

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
JUNE 3, 2013**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, June 3, 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 MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER and HOPPE 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 May 20, 2013 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Trapp.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Hoppe asked that B142-13 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. Ms. Amin noted B137-13 needed to be moved from the consent agenda to old business in order to be amended.

The agenda, to include the consent agenda with B137-13 and B142-13 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Nicholas Pretnar - Permit Parking for the Benton Stephens Neighborhood.

Nicholas Pretnar commented that he was concerned about the effects of residential developments in downtown Columbia on surrounding neighborhoods. The student housing developments on College Avenue and other downtown streets had already created parking problems in the downtown and the surrounding neighborhoods, to include Benton Stephens, East Campus and North Village. He urged the Council to consider expanding the permit parking pilot project created for the North Village Neighborhood into Benton Stephens and other affected neighborhoods. He noted the residential streets in the neighborhood were very narrow and often could only accommodate one-way traffic. In addition, the students that parked in the neighborhood were known to drive erratically and fast, and would back down an entire block in order to get a spot or park in front of a fire hydrant. The Benton Stephens Neighborhood wanted an expansion of the permit parking pilot program into their neighborhood along with adequate enforcement. He stated he believed the Council needed

to reconsider continuing the future development of downtown. The newly built student housing apartments appeared to be cheaply built and could not accommodate younger professionals that preferred to live in 1-2 bedroom units. Four bedroom units were being designed for undergraduates living with friends that tended to be rowdy. He suggested future zoning regulations consider requiring certain types of apartments and the purchase or creation of parking spaces for each resident if parking was not provided by the development, along with the expansion of the permit parking program to help maintain a continuity of community.

Lawrence Lile - Environment and Energy Commission Position on the 2012 Building Code.

Lawrence Lile explained he was the Chair of the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) and noted they were advocating the passing of the 2012 building code, and in particular the energy code. He stated the EEC had worked with the Building Construction Codes Commission (BCCC), and there were only three instances in which they did not agree. Those three situations involved attic insulation, wall insulation and perimeter insulation for slabs. The EEC felt these were three areas in which an increase in energy efficiency could occur. The 2012 code recommended an R49 for attics and an R20 for walls, but the BCCC wanted to stay with R38 for attics and high density batt insulation instead of continuous insulation for walls. The EEC felt the energy benefits for the higher insulations levels were important and should be preserved. Traditionally, Columbia had allowed the edges of a slab on grade to be uninsulated so termite inspections could be done, but the EEC understood termite shields could be utilized as they allowed the house to be resistant to termites while insulating the full perimeter of the slab. He noted his house was built in that manner and he did not have termites. He commented that these items were important because energy conservation benefited the homeowner in cost savings over the years, and these measures would pay for themselves and benefited the City in terms of conservation to avoid the purchase of more coal contracts. He asked the Council to consider adopting the stronger energy codes for the benefit of both the City and the homeowner.

Matthew Giudice of Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance - Adoption of the 2012 Building Energy Code.

Matthew Giudice stated he was representing the Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, which was an organization based in Chicago that promoted energy efficiency in thirteen states in the Midwest region, and noted they were glad Columbia was looking at the 2012 energy code as it was a strong and cost-effective code. He explained he had reviewed the proposals of the Building Construction Codes Commission (BCCC) and the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC), but felt the 2012 building code as written was the most cost-effective, and urged the Council to adopt it. The efficiency improvements contained in the code would stay with the building for the life of the building and produce benefits for the homeowner or building operator for the life of the building. He stated his organization had analyzed the energy and cost savings that could be gained by the 2012 code in comparison to the City's current code, and provided a handout which showed several hundred dollars could be saved in one year alone. He referred to a Department of Energy study, which

showed the increase in a down payment and a monthly mortgage payment over a 30 year mortgage would yield a net positive cash flow within the first year due to energy savings. He understood the BCCC and other stakeholders opposed the 2012 code requirements to verify the rate of air infiltration in new construction, to insulate slabs, which had been mentioned by Mr. Lile, and to verify the tightness of the duct system, and noted they had analyzed these issues and all would significantly impact the energy benefits of the new code. He asked the Council to consider adopting the 2012 code.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B145-13 Authorizing the repair and resurfacing of the tennis courts at Cosmo-Bethel Park and Gentry Middle School; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Public School District; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend B145-13 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala asked if other tennis courts within the City would be resurfaced. Mr. Griggs replied yes, and explained the Council had provided authorization to repair the Albert-Oakland Park tennis courts at the previous meeting through the use of surplus funds. He noted staff was also working with the Columbia Public Schools on the potential construction of 7-8 tennis courts at Hickman with the understanding those courts would be available to the public during non-school use times as they did not have any tennis courts in the First Ward. Ms. Hoppe understood the tennis courts at Shepherd Elementary had been resurfaced last year. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he thought this partnership between the Columbia Public Schools, the City and the University was great as it would bring visitors to the community, which in turn would help hotels and other businesses.

Mr. Skala commented that he liked the fact staff was coordinating the resurfacing of so many courts in order to get a better price.

B145-13, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

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

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

B148-13 Authorizing the construction of improvements to the interior and exterior of the J.W. “Blind” Boone Home; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe understood there was a \$15,300 cost estimate for exterior painting and that the exterior had been previously restored, and asked for clarification. Mr. Griggs replied there were some rotten boards and paint was coming off of some boards, but he was not

sure it would cost \$15,000 as staff estimated \$10,000. Mr. Matthes pointed out the building did not have a HVAC system so the freeze-thaw cycle throughout the year accelerated the wear and tear of the building. He did not expect these problems once the building was fully restored and the HVAC system was installed.

Ms. Nauser asked Mr. Matthes for his vision for the partnership with the John William Boone Heritage Foundation once the building was complete. Mr. Matthes replied staff was currently working through the process, but he envisioned the John William Boone Heritage Foundation as the most appropriate long term steward of the home, so he would suggest transmitting ownership to the Foundation if it was possible. If it was not possible, he suggested a long term lease of some kind. Ms. Nauser asked if there were future plans for the City to manage and operate a museum out of this property. Mr. Matthes replied the City was not interested in getting into the museum business. Ms. Nauser stated she wanted to ensure the community understood this was not a part of the City's long range plan.

Mr. Skala understood the building had a national historical significance in addition to a local historical significance in terms of ragtime music and that there had been several attempts to obtain federal funding, and explained he wanted to hear more about this from those involved with the Foundation.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Lucille Salerno stated she had been a member of the John William Boone Heritage Foundation since 1997 and explained she had worked to elevate the home from local significance to national significance in order to apply for Save America's Treasures grant money. They had submitted an application with regard to the home to the State Historic Preservation Commission, which approved its submission to the Secretary of Interior, and the home was approved for the National Register as being nationally significant in July of 2003 based upon the fact Boone had advanced the development of American music. She felt they had not sufficiently made this point in their previous efforts for funding. She provided the Council a handout regarding the historic significance of Boone.

Clyde Ruffin explained he was the current President of the John William Boone Heritage Foundation, and although the Foundation felt the Boone home was worthy of restoration due to its historic significance, they also knew it was unlikely it could be funded solely through private donations, which was why they had prepared the exhaustive application for the Save America's Treasures program. Unfortunately, this federal grant program had been suspended indefinitely due to the recession. He commented that in the interim, the Foundation had engaged in numerous fundraising programs and had continued to solicit support from local businesses, private donations and other organizations. He stated the goal of the Foundation had always been to ensure the home would stand as a lasting visual tribute to the greatness of John W. Boone and as a means to tell the story of this inspiring musician and civic leader whose life transcended the limitations of disability and race. Through a series of four charrettes over the last fifteen years under the direction of the Missouri Humanities Council, a vision for the house to serve as a unique community gathering place had been developed. The home would include a small display of Boone related artifacts and memorabilia and visitors would be able to hear renditions of his compositions, but the primary function of the restored home and surrounding gardens would

be to provide a place where the history, arts and culture of the community would be celebrated. The Foundation planned to promote the Boone home as a place for meetings, exhibits, public programs, intimate readings and musical performances. In addition, they had embarked upon a plan to use the home as instructional space for a program that would train area youth to document Columbia history through creative writing, music, art, photography and the collection of oral histories. They envisioned the restored Boone home as a place overflowing with children, creativity and the celebration of life for not only the African American community but for all of the people of Columbia. They were grateful for the historic support the City of Columbia had given this project and believed this was the opportune time to complete the mission of making the Blind Boone home a place of pride for everyone.

Greg Olson stated he was a member of the John William Boone Heritage Foundation and had been its original President so he had been working on this project for fifteen years as well, and thanked the City for its long standing commitment to the Blind Boone house. He wanted to emphasize the national significance of the Boone house and pointed out the National Park Service had recognized Boone and his achievements at a national level and had been willing to put his house on the same level as the homes of people like George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. He commented that he envisioned the management of the Boone house to be similar in model with that of the partnership between the Boone County Historical Society and the Parks and Recreation Department in which the City maintained ownership of the property, but the Boone County Historical Society operated tours, held events and managed the day-to-day operation and interpretation of the property. He thanked the Council for its support.

Anthony Stanton, 315 LaSalle Place, thanked the Council for recognizing the historic significance of this home and commented that he believed Blind Boone had a global impact because he did not believe there would have been jazz music without ragtime music, and there was nothing more American than jazz music. He stated he believed this provided the perfect opportunity to involve small, minority businesses in the renovation of the home as it would likely generate some cost savings since it would be a symbol of pride for some. He noted there were also people in the community that were old enough to know the techniques originally used and thought this would be a great way to involve the community economically and socially.

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated she was a member of the Disabilities Commission and wanted to remind everyone Boone had a disability and was able to do wonderful things despite his handicap. She noted the Commission did not want people to forget this.

Steven Heying stated he was a local land surveyor with offices at 1202 Madison Street and pointed out the J. W. Blind Boone Festival was held once a year in Columbia and drew local, national and international visitors. He believed the home would be a local, national and international showplace when fully restored highlighting the roots and development of ragtime and early American music, and noted this musical history needed to be preserved and made into a showplace for Columbia and the world.

Bill Clark explained he was a member of the John William Boone Heritage Foundation and co-chair of a loosely put together committee to bring together the various aspects of

black history. He thought the home could become a repository of black history for Columbia, Boone County and Central Missouri. He urged the Council to provide the opportunity for a repository of black history archives.

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

Mayor McDavid stated he considered it an honor to be able to support this project and thanked Coil Construction for volunteering their expertise and providing a cost estimate for the repairs based upon industry standards. He pointed out they were only able to consider this project due to the prudence, responsibility and frugality of City staff in terms of the budget. He noted the speakers had passionately expressed the value of the home in terms of the relevance of J. W. Boone. He believed the Council had made a commitment to restore this house when they bought it in 2000, and this was an opportunity to keep that promise. He stated he would support this bill.

Mr. Skala commented that he planned to support this bill as well, and noted he had been skeptical of the initial \$500,000 cost estimate and was reassured by the \$300,000 estimate of Coil Construction. He pointed out this home was not only historically significant on a local level, but it was also a national treasure. He stated he was happy to support this bill.

Mr. Schmidt stated he thought they should consider the comment of Mr. Stanton with regard to employing local people and local artisans as part of the bid process if it was possible within the financial framework. Mr. Matthes noted staff would make every effort to accommodate his request.

Ms. Hoppe commented that through the years Columbia had lost a lot of opportunities to preserve important buildings, and this home was a great candidate for preservation in terms of local and national history and character. She explained she was pleased and impressed with the vision in terms of its use as it would be a vibrant community center as well as a national center. She stated she also liked the point of a speaker to not overlook the fact Boone was blind and had become very accomplished with a handicap. She believed the home had many levels of significance and thought the City would reap the benefits of its restoration economically and by helping young people to aspire to be more and better. She stated she was happy to support this bill.

Ms. Nauser commented that she believed the Blind Boone home belonged to the taxpayers, and that they needed to devote funds to ensure it was properly taken care of since it was a community asset, similar to streets and other infrastructure. She thanked the J. W. Boone Foundation for continuing to prod the City to move forward with its restoration and noted she was happy to support it. She was glad the cost estimate had been reviewed and reduced, and hoped the City would reach out to the community for volunteers to help restore the home to its original glory.

Mr. Trapp stated he was also pleased to support this proposal as it was a City-owned asset. The deterioration of the outside paint was due to the fact the home had not been taken care of on the inside, and this was a good case in point that the City should take care of property it owned and turn it into something useful for the community. He liked the idea of the home becoming a cultural center and a place where people could come together to look to the past and be inspired for the future. Blind Boone had an inspiring story for many people

and his home was an important historical asset. He believed this would also allow the City to set an example to other owners of historical properties with regard to how those homes should be valued. He commented that there were a lot of pressing needs in the City and understood that sometimes historic preservation or the arts appeared to be luxuries, but he believed those things actually added to the sense of place and quality of life, which was a fundamental economic driver for Columbia.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been concern regarding the future plans for the home after restoration, and they had heard some very well thought out and exciting plans tonight. He supported the suggestion of Mr. Stanton in terms of hiring local contractors when possible for the implementation of the restoration and the suggestion of Mr. Clark for this home to become a repository for African American history, documents and artifacts. He explained he had worked on the African American Heritage Trail for a couple of years, and hoped the restoration of this home would provide an additional impetus for it as it would also be a cultural and historic amenity for this part of town as well as a health and recreational amenity. He stated he planned to support this project as well.

B148-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

(A) Construction of street improvements on Providence Road from Stadium Boulevard to Stewart Road.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock and Mr. Bitterman provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid explained he planned to amend Option 8A to delete “improvements to Birch Street” and to delete “conversion of Bingham Road and Brandon Road intersections with Providence Road to right-in/right-out.” He wanted the public to know this because he thought it might be relevant to some that planned to speak.

Mr. Skala asked staff to discuss the letter received from MoDOT regarding the turning movements. Mr. Glascock replied MoDOT indicated it would require a right-in/right-out on Brandon Road and a right-in/right-out/left-in at Bingham, and thought it might be difficult to obtain a permit from MoDOT if Council did not agree to those restrictions. Mayor McDavid felt there had been multiple messages from MoDOT representatives regarding these restrictions, and if MoDOT ultimately mandated the turning movement restrictions, he thought the City would respect those wishes since Providence was a MoDOT road. He did not believe any action to not limit the turning movements tonight would prohibit the project from moving forward as staff could come back to Council with the mandate. Mr. Glascock stated he would bring a report back to Council if that occurred.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had discussed the possibility of traffic lights at both Bingham and Burnam with Mr. Bitterman, and Mr. Bitterman had explained north and south bound traffic flow could not be optimized if the traffic signals were spaced that closely together. He understood north bound traffic flow could be optimized by synchronizing the traffic signals in the morning and south bound traffic flow could be optimized by synchronizing the traffic signals in the afternoon, but there would be disruption to the opposing traffic flow,

and asked for clarification regarding the seriousness of that disruption. Mr. Bitterman replied he did not believe MoDOT would approve traffic signals that close together and provided Providence Road at Broadway, Ash and Walnut as an example as those traffic signals were closely spaced. He noted the area had a higher accident rate and lower speeds making it more difficult to handle high volumes of traffic. Mr. Thomas asked why there were more accidents in those areas. Mr. Bitterman replied motorists tended to be surprised vehicles were stopped in front of them causing rear end collisions with closely spaced signals.

Mr. Thomas noted staff had provided traffic counts on this particular section of Providence Road for 1997, 2001, 2003, 2006 and 2009, and asked if there was more recent data. Mr. Bitterman replied there were more recent turning movement counts at Stadium and Providence, but he did not have that data with him. He understood the last time MoDOT conducted a count in this area was in 2006, and the other data points were likely estimates based on permanent count stations. The 2009 number was not an actual count and was based on the Statewide permanent count stations. Mr. Thomas asked if there was an estimate based upon permanent count stations for 2012. Mr. Bitterman replied that data was not available yet. He thought it would be provided around July 2013.

Mr. Schmidt understood 2009 was a down year for vehicle miles, and asked if the 2012 numbers would likely be similar to the 2006 numbers. Mr. Bitterman stated he was not sure. He understood the volumes would likely still be low since there had not been a lot of construction traffic and construction traffic generated a lot of trips for supplies.

Mr. Thomas asked for the amount of improvement that would be made to the south bound traffic congestion problem if they went with Option 10, which extended the right turn lane to Brandon. Mr. Bitterman replied the intersection would be able to handle more traffic than it currently did with Option 10, but he did not believe there would be much change in the cue length because motorists tended to try to find the quickest route so a lot of motorists that likely took Stewart Road, West Boulevard or an alternate route to avoid this busy intersection would revert back to the Providence Road route if the intersection was made to handle a little more traffic.

Ms. Nauser understood there would be turning restrictions on Kentucky as part of Option 8A as well. Mr. Bitterman stated that was correct. Ms. Nauser understood there were no plans for delineators for any of the options. Mr. Bitterman stated there would be no temporary flexible delineators associated with any of these three options. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the turning restrictions on Kentucky. Mr. Bitterman replied it would be right-in/right-out/left-in, so left-outs would be prohibited.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Robbie Price, 111 E. Brandon Road, stated he was the President of the Grasslands Neighborhood Association and they felt there were no new facts. Providence Road was the major north/south arterial as it carried more traffic than any other north/south roadway in Columbia and the road had an "F" rating from MoDOT. The road was too narrow and did not have enough lanes. The proposed right hand turn lane extension would not be long enough to make a difference as it needed to be 900 feet per MoDOT. The Grasslands Neighborhood had been working to get a safe way out with a traffic light for ten years, and they had always indicated they wanted two lefts out of the neighborhood. In addition, they did not want any

concrete or plastic barriers or any change to the internal traffic ways of the neighborhood. He noted the City had come to the point where the Council was looking at options that would take away everything the neighborhood had tried to get for ten years. Option 8A would not allow for two lefts out of the neighborhood and would impede the internal traffic in the neighborhood. He pointed out Option 8A was a deal breaker for the Grasslands Neighborhood because it changed how traffic flowed from deep within the neighborhood to Providence. Option 9 was the only viable alternative as it would allow traffic moving east using the normal traffic patterns. He displayed and described the existing traffic patterns, the anticipated traffic patterns using Option 9 and the anticipated traffic patterns using Option 8A on the overhead. He reiterated the traffic patterns with Option 9 would remain the same, but the traffic patterns with Option 8A would change since all of the residents on Bingham would have to funnel back to the middle of the neighborhood to traverse Birch to make it to the light. In addition, everyone on Brandon would have to change their traffic patterns to go down Birch. He commented that 60 percent of all of the left turns out of the neighborhood would have to funnel down Birch, which was an unimproved roadway and never meant for vehicular traffic. He noted 91 of the 171 properties would have to travel on Birch to make a left turn out of the neighborhood and 100 percent of all of the traffic in the neighborhood would funnel down Burnam, so the 23 properties on Burnam would be impacted if the Council decided to go with Option 8A. He reiterated Option 8A would force all of the neighborhood traffic down a narrow unimproved roadway and increase traffic on streets that did not have any sidewalks, and they had many residents that walked the neighborhood. He stated Option 9 was the best solution for the neighborhood and Option 8A would be disastrous for the neighborhood.

Ms. Hoppe asked if Mr. Price if the neighborhood would rather have nothing or Option 8A. Mr. Price replied he believed the neighborhood would rather have nothing than a badly thought out plan. He pointed out there was widespread support within the neighborhood for Option 9 with over 70 percent of the neighbors being in favor of that option. He noted 53 percent of those that provided input at the interested parties meeting were in favor of Option 9. The next highest was to do nothing at 20 percent. He reiterated there was huge support for Option 9 and hoped the Council would not make the neighborhood shoulder the problems of Option 8A.

Rod Gelatt, 1020 LaGrange Court, explained he and his wife had lived in the Grasslands Neighborhood for the past nineteen years and had experienced the ever increasing traffic problems that stemmed from the fact all of the entrances and exits into and out of the neighborhood required accessing Providence Road. Providence Road was the eastern boarder of the neighborhood, a major City street and a State highway, and carried a substantial part of the north/south traffic of the City. There were certain times of the day traffic was so heavy that the north and south bound lanes were backed up for several blocks. It was not only extremely difficult but it was also dangerous to exit on to Providence Road into two lanes of traffic in each direction, and making a left hand turn into the neighborhood required the hope other motorists would allow one to complete the turn. All of the solutions the neighborhood sought over the years to mitigate these problems ran into reluctance or opposition from the City or MoDOT. The traffic problem had now become so severe that the City, MoDOT and the University had agreed something needed to be done. Neither of the

three options being considered tonight, the ten options previously considered nor the plan approved in November, which was ultimately rescinded, fully satisfied everyone, and he doubted a plan could be created that would satisfy everyone. Each was a compromise that was inconvenient to someone. He preferred an option that would move the traffic more efficiently on Providence, allowed the people living in the Grasslands Neighborhood better opportunities to get in and out of the neighborhood safely, and drastically reduced the hazards to the pedestrians crossing Providence. He felt if something was not done now, it would be overlooked, and a future Council and residents of the Grasslands would be back at a Council Meeting in this situation again.

Teresa Maledy, 215 W. Brandon Road, stated she was disappointed when the previous decision was rescinded because this issue had become political, and it appeared as though the Council was listening to the loudest voices. She believed it was important for the Council to choose the best solution and not necessarily the cheapest solution, and pointed out that listening to the loudest voices did not always come up with the best solution. She used the Fifth and Walnut garage as an example as many of the louder voices were critical of the garage, but most citizens now felt the Council had been forward thinking and thoughtful in building a structure that helped the downtown in terms of parking, and hoped the Council would think similarly for the Grasslands Neighborhood in this situation. She reminded everyone this began with the ballot issue in 2005 and numerous meetings had been held since then due to their simple request for a light structure being met with resistance due to MoDOT requirements. She commented that she did not believe Option 10 should even be considered because it did not address the need for a light or provide for an improvement. It only made it harder to get in and out of the neighborhood. Option 8A would increase congestion within the neighborhood and was detrimental to value and safety of the homes on Birch. She stated many hours had gone into the planning of Option 9 and believed it was the best solution for the neighborhood as it provided a traffic light, created a new feeder road and provided the safety needed. She believed it was critical for MoDOT to be held to high standards when moving forward as delineators would be unattractive and potentially dangerous for pedestrians. She hoped the Council would consider Option 9 and believed it would be better to do nothing if Option 9 was not approved.

Bruce Beckett explained he was a co-owner of property located at 210 Burnam Road, which was on the south side of Burnam Road where the proposed sidewalk would be installed. He commented that Option 9 included the complete closure of Bingham Road for a period of time and Option 8A kept Bingham open for the most part as it would allow for a left in, right in and right out, which would alleviate some of the traffic anticipated for Birch. In addition, Option 8A included a sidewalk and a signalized intersection, which would serve pedestrian needs. It would also prevent the demolition of up to eight homes and save the City a lot of money. He felt it would be best if the City could eliminate the improvement of Birch and keep Bingham and Brandon Road open. He urged the Council to consider Option 8A as he believed it was a proposal everyone could accept.

Frank Booth, 5 E. Burnam Road, commented that he believed increasing south bound traffic flow on Providence Road to cross Stadium Boulevard during rush hour traffic was an urgent need for Columbia to grow economically. The three options being discussed tonight

would not address this need. He understood the City estimated an increase in traffic of 30 percent by 2020 due to the anticipated growth in population. He suggested the Council increase traffic flow by 50 percent during rush hour traffic by replacing the eight rental homes with two additional lanes of traffic, which would thereby encourage business growth. This would allow for a dedicated right turn lane and an extra lane to move south bound traffic. He commented that he believed the intersection of Stadium and Providence wasted people's time and gasoline, created pollution and made it less desirable for businesses and airlines to relocate. He did not believe these eight homes had much historical significance and noted the Regency Hotel, which had been demolished for the DoubleTree Hotel, had more historical significance than those homes. In addition, the Beta House, which the current University of Missouri President had resided in, and Chi Omega House had been torn down. As a result, he did not believe the argument of not tearing down historical homes was valid.

David Goldstein, 206 E. Ridgeley Road, stated the neighborhood wanted a traffic light at Burnam and understood the Council was not agreeable to Option 9, but he did not believe Option 8A, which was a bad plan, should be substituted for Option 9. He explained Option 8A was a bad plan because the movement of traffic in the neighborhood would create a serious problem since the Grasslands was a walking neighborhood where people walked in the streets since there were no sidewalks. He asked the Council to go back to the drawing board and create a way to meet all of the needs in a better way. He reiterated that approving a bad plan like Option 8A was not a solution.

Brian Struchtemeyer, 7 E. Burnam Road, stated he did not agree with a comment of Mr. Thomas indicating that people would drive more if more roads were built. He felt vibrant communities and attractions, such as the Blind Boone home and SEC tournaments, created and drew traffic. He believed the improvement at Turner and the removal of the light at Rollins would draw more traffic to the area as it would facilitate the travel of many cars from the multiple parking garages on to Providence. He felt Option 8A was a travesty since it eviscerated the normal traffic patterns of the neighborhood and was not the type of plan the Planning and Zoning Commission or the City Council would allow for in terms of a new development due to the amount of traffic one road would have to handle. He believed Option 9 provided the greatest long term plan and flexibility for the community, and if they did not pursue Option 9, nothing should be done. He commented that as indicated by Mayor McDavid, MoDOT had been confusing through this process and the comments by too many small parties had made this problem caustic and horrible.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, explained she worked at the University of Missouri and disagreed that the University had not planned for growth as they had been notifying employees for years, and had indicated they were planning for additional growth once they figured out how to extend the use of their physical plant and classroom space. There were essentially two State highways on both sides of this growing campus and she believed student safety was at risk. The University wanted a walking campus and wanted students to walk, bike and bus to campus, but this could not be achieved if they could not get staff out of their cars as well. She suggested the City think about taking control and ownership of Providence Road and College Avenue. She understood there was a financial impact of this, but had heard from various speakers of the fact MoDOT tended to obstruct progress on

projects. She believed they needed to take into account the safety of students considering 28,000 students lived in Columbia and contributed to the economy of the City in terms of food, clothing, housing, utilities, etc. She asked that any action taken tonight not prevent the opportunity to take ownership of Providence Road and College Avenue to assist in creating a walking, biking and bussing community.

Sally Malloy, 101 Bingham Road, stated her home bordered Birch and noted she represented the nine homes that bordered Birch. She understood from conversations with Jimmy Sidral before he passed away, that there was an easement that was strictly for utilities and Birch would never be paved. She noted she had e-mailed Council regarding the sequence of how Birch became paved and pointed out that using Birch would greatly affect the neighborhood in terms of property values and the way people traveled in and out of the neighborhood. She understood Mayor McDavid planned to amend one of the plans and assumed that meant another interested parties meeting and neighborhood meeting since it was a change. She wondered if signals at Turner and Stewart Road were too close as it had been mentioned that the lights north of Broadway were too close and this had been the concern when they had suggested signals at Bingham or Burnam.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, explained he did not live in the Grasslands Neighborhood and did not have a strong view of the internal traffic of the Grasslands Neighborhood, but did not believe the internal traffic of the Grasslands Neighborhood was a million dollar problem for Columbia. He thought Columbia had a lot of problems that could be solved with a million dollars that would have broader impact on the community than the internal traffic in the Grasslands Neighborhood. Option 9A achieved no additional pedestrian and traffic solutions to the broader community than Option 8A, and actually achieved less pedestrian safety goals within the neighborhood because it did not have the internal construction of sidewalks. He pointed out this a million dollar difference did not include the additional cost to the community for the use of eminent domain and commented that he was disappointed the staff report did not clarify Option 9 required the use of eminent domain to acquire homes for the feeder road. He reiterated he did not believe the internal traffic flow issue was a million dollar problem for the broader community and felt the best option was Option 8A, even though it was not the perfect solution.

Aly Price, 111 E. Brandon Road, commented that Option 8A would also involve eminent domain as it would impact the corner lot and several homes on Birch, so she did not believe eminent domain should be used as the reason to not move forward with Option 9. She stated it was easy for those not living in the neighborhood to not feel it was a problem even though it was a problem.

Ted Curtis, 1016 LaGrange Court, commented that this was an issue of safety versus convenience, and trying to get out of the neighborhood during rush hour traffic via a left turn was a safety issue. He understood Option 8A was an inconvenience to a lot of people, but felt that needed to be balanced with the safety concern and a light was needed. He did not believe Option 10 was a valid option as it would not address safety.

Beverly Carl, 301 Bingham Road, stated she supported Option 8A and hoped to live long enough to see the project completed. She felt Option 8A was a compromise solution and asked the Council to seriously consider it.

Mark Farnen, 103 E. Brandon Road, stated he and his wife supported Option 9A and were opposed to Option 8A, and noted they had concerns regarding the safety on Providence Road. He did not believe everyone understood the specifics of Option 8A. It had not been discussed at an interested parties meeting and had been amended at the suggestion of MoDOT as recently as May 23, 2013. In addition, it was likely to be amended again by Council tonight. They still did not know the exact nature of the turns that would be allowed by MoDOT. They knew the turns would be allowed initially, but did not know if they would be continued as it depended on whether it worked. They did not know whether the University had been involved in the discussions and whether they supported Option 8A. He commented that there had been discussion regarding historic homes and noted he did not believe he lived in a historic home, but his home was known as the Vandiver house. His house was the home of Mr. Vandiver who was Charlie Diggs' partner when they started an insurance agency and Mr. Vandiver's grandfather was Willard Duncan Vandiver, who was notable and was quoted as saying "I come from a state that raises corn and cotton, cockleburs and democrats, and frothy eloquence neither convinces nor satisfies me. I am from Missouri, and you have got to show me." Mr. Farnen did not believe that had been done with Option 8A and did not think anyone should be prepared to vote on any of the options tonight as there had not been an opportunity for a head to head comparison. If the better numbers regarding the road in July would be received as had been indicated by staff, he suggested they wait until they had that data. He asked the Council to not vote tonight.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and other organizations and understood a lot of hard work had gone into trying to address this problem. She thought people that did not live in the Grasslands Neighborhood were sympathetic of those residing there, but also felt there were others that needed to be considered in the decision making, and not everyone would be satisfied completely with the outcome as it would be a compromise solution. She felt historic preservation was important and that they needed to save as many older homes as possible, especially when they were located on a main thoroughfare. She suggested more time be taken to consider the options in terms of safety, mass transit, etc. She commented that roadway pressures could be alleviated by implementing good solutions for other forms of transportation.

Margaret Price, 107 Bingham Road, commented that she had lived in the Grasslands Neighborhood for 57 years, and Providence Road was a two lane road when she first moved there. The only way they could get to a football game from any other part of town was to go up Fifth Street. She wondered what would happen when they had a lot of people trying to get to football games due to the University being a part of the SEC. She also wondered how they would get there and what the traffic would be like. This was a problem for everyone that traveled on Providence, and not just a problem of the neighborhood. Traffic would continue to grow because the University would continue to grow with more students, and something needed to be done for safety purposes. The students tended to stand in the middle of road or text and put on makeup while turning left. It was a dangerous situation. She suggested Council consider safety as the number one issue when making a decision.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated he was an interested party since he drove on Providence Road quite often and noted he had attended various meetings on this

issue. He understood concrete barriers or delineators would be required with any option chosen because those turning left were creating accident hazards for everyone. He commented that he did not realize the Grasslands Neighborhood was as limited as it was and noted they needed a road to take traffic to the west. He thought they might not want to do anything until a more complete resolution was developed.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated he avoided driving in the area of Providence and Stadium and agreed traffic on Providence was a major problem. He agreed with Mr. Farnen in that they might want to fully look at Option 8A prior to voting. He pointed out the University of Missouri had recently unilaterally changed class times from 7:40 a.m., 8:40 a.m., 9:40 a.m., etc. to 7:00 a.m., 8:00 a.m., 9:00 a.m. etc. so classes began and ended on the hour, which dumped a lot of traffic on to Providence during rush hour. He believed the University needed to communicate changes that impact the community to the community. In addition, the change to the SEC would result in more RV's traveling on the narrow lanes of Providence Road. He reiterated he believed the issue needed further study.

Lili Vianello, 1005 Wayne Road, commented that while she would not be opposed to doing nothing, she supported Option 8A as she felt it was a nice compromise and offered solutions for issues that needed to be addressed. The reason she would be agreeable to not doing anything was because during the majority of the day it was not very hard to get into and out of the neighborhood. For those times it would be difficult to enter and exit the neighborhood, Option 8A would address the problem. She pointed out she would be in favor of Option 8A with or without the improvements to Birch. She noted the properties along Providence Road were all rental properties, and the residents of the Grasslands Neighborhood did not want those to be rental properties. If those properties were acquired through eminent domain to allow Providence to be expanded, she would be concerned the next line of homes would become rental properties as no one would want to live along Providence at that capacity, and little by little rental would move deeper into the neighborhood and close to her. She encouraged the Council to consider Option 8A.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he favored Option 8A as it was the most minimal and did the least harm going forward while still providing for a traffic light, but did not believe a thorough discussion had been held. He stated he felt bad for Mr. Price as he had been subjected to a bad planning process over the past twelve years. He thought the Council needed to fix the planning process, but did not believe this bad process justified the adoption of Option 9, which he felt was an inadequate solution. He encouraged the Council to think about instituting a corridor planning process.

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

Mr. Schmidt made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Option 9. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Mr. Schmidt commented that this had been a twelve year process and the Council had previously voted unanimously for the equivalent of Option 9 based on this process, which was why they needed to proceed with that option.

Ms. Hoppe stated she believed Option 9 solved all of the problems that had been presented. It had the negative feature of removing two houses, but had the positive feature of not negatively impacting the entire Grasslands Neighborhood in terms of its traffic patterns.

She noted eminent domain was involved in Option 8A as well and there was no guarantee Phase 2 of Option 9 would need to be completed. She preferred a solution that met all of the safety factors and needs while keeping the two homes, but it was evident Option 8A would negatively impact all of the residents of the Grasslands Neighborhood. She believed a long term and permanent solution was needed and a million dollars appeared to be reasonable to attain this goal based upon her experience with other road improvement costs. With regard to the two homes that would be demolished, the State Historic Preservation Office had initially determined a finding of no historic significance. It was only when the State Historic Preservation Office was looking at all eight houses that they stated they would like to review their previous determination as a whole. She reiterated she did not believe Option 8A would solve all of the important issues and noted she would vote in favor of Option 9A. If that Option did not pass, she suggested they wait until the July traffic count was provided. She also agreed with the comments of the City taking ownership of Providence Road and College Avenue as she had previously proposed it for College Avenue since it would provide the City more flexibility to craft different solutions.

Mayor McDavid commented that he did not believe one could equate the eminent domain condemnation and destruction of two houses with the use of eminent domain to widen a street. He did not feel those two situations could be compared and noted he would not support the condemnation of the two houses as he did not believe it was necessary. He also thought the Council should proceed with making a decision tonight. He felt there were three primary issues and that two of those were not contentious. It was not contentious to put a right turn lane between Brandon and Stadium Boulevard as all three options being discussed tonight included. In addition, he did not believe it was contentious to install a signalized intersection at Burnam, which was included in Option 9 and Option 8A. He thought they all agreed there was a pedestrian issue in terms of safety and believed it was their obligation and responsibility to make pedestrian transport across Providence safer, which could not be done without signaling Burnam and Providence. He understood the contentious issue was the internal traffic flow the Grasslands Neighborhood and stated Option 8A was attractive to him because it did not force a decision regarding this traffic flow. He believed the question was whether the City should spend a million dollars, tear down two houses and construct a road forty feet off of Providence and thought they should wait until MoDOT required a change in the traffic patterns as he felt there was a lot of wiggle room in their statement. He understood they did not care what was done as long as it did not make things worse on Providence, but that they could change their mind and restrict access on Brandon and Bingham. He commented that if they did, it would be fine, but reiterated they might not, and if they did not the status quo would be maintained. He stated Option 8A allowed for incremental changes. They could construct the portions of the project that were not contentious and evaluate the traffic flow over the next few months. He reiterated Option 8A and Option 9 had the same characteristics except for how the internal traffic flow was altered and it was not clear to him the traffic flow needed to be altered, and that was the reason he would vote against Option 9 and would support Option 8A.

Mr. Trapp explained he and Ms. Hoppe had attended the Smart Growth Conference in Kansas City and toured the Country Club Neighborhood, which had greatly informed and led

to his changing his decision with regard to the support of what was now referred to as Option 9. He stated he could not justify the destruction of two lovely homes in that option and the six additional homes that might be associated with Phase 2 of the project, the additional million dollars in expense and no sidewalk on Burnam, which was included in Option 8A. He had heard the argument that fewer homes would be impacted with Option 9 than Option 8A, but that was in reference to 70-80 households possibly driving their cars 60 percent of the time by others houses versus houses being taken by eminent domain and destroyed. He did not believe those impacts were equivalent. He understood the lack of access in terms of only having access on Providence Road was a decision made by the residents of the Grasslands Neighborhood as one of those streets could connect to Stadium, which would provide more options. In listening to the comments, he felt something needed to be done to improve pedestrian safety, which Option 8A and Option 9 accommodated. He noted Option 8A did everything Option 9 did, except it disrupted the traffic patterns of the Grasslands Neighborhood. He commented that he had a lot of traffic in front of his house and more than all of the streets in the Grasslands Neighborhood combined. He stated he could not vote for Option 9 for those reasons and pointed out it had nothing to do with who had the loudest voice as the Council listened to everyone and gauged their decisions based on the quality of the argument. He explained one of his biggest regrets was to not listen to former Council Member Kespohl when he had suggested they delay their previous decision on November 19, 2012 and refer the issue to the Historic Preservation Commission. He commented that he had done due diligence when he voted in November, but did not know the immense historic significance of the urban planning and revolutionary design of a neighborhood that was build for permanence, and how important the Grasslands Neighborhood was in totality. He stated he could not support Option 9.

Mr. Thomas commented that he planned to vote against Option 9 as well for the same reasons as stated by Mr. Trapp and others, and because he thought this decision was pivotal and might have ramifications in terms of transportation planning in the future for Columbia. He did not believe the City could build its way out of traffic congestion problems with more roads. He stated he sympathized with the residents of the Grasslands Neighborhood, especially for those on the four corners of Birch Street if MoDOT restricted left turns out of Brandon and Bingham, but did not believe the percentage increase in traffic over what was currently going past those homes was catastrophic. He also believed that a lot of the journeys that would go past those houses in order to turn left at the traffic signal at Burnam to go north might turn into walking journeys, and noted 25 percent of all journeys in the United States were one mile or less. If there was more of detour to get out of the neighborhood to turn left along with the installation of a crosswalk at Burnam to get people safely to campus and provide for a much nicer walk to the downtown area, he thought there would be a further reduction in vehicle journeys. In addition, the million dollars saved with Option 8A over Option 9 and the additional three million dollars saved by not pursuing Phase 2 could allow for more investment in other economically efficient modes of transportation that would allow the City to meet mobility needs and help with health and pollution issues while improving the quality of life. He commented that he had been called delusional for his thoughts on the issue as his position was not mainstream, but he had seen other communities start to adopt

this approach, and those were successful and attractive communities where people wanted to reside. He reiterated he would vote against Option 9 for those reasons.

Ms. Nauser explained she was not in favor of Option 9 and had considered supporting the “do nothing” option, but could not support that option either as there was a pedestrian safety issue that needed to be addressed and it would be inappropriate for the Council to not address it. Option 8A included the sidewalk and a signalized intersection at Burnam, which she felt was crucial in terms of pedestrian safety. She understood the concern for increased traffic, but did not feel it would be as bad as the residents of the Grasslands Neighborhood thought it would in terms of negative impacts to their homes, and provided her neighborhood as an example. There had been two new subdivisions constructed requiring traffic to move through her neighborhood, but that increase was sporadic throughout the day. She felt the situation in the Grasslands Neighborhood would be similar. In addition, decisions made by Council in the past had direct impacts and she provided the development of the law firm at the corner of Stadium and Broadway as an example as the adjacent neighborhood had been required to change its traffic patterns. She understood the safety of those in the neighborhood had improved as well as a result of the changes. She commented that she would have to support the improvements to Birch and the restrictions to left turns out of the Grasslands Neighborhood for safety purposes. She understood that was not being required by MoDOT at this time, but felt it would be necessary in the future, especially in light of the letter MoDOT provided that had been included in the packet. She stated she would support Option 8A as proposed.

Mr. Skala commented that he agreed there had been flaws in the process, but it was the process they had inherited, and he believed the Council had to do something. He understood the crux of the problem was north/south flow through the neighborhood, and this could be done with a berm that destroyed houses closer to Providence or through Birch. He stated he personally thought Birch was a reasonable candidate for being improved, but had also promised he would not impose something the neighborhood did not want, and that imposition was the widening of Birch. He pointed out this started as a request for a stop light and a way out of the Grasslands Neighborhood, and had grown from a million dollar project with improved egress and ingress and pedestrian safety to a \$6-\$7 million project if both Phase 1 and Phase 2 were constructed. He could not support that kind of cost given the circumstances and needs in other parts of the community, such as Clark Lane and St. Charles Road. He noted the intersection of Clark Lane and Highway 63 was six lanes wide due to MoDOT requirements and it was not any better than Providence Road was currently. He agreed with Mr. Thomas in that the larger the road, the more traffic it would attract. He reiterated he thought a solution was needed for Providence Road and felt Option 8A was a reasonable compromise. He noted he favored Option 8A with the amendments suggested by Mayor McDavid over Option 9, and intended to vote in that manner.

The motion made by Mr. Schmidt and seconded by Ms. Hoppe directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Option 9 was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Schmidt and Ms. Hoppe voting in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Option 8A. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend the motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Option 8A by removing the improvements to Birch Street from those plans. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mayor McDavid stated he sensed a lot of people in the Grasslands Neighborhood did not want Birch widened, and at this time, he did not feel it was critically important to widen Birch. He noted that if they approved this amendment, it did not mean they could not decide to improve Birch at a later date.

Mr. Trapp asked if this amendment was passed if additional costs would be generated by a decision to improve Birch at a later time. Mr. Glascock replied he would likely have it designed and on the shelf ready to go if it was decided to improve it at a later time. Mr. Trapp understood there would not be a significant hardship. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked staff if they would recommend improvements be made to Birch, including sidewalks, from a traffic safety point of view. Mr. Glascock replied staff definitely thought the sidewalks on Burnam were needed. He did not think they would need to have sidewalks on Birch.

Mr. Thomas stated he was not sure how he felt regarding the improvements on Birch. He thought the people in the neighborhood objected to the widening of Birch and the addition of sidewalks, but now felt the likely MoDOT decision to restrict left turns and force traffic in that direction was what the neighborhood opposed since a number of people had indicated they wanted to see improvements to Birch.

Ms. Nauser understood a concern in addition to the traffic concern was the extra width needed to improve Birch. Mr. Glascock explained Birch would need to be at least two lanes wide, so it would have to be at least 28 feet, and it was currently 16 feet wide.

Mr. Skala understood MoDOT would not require any temporary bollards and had agreed to some circulation from Providence in and out of the neighborhood even though it was limited. He commented that everyone he had spoken with was in opposition to improving Birch. He agreed internal circulation was important, but noted he did not know the extent to which it would really have an effect given the uncertainty of the position of MoDOT with regard to Providence. On that basis, he was willing to do something to ensure stop lights were installed and would wait for the evaluation by MoDOT prior to deciding whether the internal circulation of the neighborhood needed to be improved.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought it would be interesting to track the number of left turns that were currently being made out of the three streets and to then track the change in traffic patterns to determine how much traffic flowed through Birch. He stated he would support the amendment to remove the Birch improvements from Option 8A.

Mr. Schmidt stated he would support both of the amendments Mayor McDavid had indicated he would propose since Option 9 was no longer being considered as it provided the opportunity to wait to see what the future held. He understood it would not preclude the widening of Birch or any other option. In addition, it would allow for the traffic light to be installed to address the safety issue of getting into and out of the Grasslands Neighborhood.

Mr. Thomas commented that the most important issues for him were the left turns in and out of the Grasslands Neighborhood and the associated danger of a serious accident and the pedestrian safety issue of crossing Providence.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend the motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Option 8A by removing the improvements to Birch Street from those plans was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting against it.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend the motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specification for Option 8A by removing the conversion of the Bingham Road and Brandon Road intersections with Providence Road to right-in/right-out.

Mayor McDavid understood MoDOT might require this in the future, but he was proposing this amendment as it would not change the internal circulation of the neighborhood. If MoDOT required the restriction in the future, they could address it at that time.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid to amend the motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specification for Option 8A by removing the conversion of the Bingham Road and Brandon Road intersections with Providence Road to right-in/right-out was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas explained he was in favor of this amendment because he believed it would stimulate an important and interesting conversation, and give them the opportunity to discuss the rules and requirements of MoDOT.

Mr. Skala commented that MoDOT might decide they did not have to exercise that restriction although he believed they would eventually require it.

Ms. Nauser pointed out a letter from MoDOT included in the packet indicated they would require the conversion of the Bingham Road and Brandon Road intersections with Providence Road to right-in/right-out and was unsure of the likelihood they would allow the City to move forward without the restriction. She felt this would just delay the inevitable and that the City would not be provided the permit without this restriction, so they would soon have this discussion again.

Mr. Thomas noted that MoDOT had initially indicated Bingham would have to be closed completely with Option 9 and had ultimately changed their minds. In addition, MoDOT had initially indicated a right-in/right-out for Option 8A and had then indicated left-ins would be allowed. As a result, he thought it was worth approving this amendment.

Mr. Schmidt asked if the City would have the design on the shelf for this scenario as well. Mr. Glascock replied that if Council provided direction to proceed with this change, staff would discuss this project with MoDOT, and if they were adamant regarding the restrictions, staff would come back to Council with a report requesting Council direction.

Ms. Nauser commented that if MoDOT was insistent on limiting access on these roads, it would necessitate the widening of Birch since it would likely have to handle more traffic and she did not believe the current condition of the road was adequate. She believed they needed to allow for two cars to safely pass. Mr. Thomas stated he was not sure it would be necessary if traffic patterns did not change and thought a study should be done to determine the change in traffic patterns.

Ms. Hoppe explained she was planning to ask for a report later tonight regarding the pros and cons of the City taking ownership of Providence Road and College Avenue as she wondered if it was something the Council should consider.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Thomas to amend the motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specification for Option 8A by removing the conversion of the Bingham Road and Brandon Road intersections with Providence Road to right-in/right-out was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser and Mr. Trapp voting against it.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Skala, which was twice amended, directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Option 8A without the improvements to Birch Street and without the conversion of the Bingham Road and Brandon Road intersections with Providence Road to right-in/right-out was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Hoppe voting against it.

R106-13 Authorizing the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) Land Bank Plan; authorizing the City Manager to submit the Land Bank Plan to the Missouri Department of Economic Development – Division of Business and Community Services.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood Council was only authorizing the City Manager to submit this Plan to the Missouri Department of Economic Development and staff would come back to Council for authorization of the actual transfer of property to the Columbia Housing Authority (CHA). Mr. Teddy stated a separate bill was under the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda for the transfer.

Mr. Schmidt commented that he had received a letter with a number of signatures from neighbors asking that the transfer be postponed, and asked if there was any reason in terms of funding or legal requirements the City could not hold off on the transfer of property. Mr. Teddy replied he did not believe there was any jeopardy in delaying the transfer. Mr. Matthes asked for the purpose of the delay. Mr. Schmidt replied he understood the neighbors were requesting a delay until they were provided the actual plan for the land in question. Mr. Matthes thought that had been well established so staff could respond.

Mr. Trapp asked if there were any springs on the properties in question. Mr. Cole replied he was not aware of any. He understood the property was in a 500 year floodplain, but that did not disqualify it for HUD and housing development. Mr. Matthes stated he understood the development would include positive actions to ameliorate some of the flooding problems, so doing nothing would be worse than proceeding with the project in terms of stormwater. Mr. Schmidt thought this should be explained to neighbors. Mr. Matthes indicated staff would meet with the neighbors. Mr. Teddy pointed out the three City lots were zoned as planned district, and noted he had recommended to the CHA that they consolidate the zoning over the entire project as there was currently a hodgepodge of four different zoning classifications.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Phil Steinhaus stated he was the CEO of the CHA, which had offices at 201 Switzler Street, and explained they planned to develop affordable housing that would remain affordable for a long period of time and would engage a number of partners in the development process. He commented that when the Lambeth Apartments at Lambeth Drive

and Clark Lane failed to obtain funding from the Missouri Housing Development Corporation, they started looking for other opportunities for the development of affordable housing, and this area across from Oak Towers, near the central base of CHA operations, was a perfect location. He displayed a map of the area and explained they planned to develop the northeast and southwest sections in partnership with the City and the Columbia Community Development Corporation (CCDC). He noted they wanted to ensure it fit in with the neighborhood streetscape, the density was appropriate for the neighborhood, it was energy efficient, etc. He pointed out this would be affordable housing for people at or below 60 percent of the median family income. This was not public housing, which was for people that were at or below 30 percent of the median family income. He described the development concepts they had for the two locations. Kinney Point, which was in the northeast, would include 40 one-bedroom units and McQuitty Square, which was in the southeast, would likely include six homes on the exterior that would provide homeownership opportunities and three 3-plexes and two duplexes for a total of fifteen units in the interior. He stated they were very concerned about the stormwater issues in the area and had met with the City and Justin Thomas to discuss the issues and thought they could make a difference if they planned and worked together. He commented that they were excited about this opportunity and appreciated the support of the City on this project as it would help create affordable housing since affordable housing was dependent on affordable land.

Ms. Hoppe explained she had spent two hours reviewing sewer back up issues in the First Ward and asked if Mr. Steinhaus knew what the sewer condition was in this area. Mr. Steinhaus replied there were a lot of issues that needed to be reviewed. He noted there had been a foot of a stormwater and sewer mixture in front of his office at the intersection of Switzler and Trinity and at the corner of Pendleton and LaSalle recently. He thought the entire system was overwhelmed, which was why the CHA was partnering with the City. He pointed out this could not all be fixed on their property, but noted they were open to working with the City and others if additional funds could be found to address the other issues. If not, they would likely have some sort of on-site retention. He commented that until they received funding for actual architectural and engineering plans, they were only working with concept plans.

Mr. Schmidt understood addressing the stormwater problem would likely address much of the sewer problem. Ms. Hoppe noted it would help, but it did not resolve the problem. Mr. Steinhaus stated the CHA would address the sewer problems on their properties as well as the properties the City owned because they all had bad sewer taps. They could not fix the sewer taps for those living upstream or downstream from their property, but their development would not contribute to the problem. They also planned to manage stormwater runoff on their property.

Ms. Nauser asked if the CHA would maintain the management of all of the rental properties. Mr. Steinhaus replied that was the plan. Ms. Nauser asked why the CHA decided to build 40 one-bedroom apartments instead of a mixture. Mr. Steinhaus replied 90 percent of the people on the public housing and Section 8 housing waiting list needed one bedroom units as there was a critical shortage. Ms. Nauser asked if the tenants that resided in these units would have access to the same programs offered to others in public housing, such as

job assistance and budget planning. Mr. Steinhaus replied yes since a number of their programs were open to everyone in the community.

Pat Kelley, 1007 Grand Avenue, stated she was the Vice President of the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association and explained the Neighborhood Association had not voted on this issue. They had met with Mr. Steinhaus in February and understood the project was in its preliminary stages with the opportunity for more involvement later in the process. She noted the neighbors had some concerns, which included the fact there were springs and Flat Branch Creek ran through the property, whether the plan was consistent with neighborhood patterns, etc. She commented that they were all generally supportive of affordable housing, but wanted to be more involved and were asking for the transfer of property to be postponed.

Mr. Thomas asked how long they were requesting in terms of a delay. Ms. Kelley replied she would suggest the end of July as it would provide for a couple meetings to discuss the issue. She noted she was not sure what Justin Thomas had in mind as his letter indicated a delay in the transfer of those properties for ten years. Mr. Schmidt understood the neighborhood wanted to see more than a conceptual design if he understood Justin Thomas' letter and wondered if that would create a problem for Mr. Steinhaus. Mayor McDavid suggested staff meet with the neighbors and notify the Council of the amount of time needed in terms of the actual transfer, which was not being addressed at this time.

Mr. Skala asked about the application process and whether it would take a certain amount of time before it was processed. Mr. Matthes replied this resolution would allow staff to inform the State of the City's plans. The item under the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda would allow for the transfer of the property, and that was the one that was of concern to the neighbors. He suggested the item under the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda be tabled to July 15, and if that did not allow for enough time, it could be tabled again at that time. He pointed out he understood the CHA needed to have site control in order to apply for tax credits so the transfer needed to occur this year.

Hal Williams, 208 W. Sexton, commented that his home was at the intersection of Garth and Sexton and he had been unaware of this development until a neighbor had contacted him. He noted he had been aware of the purchase, but when he had spoken to Mr. Steinhaus, Mr. Steinhaus had indicated there were not any concrete plans at this time. He stated he appreciated the fact Council would provide additional time for this to be discussed. He pointed out he belonged to the Douglass Neighborhood Association and did not believe they had been notified. He was happy the stormwater issue was raised as it was a problem for the area every time there was a significant rain. He suggested the City clean up the lots prior to transferring the property to the CHA as there was an overgrowth of brush, invasive species of plants and tires that needed to be removed. He reiterated his appreciation for the Council allowing them time to obtain more information.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of the People's Visioning and noted she had attended the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association meeting a month ago to share their neighborhood survey and inform them of the NetZero home model. She explained there had been members of the Douglass Neighborhood Association at the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association meeting, and recalled they wanted cross conversations regarding this project. She understood they wanted more information

and the opportunity to provide input. She had also heard some remarks in favor of allowing part of the area to be a park instead of developing it all. She stated she wanted to visit with CHA regarding this project as well in terms of considering a NetZero design as it would save a lot of money in the long term.

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

Ms. Nauser noted the packet included information that indicated a meeting approximately twenty people attended had been held, but the comments indicated many others had not been informed of the meeting and asked about the notification process. Mr. Cole replied the City placed a notice in the newspaper and had contacted neighborhood associations. In addition, Mr. Steinhaus did his own outreach.

Mr. Trapp commented that there was a huge need for affordable housing, especially for one-bedroom units, and housing with supportive services, so he thought this was a great project. He noted this area was suffering and a development such as this could really turn it around. He also believed it would fit into the context of what was happening there. He pointed out the tax credit process was competitive and hoped they did not encumber this project with the utopian ideal of making it perfect as he felt that would inhibit it from being completed. He suggested they look at what could be done realistically. He noted the CHA was an amazingly well run organization that was trying to expand opportunities for affordable housing and other critical needs. He encouraged the Council and community to be supportive even if it was not perfect so they were able to do something as people needed housing right now. He did not want to see this go down in defeat due to things that were far less significant just because they thought it would be beautiful and great.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she agreed this met a great need and was in an area where there was an opportunity to improve stormwater and sewer on-site, which would be helpful. She thought it would be beneficial and legitimate for the neighborhood associations to meet and provide doable suggestions to make the project better. She hoped they would see the NetZero design was feasible, and although it might not be fruitful to include that design on the entire project, she thought it could be accommodated for one of the structures as it would lower utilities and make it more affordable in the long term.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with the comments of Mr. Trapp except for the idea that providing the neighborhood more time might reflect badly on the City's intentions. He hoped those that were reviewing the application would take an enlightened approach. He agreed this was needed and was better than nothing, but also felt time should be taken to ensure everyone was a part of the process. He believed the units should be energy efficient as well as the flip side to affordable housing was the costs of utilities, and noted he would be interested in supporting something creative in that regard.

Ms. Nauser asked if the City and the CHA was working toward cleaning up these properties in terms of brush and debris. Mr. Teddy replied a benefit to pooling the properties was that CHA could manage them all in terms of clean up, mowing, etc. Ms. Nauser asked if the City was staying on top of this so rainwater was not being collected creating a breeding ground for mosquitoes. Mr. Teddy replied he hoped they were and noted he would be happy to receive calls from anyone noticing any noxious condition. Ms. Nauser suggested City staff be proactive instead of waiting for a complaint.

The vote on R106-13 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B38-13 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 R-1 and PUD 5.5 zoning; approving the Preliminary Plat & PUD Plan of Parkside Estates; allowing a reduction in the required perimeter setback.

The bill was read by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid understood this item had been withdrawn. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He pointed out the letter indicated the withdrawal was based on the understanding the applicant could bring back an application to the Council at any time, but if it was a similar or the same application, it could not be considered by Council within twelve months of the original application and staff would not be able to accept the application unless the Council granted a waiver. Mayor McDavid stated he believed the risk was on the applicant.

B137-13 Approving the Final Plat of Landmark Subdivision, Plat 2 located north of Country Club Drive and south of McAlester Street; authorizing a performance contract with Bear Creek Properties, LLC; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to construction of a sidewalk along a portion of Country Club Drive.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B137-13 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Marjorie Lewis, an attorney with offices 601 E. Broadway, Suite 203, stated she was present on behalf of the applicant and explained this was an application to replat Lot 2 of Landmark Subdivision into three lots and for a variance eliminating the sidewalk requirement along Country Club Drive. One of the reasons this was being platted was to convey one lot to neighboring property owners and to allow the applicant to build a home on the center lot. The third lot, which was next to Landmark Hospital, had a large drainage easement on it and there was a desire to build a home on that lot as well. The property had frontage on Country Club Drive and McAlester Street and the McAlester side would have a sidewalk. They were seeking a variance to the sidewalk requirement for Country Club Drive, which was an unimproved street. A large percentage of the neighbors were in support of the replat and opposed to a sidewalk along Country Club Drive.

Ms. Nauser asked if there were any other sidewalks in that area. Ms. Lewis replied there were no sidewalks on Country Club Drive. There was a sidewalk one property over, but there was a large gap in between prior to getting to the sidewalk.

Steve Heying stated he was a land surveyor with offices at 1202 Madison Street and explained there had been some confusion on the platting process, which was why the amendment was needed.

Mayor McDavid commented that this was straight forward and the only contentious issue would be if they required a sidewalk on a street that did not have any sidewalks.

Mr. Skala stated he did not necessarily agree with the “sidewalk to nowhere” argument, particularly as it related to new development or any development that connected with a new development, but in this instance he thought it was appropriate to not require the sidewalk as it was unnecessary.

Mr. Schmidt explained he had walked and biked that street several times without any problems.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed a sidewalk was not necessary here, but noted the “sidewalk to nowhere” argument should be looked at carefully because the sidewalk requirement had been created to start building a network of sidewalks.

B137-13, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B142-13 Authorizing a public infrastructure development cost allocation agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the College Avenue Median/Pedestrian Refuge Project; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe explained she had asked for this to be taken off of the consent agenda because the cost allocation agreement, which she was supportive of, included the design of the median and the location of the crosswalks in the scope of improvements, and the East Campus Neighborhood and other interested users had not had a chance to provide input as to what option would best meet pedestrian and traffic needs. She wanted to ensure the approval of this agreement did not lock the City into the option included in the agreement. She understood another contract would come before Council with the contractor for the design, but wanted to ensure the University understood the City was not limited to the solution identified in the agreement with them. Mr. Glascock explained this was an appropriation ordinance and only indicated where the money would be spent. The project had not yet been designed and the University had participated in the selection of the consultant that would design the project so they understood the design had not been finalized. Staff would provide Council a consultant contract that stated the scope of the project. Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted to ensure the users were provided the opportunity to provide input on the front end to help create options instead of responding to options.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Glascock if he had any sense of what the barrier would consist of in the spaces between the crosswalks. Mr. Glascock replied no. Mr. Thomas hoped it would be something attractive. Mr. Glascock stated the University wanted it to blend with the white campus area and the East Campus Neighborhood wanted to ensure it was attractive as well.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, stated she was President of the East Campus Neighborhood Association, and explained last summer, they had discussed this same preliminary design and a lot of e-mail opposition had been received to various parts of that design. One of the concerns was that this did not go all of the way up to Broadway as they

felt this should be planned in its entirety or at least the portion from Broadway to Stadium. She suggested a full plan for College Avenue be designed. She noted she received a letter from the manager of the Gathering Place Bed and Breakfast, which was a University of Missouri owned business, and he was against the limited left-in/left-out as he believed it would negatively affect the business. She commented that the Neighborhood Association and all of the people that lived, drove and biked through there were opposed to the preliminary plan, to include the pedestrian crosswalks that were located in the middle of the blocks and the barriers on the sketch.

Ms. Hoppe read the letter from James Hundle at the request of Ms. Hammen, which indicated he was writing on behalf of the Gathering Place Bed and Breakfast, a lodging establishment operating at 606 S. College Avenue, and that he had just been made aware of the College Avenue project being on the Council agenda. The letter indicated Mr. Hundle had been told a year ago that the funding to do this project was not available and the plans were not going forward, and requested the Council give serious consideration to the plan as it would have a significant and negative impact to the access of East Campus and the operations of his business. He agreed pedestrian safety was important, but adding a barrier as planned was not the best solution given the number of individuals crossing the street at high foot traffic times and forcing them to cross at limited locations. He felt additional design and review was critical and requested neighborhood participation.

Ms. Hammen stated the East Campus Neighborhood wanted to be at the table as this was planned.

Elizabeth Peters, 305 McNab Drive, reiterated the comments of Ms. Hammen in that they wanted to be involved in the planning process as they wanted their input included since it would affect the East Campus Neighborhood in terms of egress and the wear and tear of traffic.

Ms. Hoppe stated she would be agreeable to moving forward if this contract was flexible and the design was not determined until there was input from the immediate stakeholders.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought they should be pleased neighborhood association representatives were coming to Council and ascertaining their desire to be involved at a deep level as having strong neighborhood associations was a wonderful asset for the community. He stated he believed this was an important project and the best scheme he could come up with for improving the safety of pedestrians in that area was to create crosswalks that stopped traffic at specific locations and were frequent enough to not burden pedestrians by pushing them a long way out of their way. He also suggested attractive barriers that effectively discouraged people that crossed the road at the wrong locations. He did not believe this required the elimination of left turns everywhere.

Ms. Hoppe stated there was an interest and need for a comprehensive plan for the whole stretch of College from Broadway to Stadium, but she also did not want to hold up the funding for this project. She hoped the design of this area would fit with what people had in mind for the rest of College Avenue.

Mr. Skala asked to what extent the design was set in stone. Mr. Glascock replied the design was not set in stone. It was a concept the University developed to try to obtain

funding from MoDOT. The process was only starting, and once they hired a consultant, they could obtain ideas from the various stakeholders.

Mr. Trapp pointed out the Garth sidewalk, which was also a part of this ordinance, was vitally important to get the children that lived on Phyllis safely to Parkade School. It would also allow him and others to walk down the other side of Garth.

B142-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B151-13 Consenting to the establishment of Veterans United Drive as a private street; authorizing a right of use permit with Veterans United Home Loan to allow the installation and maintenance of private street signs in a portion of the Forum Katy Parkway right-of-way.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if this would change anyone else's address. Mr. Teddy replied no.

Mr. Skala asked if there was any other precedent in town for a business to have a street named after them. Mr. Thomas replied he thought there was a Bass Pro Drive. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mr. Teddy explained this would be treated similarly to a private street even though it was not technically a street in terms of mapping. Mr. Matthes stated they would probably want to limit this to local companies that employed over 1,000 employees. Ms. Hoppe pointed out a street off of Broadway had been renamed for safety reasons and Capri had been chosen since the Capri Apartments were located on the street.

Mr. Trapp commented that this seemed like a great compromise measure to support a large local employer as it did not impact other people.

B151-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

B136-13 Voluntary annexation of property located on the west side of Greenfield Court within Country Meadows Subdivision (3261 Greenfield Court); establishing permanent R-1 zoning.

B138-13 Approving the Final Plat of The Residences at Old Hawthorne located northwest of the Old Hawthorne clubhouse, north of Route WW and east of Rolling Hills Road; authorizing a performance contract with Boone Development, Inc.

B139-13 Approving the Final Plat of Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 1 located west of the U.S. Highway 63 and Discovery Ridge Parkway interchange; authorizing a performance contract with P1316, LLC.

B140-13 Approving the Final Plat of Arbor Falls, Plat No. 3 located northwest of Route WW and Old Hawthorne Drive West; authorizing a performance contract with Peter Grathwohl.

- B141-13 Authorizing a right of use permit with Aegis Investment Group for the construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of landscaping, an irrigation system, signage and lighting in an island located at Massengill Court and Mace Drive and electric conduits and water service lines within a portion of the Massengill Court and Mace Drive rights-of-way.
- B143-13 Accepting conveyances for temporary access, temporary construction, sewer and drainage purposes.
- B144-13 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B146-13 Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Public School District to provide funding towards gymnasium enhancements at two planned new elementary schools; appropriating funds.
- B147-13 Authorizing a subrecipient commitment with the University of Missouri for collaboration on the BGREEN for CoMO project as it relates to the Parks and Recreation Department coordinating field activities at the 3M Urban Ecological Restoration Area with fourth and fifth grade students in the Columbia Public School District.
- B149-13 Appropriating funds received for Columbia Values Diversity Celebration activities.
- B150-13 Authorizing a license agreement with St. Charles Tower, Inc. for a Cell on Wheels (COW) to be located on Parks Management Center property at 1507 Business Loop 70 West.
- R100-13 Setting a public hearing: construction of sidewalks on the east side of Fairview Road from Highland Drive to West Broadway.
- R101-13 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri on behalf of the Institute of Public Policy, Harry S. Truman School of Public Affairs for evaluation of the organizational capacity of prospective contracted social service providers.
- R102-13 Authorizing the temporary closure of a portion of South Sixth Street between Elm Street and East Stewart Road to allow for emergency repair of the Loeb Courtyard steam distribution and potable water system.
- R103-13 Authorizing the temporary closure of a portion of Ashland Road and the sidewalk on the north side of Ashland Road between College Avenue to a point approximately 260 feet eastward on Ashland Road to facilitate soil excavation, equipment staging and soil re-installation following foundation damp-proofing and soil drainage installations on the Telecom Building.
- R104-13 Authorizing an agreement for professional architectural services with Connell Architecture, P.C. for design of the Solid Waste Administration and Collection Operations Facilities building and miscellaneous site work.
- R105-13 Transferring Council Contingency funds to the Citizens Police Review Board.

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

NEW BUSINESS

None.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B152-13** Authorizing a neighborhood stabilization program operating agreement with the Columbia Housing Authority for the transfer of title to properties located at 106, 108 and 110 West Sexton Road; authorizing the City Manager to execute a general warranty deed to transfer title to properties located at 106, 108 and 110 West Sexton Road.
- B153-13** Authorizing reconstruction of the sidewalk on the east side of Seventh Street from Broadway south to the alley; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B154-13** Authorizing a right of use permit with MM II, LLC for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of collapsible bollards in a portion of the alley right-of-way on the east side of Ninth Street, between Elm Street and Woodson Way.
- B155-13** Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on a portion of Rainbow Trout Drive.
- B156-13** Accepting conveyances for temporary construction and sewer purposes.
- B157-13** Naming the property located south of the Flat Branch Creek and Hinkson Creek confluence as the “3M Flat Branch-Hinkson Creek Wetlands.”
- B158-13** Accepting and appropriating donated funds for the Memorial/Heritage Tree and Bench Programs.
- B159-13** Appropriating FY 2012 General Fund savings for projects identified by the City Council.
- B160-13** Amending the FY 2013 Annual Budget to add, change and delete positions in the Law Department and the Public Health and Human Services Department; amending the FY 2013 Pay Plan to close a position in the Public Health and Human Services Department; transferring funds.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP80-13 Street Lighting along Edenton.

Mr. Skala understood the high pressure sodium fixture was being used because it matched the other fixtures in the area. Mr. Williams stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to install single post top luminaries near Smiley Lane Park at the end of the cul-de-sac on Jackal Drive. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP81-13 Credit/Debit Card Payment Capability at Multi-Space Pay Machines in City Parking Garages.

Mayor McDavid asked if the City would charge more for parking to accommodate the extra expense for accepting credit card payments in the parking garages. Mr. Glascock replied no, and explained staff thought the use of credit cards would cover that additional cost. Mayor McDavid thought the City had increased the rates for parking meters when those

were changed to accept credit card payments. Mr. Glascock replied there was a two hour minimum to break even. Mayor McDavid understood this was a different situation.

Mayor McDavid made a motion authorizing staff to program multi-space machines in City parking garages to accept payment by credit/debit card. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Mayor McDavid commented that it was now a plastic world and people no longer carried change.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Ms. Hoppe authorizing staff to program multi-space machines in City parking garages to accept payment by credit/debit card was approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP82-13 Trash Near Dumpster in Alley between Eighth and Ninth Streets.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Schmidt stated the dumpster and the area in front of the dumpster was clean when he walked around it today, but it was still fairly filthy behind the dumpster. He wondered if the restaurants were the cause. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it was a result of grease as there were grease containers in the area, and the grease did not always make it into the containers, and that was hard to clean up.

REP83-13 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Ms. Hoppe understood a \$400,000 transfer was needed by the Water and Light Department because of an increase in multi-family housing construction, and asked if this expense was made up through fees. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and explained it was covered by the rates. Mr. Schmidt understood the Water and Light Department was being paid to install multi-family meters instead of single-family meters. Ms. Hoppe understood the City was paid back that expense through the rates.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he agreed it made sense for the Board of Adjustment to hear situations of 2-4 units in existing buildings in the C-2 zoning area like it did prior to 1988, but did not believe it made sense for the Board to make decisions on multi-family, multi-story residential buildings in the C-2 zoning area. He suggested the Council consider making major changes to the Board of Adjustment because he felt the scope of authority of the Board of Adjustment was excessively broad and needed to be reduced. He commented that he did not believe the Board of Adjustment process was sufficiently robust for the authority it had been granted and the Board had not been adequately charged to present and defend the City's position on issues as the staff only read a report and sat down. He asked the Council to look into this issue further as the Board was asked to make major decisions involving climax forest, etc. without the proper training and a charge from the City.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and commented that she thought it would be good to keep local talent in mind as suggested by Mr. Stanton earlier in the evening. She felt those involved with People's Visioning could help with many projects as well. She stated she would love to discuss issues

of energy, building codes, natural gas decisions, the Prairie State contracts, renewable energy, trees, sidewalks, mass transit, etc. with the Council. She thanked the Council for its work.

Mayor McDavid explained he had received two inquiries from University of Missouri student groups asking the City to look into the concept of soft closings, which would require establishments to remain open one hour following the final sale of alcohol. These groups felt this would ensure the safety of students and people in the community since it would allow extra time for people to find safe rides home and prevent drunk driving. He asked staff to look at this suggestion and obtain input from the Downtown CID and other appropriate organizations.

Mayor McDavid explained a first reading was conducted for B154-13 earlier tonight, and the applicant had requested the issue be continued to the July 1, 2013 Council Meeting.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to table B154-13 to the July 1, 2013 Council Meeting so it had a second read and vote on July 1, 2013 instead of June 17, 2013. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid commented that spillover parking of students into neighborhoods continued to be an issue and asked if a report could be provided regarding the City's enforcement efforts. He wondered if the City was enforcing the rules, such as storing a car for 24 hours, etc. He wanted a report regarding how much of a problem this was, whether the City was enforcing local ordinances and whether new ordinances were necessary so neighborhoods were not compromised by the influx of adjacent students.

Ms. Hoppe noted the East Campus Neighborhood was working with the City on residential hangtags and there had been a request earlier in the evening to consider a program for Benton Stephens.

Mr. Skala stated the enforcement piece of this request was good, but noted he also wanted to know how the pilot was working in terms of permit parking in the North Village area and whether it could work similarly in Benton Stephens and East Campus. If it could work, he suggested it be implemented before the next school year.

Mayor McDavid asked the report to include all of this information.

Ms. Hoppe understood a feedback meeting was going to be held and had been delayed, and asked when that would be rescheduled as East Campus residents wanted to listen to their comments.

Mr. Trapp stated he recalled that they had agreed to not expand parking permit zones for six months in order to analyze how the pilot worked. Ms. Hoppe agreed, but felt that did not prohibit them from looking into it.

Mr. Thomas asked staff to provide a proposal and the cost of a traffic study for the change they made earlier in the evening involving the Grasslands Neighborhood. He wanted to know how people were currently leaving and re-entering the neighborhood, especially with regard to left turns, and how they were leaving and re-entering the neighborhood after the

changes were made, especially in terms of when MoDOT restricted left turns. Mayor McDavid thought there should be a traffic count on Birch as well. Mr. Thomas agreed.

Mr. Thomas suggested a pre-determined process for the use of surplus funds in the future, particularly if this was an annual situation. He felt this year's process was a free for all type situation whereby the most forward and vocal groups were accommodated. He asked staff to think about that and noted he did not need a report.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had been contacted by residents on Rockcreek Road that had sewage flooding in their basements due to the storms this past Friday. They wanted to know why it happened, if it would happen again, whose fault it was and whether the City had any obligation to compensate the property owners. Mr. Matthes stated the property owners should contact the Risk Management Division to determine responsibility.

Mr. Schmidt explained there were serious and localized sewer back up problems on Aldea, W. Ash and W. Walnut even though they had back flow prevention equipment. He wondered if a pinch point could be identified to resolve the issue on Aldea fairly easily and asked for a GIS map showing the sewers and storm drains in the area. He thought a report on scheduled sewer projects for the area would be helpful as well in terms of how upgrades were prioritized and where these neighborhoods were on the priority list. Mr. Matthes noted staff had started looking at a ballot issue so more studies could be funded. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct and explained they were focusing on maintenance projects due to the significant inflow and infiltration problem throughout the City.

Mr. Schmidt commented that parking in the Benton Stephens Neighborhood had been issue well before the recent apartments had been built, and asked that staff look into the issue. He suggested it be looked immediately and thought they might be at the six month end of the pilot program by the time they were ready to proceed.

Mr. Schmidt noted he mentioned the need for metered parking on Locust between Hitt and Waugh, and asked for an ordinance to be drafted to implement it. Once the nearby apartment building was completed, parking would become an issue for Sacred Heart Church on Sundays. He also thought they would have to protect the volunteer parking spaces they had created for Lee School, and suggested these issues be resolved by August 1.

Mr. Schmidt asked about the parklet. Mr. Griggs replied the City was working with the Downtown CID in relocating the parklet. They planned to tie it to events held in the downtown area. Mr. Schmidt noted a majority of the business owners on Ninth Street were supportive of leaving it where it was, and asked if all needed to be supportive in order for it to be placed there. Mr. Griggs replied that Council could provide direction to staff regarding the parklet. Mr. Schmidt asked if the consensus was to move it around the downtown during the summer. Mr. Skala replied that was his sense.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Shepard Neighborhood had been working with the City to adopt the roadside park by Old 63, but was also interested in naming it after Sterling Wyatt,

who had lived in the neighborhood and was killed in Afghanistan last year. She asked staff to look into this possibility and to let Council know what needed to be done. She noted staff could contact the Shepard Neighborhood Association President regarding this issue.

Ms. Hoppe stated she understood a report regarding fluoride from the Board of Health would soon come to Council, and asked that it not be placed on the June 17, 2013 Council Meeting agenda since she would miss that meeting and had asked for the report.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Planning and Zoning Commission did not have a quorum for their last meeting, and this issue had been discussed in the past whereby the Commission thought they could internally solve the problem. She did not believe the solution was to reduce the quorum as it was a work intensive Commission. She suggested the ordinance establishing the Commission be revised to limit the number of meetings missed. Currently, the chair of the Commission could excuse absences, and she thought a maximum number of absences such as three per year per person should be established instead, since they needed people to attend the meetings regardless of the reason for being absent. She asked staff to obtain input from the Planning and Zoning Commission and to then draft an ordinance for Council consideration.

Mr. Skala stated he was on the Planning and Zoning Commission when this issue was discussed previously, and at the time, the majority felt the Commission was too important to reduce the quorum numbers because of what it would suggest to the public. They decided to ensure trying to get people to attend instead. He noted this was becoming more of a problem and thought they would need to do something with absences as suggested by Ms. Hoppe.

Mr. Matthes pointed out the super quorum made it harder and a higher level was being demanded of the Planning and Zoning Commission members. Mr. Skala noted this had not been a problem historically. Ms. Hoppe agreed, and thought it might be an issue of commitment by the current members. Mr. Matthes thought they could consider alternates as well.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was told new Planning and Zoning Commission members were not being trained like they had been historically, and asked staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission to hold some type of training for their new members. Mr. Skala thought an orientation was required per the Commission rules and procedures. Mr. Matthes stated that could be accommodated.

Ms. Hoppe noted the Rock Quarry Road Park was supposed to have a wildflower area, but that had never been established because the developer had not followed through. She asked that staff look into the possibility of acquiring or taking over the park and obtaining funds for maintenance from the developer since the developer had shown over the years that he would not maintain the park as agreed upon, and to provide a report. She pointed out the sign for this park was replaced incorrectly and that the sign needed to say "Scenic Rock Quarry Road Park" because the road was scenic.

Ms. Hoppe understood the vote to appoint members to the Environment and Energy Commission and the Water and Light Advisory Board was scheduled for the June 17, 2013

Council Meeting and noted she wanted input on the appointment of those members but would miss that meeting.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to delay the vote to appoint members to the Environment and Energy Commission and the Water and Light Advisory Board to the July 1, 2013 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe felt something needed to be put in place while they worked on revisions to the C-2 zoning ordinances and suggested they follow the recommendation of the Historic Preservation Commission, which temporarily required a conditional use permit for any development over existing stories. Developers could still ask for PUD or R-4 rezoning if they did not want to obtain a conditional use permit. This would ensure some type of input. She asked for an ordinance to be drafted and introduced at the June 17, 2013 Council Meeting to that effect. She also asked for a separate ordinance to be drafted to enlarge the Board of Adjustment so it included representation of the fields of architecture, urban planning, real estate and historic preservation.

Mayor McDavid noted this would likely be opposed by the Downtown CID, and did not believe this time frame would allow enough time for the CID to review it and provide input. Ms. Hoppe thought they would have time since it would not be voted on for a month. She noted she was suggesting they temporarily go back to the 1988 conditional use permit requirement and associated criteria for developments over the height of existing buildings as suggested by the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Nauser stated she would like to see the language prior to it being drafted into ordinance.

Mayor McDavid commented that it appeared as though Ms. Hoppe was placing the suggestions of the Historic Preservation Commission over the suggestions of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Downtown CID. Ms. Hoppe thought it dovetailed with some of the immediate concerns of the Downtown CID regarding parking, trash, etc. and sufficiency of services. She believed it would address some of the issues discussed by the Planning and Zoning Commission as well. Mr. Skala agreed, and noted suggestions at a Planning and Zoning Commission work session were to revert back to the pre-1988 rules as a preventative measure and for an overlay. He agreed with Mayor McDavid that this would be a contentious issue and that they should provide adequate time for several of the commissions to address it.

Mayor McDavid pointed out the Charrette had indicated one of the problems with downtown was the lack of certainty and predictability with regulations, and this added to that uncertainty and unpredictability. He thought it would cause people to not develop in the downtown, and asked if that was the intent. Ms. Hoppe stated that was not her intent. Mayor McDavid stated he believed that would be the result. Ms. Hoppe pointed out options were still available with PUD and R-4 zoning. Mayor McDavid felt this was a short term moratorium that would confuse the issue.

Ms. Nauser suggested they first define the problems they were trying to address, and that this effort be made through one project or process versus a piecemeal process as she did not feel a good product would result by a piecemeal process.

Mayor McDavid reiterated this was essentially a moratorium. Ms. Hoppe disagreed and noted a conditional use was a permit and not a moratorium. Mayor McDavid asked if the goal was to not have more students downtown. Mr. Skala replied it was about sufficiency of services and the impact in terms of parking, etc. Mayor McDavid asked if this could be addressed in a month. Mr. Skala replied no. He understood Ms. Hoppe was suggesting a two stage process by first putting something in place where there was recourse while slowing things down. They could then concurrently work on the rest of the issues. Mayor McDavid wondered what problem they would solve.

Mayor McDavid noted they had discussed a one and one-half year process to go through downtown rezoning revisions and this suggestion would cause significant zoning changes in four weeks without consultation from stakeholders. Mr. Skala stated he did not see it that way. If they did not put something in place, there would be a flurry of activity. He understood some might want this, but noted he thought they should ensure that flurry of activity was in the best interest of the entire community.

Mr. Schmidt understood this would not necessarily prevent anyone from doing what they could now. It would only require a conditional use permit.

Ms. Thompson pointed out changes to the zoning ordinance would require a public hearing notice to be published and for the Planning and Zoning Commission to review it prior to the Council considering it. In addition, the Board of Adjustment was statutorily controlled in terms of composition, etc. so staff would need to determine if the ordinance change requested could be accommodated.

Ms. Nauser asked for a copy of the handout from the Pre-Council meeting to be e-mailed to the Council. She also noted it would be helpful to have access to any powerpoint presentations at meetings as those presentations sometimes had more information than the staff report. Ms. Hoppe agreed. Mr. Thomas stated he definitely wanted a copy of Mr. Teddy's powerpoint presentation regarding C-2 zoning.

Ms. Nauser stated she received an e-mail from Ann Mehr regarding the Museum of Art and Archeology. She understood the museum would be moved to the Ellis Fischel facility and there was a concern that it would not be moved back to the downtown area. She noted museums were a part of the cultural aspect of the downtown community and suggested the Council, as a group, send a letter to the University of Missouri stating support to move the museum back to its original location in the downtown area when the work they were doing was completed.

Mr. Schmidt stated he would be supportive.

Mr. Matthes pointed out one complaint of the museum was that they could show only a small percent of their holdings, and asked if they wanted to limit it to its original location. He thought they might want to ask them to return it to campus or the downtown area. Ms. Nauser stated she would suggest the downtown area.

Ms. Nauser commented that she had been contacted by an individual with regard to the sexual harassment of pedestrians by patrons of businesses in the outdoor seating areas and wanted the Downtown CID and the Human Rights Commission to review the situation

and get business owners with outdoor seating to be in tune to the situation as it did not reflect well on those businesses or the community.

Ms. Nauser understood many communities to include Joplin were considering the silent testing of tornado sirens because their citizens were becoming desensitized to hearing the sirens and were not taking them seriously. She asked staff to review the situation and determine if Columbia might want to do something similar.

Ms. Nauser stated she had an individual contact her regarding the disability ramps at the Columbia Public Library as that person felt the ramps were too steep and had suggested a lift be installed. She asked the Disabilities Commission look into this in terms of recommendations or a partnership with the Library if there was a need.

Ms. Nauser commented that she had been contacted by the Heritage Woods Neighborhood Association as the dam in their neighborhood had overflowed causing flooding in the streets. The neighborhood was concerned the pipe was too small to handle the overflow. She asked staff to recommend solutions to this problem.

Ms. Nauser stated she had been contacted by an individual regarding traffic problems on Royal Heritage and Murfield in Heritage Meadows. This individual had been under the impression that speed humps would be installed in the neighborhood. She asked staff to provide a status report if it had been looked into, and if it had not been looked into, she asked for a report with recommendations to address speeding and cut-through traffic.

Mr. Skala suggested the City be creative in finding funds for the flooding problems in the First Ward and wondered if reserved funds beyond the 20 percent level could be utilized or if Water and Light Department reserve funds could be used like they were with the Ewing Industrial Park. He thought they should start thinking about how they could fund emergency issues that had been occurring due to flooding.

Mr. Trapp stated he had met with residents of Hockaday Court who were concerned about stormwater. A culvert was installed when Brown School Road was widened and water was pushed through the culvert toward the neighborhood. They had met with City staff and were told what needed to be done, but were also told it was not a City responsibility. If they were going to put together a stormwater funding plan, he suggested a small piece of it include matching funds to help citizens as the recommended solution was costly. This would allow City funds to go further while allowing the City to offer citizens something instead of nothing. He thought this might help pass a ballot issue as well.

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk