blend of property taxes, sales taxes and an infrastructure fee based on trip generation or an impact approach as it could help to increase revenues. He thought that discussion should be had with the community as well as any other novel approaches. He agreed it was not a good idea to put this proposal on the November ballot. He also did not think they could hire as many officers as some were indicating at one time, and explained they likely would not have that many applicants as it was not as lucrative of a position as before the pension solution was implemented. He thought 15-20 additional officers was a more reasonable approach.

Mr. Trapp stated he appreciated Mayor McDavid bringing this proposal forward and believed he was trying to respond to the community's desire to see immediate action, but he

did not feel this situation lent itself to quick responses. He thought they needed to create a coalition to identify the exact numbers that were easily defensible to build support. He did not believe the community would support this in November and thought they should vote against it while continuing to look to add officers within the existing budget with existing dollars. They could come back later with a proposal that had wider support, such as a hybrid approach.

Ms. Nauser commented that she supported the use of property as a potential way to deal with this issue as she agreed they were at a ceiling with regard to sales tax. In addition, this problem would occur again if the revenue source was solely sales tax for an issue such as public safety. She also agreed a blended approach might be better. She thought they should pause as this was a more reactive approach. She noted she believed the problem with crime was larger than a lack of police officers. There had been a lot of misinformation, a lack of information, a lack of communication, etc., and as a result, she thought they should have a conversation as a community on how they wanted to move forward. She pointed out a Task Force had been established so that group would soon discuss the issue. She also suggested the public review the budget as the City Manager had proposed a \$1 million increase to public safety. There was more to public safety costs than personnel costs, and although the 911 tax was passed by the voters, the City was still responsible for some of those costs. In addition, pension costs impacted the budget. She noted the public could participate at the budget public hearings. She did not think an increase in taxes should be off of the table, but agreed they needed to move in a slow and methodical manner in coming up with a plan to hire more police officers as more officers were needed.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with the previous comments.

Mr. Schmidt explained he also agreed with many of the comments made. He thought the Task Force could review this situation and build support for a solution. He noted there had been merit in bringing this forward, but it did not have support. He was hopeful the Task Force would come up with some valid ideas.

Mr. Thomas agreed with many of the comments made as well. He noted he was also distressed by the lack of constructive communication between the stakeholders in the law enforcement community. He believed they had to bring everyone together to work as one with the common goal of keeping Columbia safe. At the moment, he believed they were wasting a lot of energy fighting each other.

B228-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. Bill declared defeated.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

The following bills were given second reading and the resolutions were read by the Clerk.

**B207-13**     **Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on a portion of Blue Ridge Road.**

**B208-13**     **Accepting Jenne Lane and a section of Old Route TT for ownership and maintenance from the Missouri Department of Transportation; authorizing**

road relinquishment agreements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission.

- B209-13 Authorizing a right of use permit with Bluebird Network, LLC for the installation of fiber optic telecommunications cable within the City rights-of way.
- B210-13 Authorizing a right of use permit with LAST Enterprises LLC for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of an egress ramp with handrail in a portion of the South Eighth Street (105 South Eighth Street) right-of-way.
- B211-13 Authorizing a financial assistance agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for a food waste collection vehicle to be used to collect organic food waste from commercial customers for composting; appropriating funds.
- B212-13 Appropriating non-motorized transportation funds for the sidewalk/pedway project along the north side of Stadium Boulevard from Providence Road to College Avenue.
- B214-13 Accepting conveyances for utility services.
- B217-13 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County Family Resources for additional funding for the Parks and Recreation Department's Career Awareness Related Experience (CARE) Youth Employment Program.
- B218-13 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County Family Resources for additional funding for the Parks and Recreation Department's Adapted Community Recreation Program.
- B220-13 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to conflicts of interest and financial disclosure procedures.
- R151-13 Setting a public hearing: considering the replacement of a water main along Business Loop 70, between Old Highway 63 and Eastwood Circle.
- R152-13 Setting a public hearing: authorizing the construction of infrastructure improvements, replacement of play features and the installation of playground surfacing improvements to the Steinberg Playground located within Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area.
- R153-13 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the west side of Howard Orchard Road, south of Stedman Road (5551 Howard Orchard Road).
- R154-13 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for the Show Me Healthy Women program.
- R155-13 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the purchase, installation and use of Missouri Statewide Wireless Interoperable Network (MOSWIN) capable radio equipment by the Department of Public Health and Human Services.
- R156-13 Authorizing an agreement with Job Point to provide vocational training for at-risk youth and young adults; transferring funds.
- R157-13 Authorizing an agreement with Central Missouri Community Action for administering a micro-loan program.
- R158-13 Authorizing an operations agreement with Thumper Productions, LLC for the 2013 Roots 'N Blues 'N BBQ Festival.

- R160-13 Authorizing an agreement with DoubleMap, Inc. for Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) equipment and related software and services for the Columbia transit system; authorizing an agreement with QuarkWorks, LLC for professional services for development of mobile applications to display bus location data from the AVL system.
- R161-13 Approving a project for Burrell, Inc. and the issuance of bonds by the Industrial Development Authority of Boone County, Missouri.
- R166-13 Authorizing an extension of the temporary closure of a portion of the sidewalk along the west side of Short Street, and a portion of the sidewalk along the north side of Broadway to allow for construction of a hotel at 1111 East Broadway.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

## NEW BUSINESS

- R159-13 Authorizing a contract with Engineering Surveys and Services, LLC for professional engineering services relating to the College Avenue pedestrian refuge enhancement project.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe commented that the East Campus Neighborhood was concerned about the left turn lanes and whether mid-block crosswalks would work for both pedestrians and vehicular traffic, so she wanted to ensure other options could be considered even though the project description had only proposed one possibility for safe pedestrian passage across College. Mr. Glascock replied other options could be looked into, but noted MoDOT ultimately made the decision since College was a MoDOT street.

Ms. Hoppe understood the contract indicated one meeting with the East Campus Neighborhood Association would be held if they were invited, but thought two meetings were necessary. One was needed to initially discuss the parameters and concerns, and another was needed after the engineer had come up with some ideas prior to the interested parties meeting. Mr. Glascock stated this contract was heavy in terms of the engineering fee, and as a result, City staff would have to participate in some of the meetings without the engineer in order to keep the engineering fees down. Ms. Hoppe asked if this would be the same for the Missouri Student Association (MSA). Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Hoppe asked if East Campus would be notified when they were meeting with the MSA so they could hear their ideas and concerns as well. Mr. Glascock replied it would be a public meeting. Ms. Hoppe asked if she and the Neighborhood would be notified. Mr. Glascock replied it would be posted and he would notify her.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, stated she was President of the East Campus Neighborhood Association and noted the Neighborhood was disappointed as they had been left out of the meetings from the start. The proposed plan was not acceptable to those that



lived, worked, rode bikes and walked to and from the University. They felt they would be better off if nothing was done.

Mr. Thomas asked what specific concerns the East Campus Neighborhood had with the design. Ms. Hammen replied the median was terrible as it was a fence. It would not have any landscaping because it was too expensive to maintain. There would be two mid-block crosswalk areas. She was concerned about their effectiveness. She understood there were two mid-block crosswalks at Stephens College on Walnut, but Walnut did not have the same amount of traffic as College. The plans called for no left turns on to and off of College at many intersections, which would decimate the business of the bed and breakfast and create terrible traffic patterns through the Neighborhood.

Ms. Hoppe asked if Ms. Hammen saw the possibility of providing input to create a good result or if she had completely given up with regard to this project. Ms. Hammen replied she agreed something needed to be done, but she was not sure they could get there from this plan.

Mr. Glascock explained the reason they had received the grant was because the University had provided this design. It did not mean this was what would be built. It was only an idea. Mayor McDavid understood input could be provided. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if the addition of landscaping and a redesign of the fenced area were possible. Mr. Glascock replied yes, and explained it could be improved.

The vote on R159-13 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R162-13 Expressing support for the second phase of the Gentry Estates housing development for senior citizens.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Bob Ring stated he was with JES Development Company and explained he was here tonight to ask for a resolution of support for the second phase of Gentry Estates. He pointed out the first phase, which would open in a couple weeks, was almost fully leased right now.

Ms. Nauser commented that this was in the Fifth Ward and the project that had already been developed was a wonderful addition to the community. It served a need and was close to many amenities that were beneficial to seniors. She noted she planned to support it.

The vote on R162-13 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R163-13 Expressing support for the Kinney Point Apartments housing development.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Phil Steinhaus commented that he was the CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority, 201 Switzler Street, and noted they had put a lot of work into this project. It would be a nine

percent low income housing tax credit application. They were excited for this to be one of their first forays into developing new affordable housing. He asked for Council support.

The vote on R163-13 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R164-13 Expressing support for the renovation of townhomes to be known as the Stuart Parker Apartments, located on Lincoln Drive, Unity Drive, Worley Street, Oak Street and Hicks Drive; expressing support for improvements to public housing units in Paquin Tower located at 1201 Paquin Street.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Phil Steinhaus commented that he was the CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority, 201 Switzler Street, and explained these aging public housing units needed to be renovated. The rental assistance demonstration program discussed during the Pre-Council Meeting would put them on the firm financial footing to apply for the four percent low income housing tax credit. They were less competitive than the nine percent tax credits so he was hopeful they would receive it.

Mr. Trapp asked for clarification regarding the pronunciation of Paquin. Mr. Steinhaus replied he was informed by C.K. Odor, the Executive Director of the Columbia Housing Authority when Paquin Tower was built, of the pronunciation of Paquin with a long “a” by the family.

Mr. Steinhaus pointed out they would not have to relocate anyone at Paquin Tower, but would have to relocate people at the Stuart Parker Apartments as major renovation was being done in those buildings.

Mr. Trapp noted the rental assistance demonstration project was a great opportunity to lock in steady funding for the Columbia Housing Authority for a long period of time. It was a great project with a high level chance for success.

The vote on R164-13 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

The following bills were introduced by the Mayor unless otherwise indicated, and all were given first reading.

**B229-13 Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Route K, approximately 2,000 feet south of the intersection of Providence Road, Route K and Old Plank Road; establishing permanent PUD-2.0 zoning; approving the Preliminary Plat & PUD Plan of Parkside Estates; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction.**

**B230-13 Changing the uses allowed on C-P zoned property located on the north side of Buttonwood Drive (3500 Buttonwood Drive); approving a revised statement of intent; approving a revision to the C-P Plan of Pavilion Building.**

- B231-13 Approving the Replat of Oak Ridge Plat 3A located on the east side of Scott Boulevard, approximately 250 feet north of Grant Lane.
- B232-13 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to balcony projections over property lines in C-2 zoning districts.
- B233-13 Authorizing the acquisition of additional easements for construction of the Scott Boulevard Phase 2 Street Improvement Project, from Brookview Terrace to Vawter School Road.
- B234-13 Accepting an easement for drainage and utility purposes.
- B235-13 Authorizing the construction of infrastructure improvements, replacement of play features and the installation of playground surfacing improvements to the Steinberg Playground located within Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area.
- B236-13 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Nauser Investments, LLC for property located on Paris Road.
- B237-13 Authorizing construction of a portion of the south section of the 24-inch East Water Transmission Main Project from Ponderosa Street under Highway 63 and northward to an existing water valve on Maguire Boulevard.
- B238-13 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

**REP126-13 FilterPave Donation Project for City Hall.**

Ms. Hoppe asked if the performance would be monitored. Mr. Glascock replied this small area along with the area along the Plaza Parking Garage was already porous, so they could determine if it performed better.

Mr. Skala understood there were other demonstration projects and this would provide a comparison to those projects. Mr. Glascock replied they would compare it to the best of their ability. He pointed out they did not have the flow or velocity, but could watch how it acted.

Mr. Trapp made a motion accepting the donation and directing staff to work with FilterPave to replace the porous concrete in the parking area north of City Hall. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP127-13 Request for Parking Prohibition on a Portion of Madison Street.**

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to bring forward an ordinance amending Section 14-324 of the City Code to prohibit parking on the east side of Madison Street 250 feet south of Business Loop 70. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP128-13 Establish Tow Zones on Priority Routes with Snow Measuring More than Two Inches.**

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if the police had to be present when a tow situation occurred since private property was involved. Mr. Glascock replied a car could be towed by parking

enforcement, but this would be in areas other than the downtown so the police would likely be involved. Mr. Matthes stated the City would do a lot of marketing during the snow season if Council decided to proceed. He was hopeful not very many vehicles would need to be towed.

Mr. Schmidt recalled the City having to plow around a lot of abandoned cars and this would provide them the ability to tow them.

Mr. Glascock noted they would likely only tow if the City Manager declared a snow emergency.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to bring forward an ordinance that created tow zones on first and second priority routes when snow was more than two inches deep. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP129-13 High-Density Residential Use in the C-2 District.**

Ms. Hoppe made a motion for this report to be placed on the September 3, 2013 Council Meeting agenda for discussion as many of the interested parties had left. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP130-13 Correspondence from the Disabilities Commission regarding Clark Lane.**

Mayor McDavid asked about timing as he understood this was under design. Mr. Skala replied he understood they were in preparation to begin as GetAbout money was available, but understood it would need to be cleared through the appropriate federal agencies. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct and noted they had to coordinate with all three levels. He thought December was when federal amendments would be considered.

**REP131-13 Compressed Natural Gas: Fracking, Safety and Alternative Fuels Comparison.**

Mayor McDavid asked how much natural gas was used to heat homes in Columbia. He wondered what percent of homes used natural gas to heat their home in Columbia. Mr. Reharde replied he did not have that information. Mayor McDavid understood it was a substantial number. Mr. Reharde stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood it had been stated that natural gas was a more environmental friendly fuel because the tailpipe emissions were lower than new diesel, but felt that was disingenuous because there was a lot of uncertainty about the environmental impact of the extraction technique and good evidence that diesel and compressed natural gas were equally damaging during their lifetimes from extraction to combustion. In addition, there was uncertainty with regard to the effects of hydraulic fracturing. If existing regulations were followed, there was very little to choose from in terms of the safety of the different fuels. Compressed natural gas was about 60 percent of the cost of diesel so there was potential savings to convert some of the fleet. If he read the budget correctly, they were spending \$570,000 on fuel for transit in 2012, and if they continued at that level, they would save \$230,000 per year with compressed natural gas, but there were costs to switch to compressed natural gas, which included the cost of the land, refueling station and vehicles.

He commented that he did not see the financial savings of this move or the environmental or safety benefits.

Mayor McDavid noted a Kansas City Star article he had read two weeks ago had indicated Kansas City was converting its transit system, and they were telling their citizens the life cycle savings per bus was \$100,000 based on current costs of transition, maintenance, fuel, etc. He understood an analysis had been done indicating there would be a savings notwithstanding the environmental impacts.

Mr. Skala stated he understood the cost of the refueling station would be born by the private side of the private-public partnership. Mr. Thomas understood the costs had been included in a grant application the City had written to the United States Department of Transportation. Mr. Skala stated that had not been his understanding. Mayor McDavid explained he understood it the same way as Mr. Skala had. Mr. Matthes noted the agreement with Clean Energy would be brought to Council, and that was the way it read, but the City could also chose to pay for it and own it outright through the TIGER grant. Either way, it would not be funded by local taxpayers.

Mr. Skala commented that the importance of this conversion in the interim to compressed natural gas was part of a diversification program. The entire fleet would not be converted. He understood they still needed to focus on renewable or hybrid vehicles, and pointed out that if they got to their goal of renewables and did not have to use compressed natural gas, the energy companies would likely continue to frack and sell that gas to other countries unless regulations were changed. As a result, he did not believe the City was fueling their thirst for the fracking technology.

**REP132-13 Correspondence from the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board regarding FY2013 Tourism Development Funds.**

Ms. Schneider provided a staff report.

**REP133-13 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

Mayor McDavid understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline, stated Clark Lane was dangerous as people walked in the road since there were no sidewalks. He commented that he had been involved with bringing Habitat for Humanity to the City, which likely saved the City millions of dollars, and believed he should be provided more respect. He noted he was disabled and was trying to help people with regard to voicing his concerns regarding compressed natural gas. He provided some examples of the dangers of fracking and compressed natural gas.

Ben Jacobs, 1 Liberty Plaza, commented that he did not believe the public should be required to provide addresses for safety purposes. He also noted CAT TV was a multi-award winner and provided educational opportunities to those with low incomes. He stated he believed in sublimity in civic life, education and food as well as security, and asked the Council to re-evaluate the request of those that wanted sublimity next to the creek. He hoped the entire City would be a park with benches and the streets were shaded with fruit trees.

Mr. Skala asked for a report with the proportion of calls to the Fire Department for medical emergencies and fire emergencies.

Mr. Skala asked for a draft ordinance concerning a citizen tree board based upon the ideas encompassed in the letter he provided the City Manager in May. Mr. Matthes replied staff had been working on it so he would see something in the future.

The meeting adjourned at 1:44 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk