MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
OCTOBER 6, 2008

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, October 6, 2008, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE and NAUSER 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 September 15, 2008 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Janku and a second by Ms. Nauser.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

At his request, Mr. Janku made the motion that Mr. Sturtz be allowed to abstain from voting on R221-08 and R222-08. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote. Mr. Sturtz noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he was a paid consultant to the True/False Film Festival, which was receiving funds through its umbrella organization, Ragtag Programming for Media Arts.

The agenda, including the Consent Agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Wade.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT


Jimmy Pounds, 4403 Brown Station Road, stated he brought a piece of ground to the Council, which was approved as PUD and he had planned to build under the 2000 International Building Codes (IBC). The IBC had since been changed and the reason he was here was because it would cost him more money to build under the 2006 IBC versus the 2000 IBC.

Mr. Wade asked if any houses had been built. Mr. Pounds replied yes. Mr. Wade asked when they were built. Mr. Pounds replied in 2006. Mr. Wade asked if that was when the first house was built. Mr. Pounds replied yes.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B281-08 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southeast side of State Route KK, west of Red River Drive; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Watkins explained this was a request for the voluntary annexation and zoning of 3.65 acres in south Columbia. The site was currently zoned Boone County A-2, which was agricultural zoning. The applicant was asking for City R-1 zoning. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval.

Ms. Nauser asked if the site distance for the driveway had been looked into as it was at the bottom of the hill at a curve. Mr. Teddy replied he understood there was a permit for the property, which the County had been handling. He stated he did not recall doing a site analysis on it. Ms. Nauser stated she wanted to be sure it was satisfactory to staff. She thought people coming down the hill might pose a problem for people coming out of the driveway.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Wheeler on the Planning and Zoning Commission raised some access issues to include the number of curb cuts, which were resolved, and asked Mr. Teddy to comment. Mr. Teddy replied this was a single lot and the City’s ordinances would not allow re-subdivision with additional driveways because Highway KK was one of major roads where residential access was restricted. There was also discussion of this property not being divided for other reasons. Residents in the subdivision indicated they had restrictive covenants that ran with the land, so they would not be able to have additional driveways. He agreed the placement of the one driveway was critical given the conditions, but noted there would not be additional driveways compounding the problem.

Mr. Sturtz commented that the map showed all of the land going out off of Highway KK was zoned agricultural in the County and asked if he could assume that was the case for all of the property going southwest on Highway KK. Mr. Teddy replied generally yes, in the vicinity. He noted he was not certain how far it extended. He understood there were some County subdivisions along Route K that had smaller lots with higher densities. In the immediate vicinity, the County jurisdiction tended to consist of A-2 zoning, which was 2 to 2.5 acre minimum lot sizes.

Mr. Janku understood there was a City subdivision further south. Mr. Teddy stated Boone Pointe and Deerfield Ridge were east and south of this location and zoned R-1.

Mr. Sturtz asked if there was a City policy on annexing non-contiguous parcels. Mr. Teddy replied there was a standard annexation agreement policy, which allowed an individual who needed sewer where it could be provided, to sign a pre-annexation agreement because the City could not annex until the boundary became contiguous. He noted that did not apply here because this was a voluntary annexation involving a petition. Mayor Hindman pointed out it had to be contiguous for voluntary annexations as well.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 2601 Stadium Boulevard, explained there would be one entrance into the property and it would be permitted by MoDOT. He noted all entrances would have to be permitted by MoDOT. The owner of the property was the builder and he had started his own single family home on that site. It would not be subdivided or under multiple ownership. It would be under one ownership.

Mr. Wade understood it was being annexed as R-1 and asked if it had to be platted as a single lot. Mr. Crockett replied it had already been platted in the County. Mr. Wade understood that plat applied. Mr. Crockett stated that plat applied in the City as a legal lot.
The reason it was coming into the City was so they could utilize City sewers. Mr. Wade understood Council would not have another chance to address the location of the driveway since it was already identified on a plat. Mr. Crockett explained the driveway was not identified on the plat, but there was a current driveway down there now. All driveways, either current or future, would have to be permitted by MoDOT.

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

B281-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B282-08**  
Rezoning property located on the northeast corner of Ash Street and St. James Street (1201 and 1203 Ash Street and 210 St. James Street) from M-1 and R-3 to C-2.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a request to rezone about a six-tenth of an acre parcel. The north part of the site was zoned M-1, which was general industrial and contained a vacant contractor's shop. The south part of the site was zoned R-3 and contained two vacant houses that were currently undergoing renovations. The Planning and Zoning Commission voted 6-2 to recommend denial of the proposed C-2 zoning, which was downtown commercial.

Mr. Teddy stated the Commission felt the zoning of C-2 for the two lots currently zoned R-3, which was a multiple family dwelling district, was too broad for the neighborhood setting when looking at the R-3 dwellings on Hubbell Street and the other dwellings on the remainder of the block on the north side of Ash Street. The Commission seemed to have less discomfort with the notion of rezoning the M-1 site to C-2.

Mr. Sturtz asked if it was possible to grant C-2 and not permit certain uses. Mr. Teddy replied no and explained it was an all or nothing proposition on conventional zoning districts. The owner would have the full entitlement of all of the uses that were allowed and the development rights that went with it.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Skip Walther, an attorney with offices at 700 Cherry Street, stated he was representing the applicant who was requesting the City rezone three parcels to C-2. Since the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, they had subsequent communications and conversations with the neighborhood. They felt the Planning and Zoning Commission vote was predicated upon neighborhood opposition. They believed the opposition was now gone and the people who were opposed to their request were present tonight to support their request. The reason they now supported the request was because although the City could not impose C-2 zoning and restrict certain uses, the private landowner could, and they were proposing to do just that. He provided the Council a set of restrictive covenants he had prepared for the applicant to sign. He explained that after the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, they met with the neighborhood and went through the C-2 list. The neighbors and applicant marked out the uses they felt were inappropriate for the two R-3 lots. He had created a restrictive covenant that would, if this rezoning was approved, be recorded in the real estate records in Boone County. It would be covenants that ran with the land, so they would be in perpetuity. The
covenants specifically stated they were benefiting certain lots on Hubbell Street and that those covenants could not be changed unless all of the affected properties that were listed on the restrictive covenants consented to it in writing. He explained that once the restrictive covenants were recorded, they could not be changed under any circumstance unless 100 percent of the people identified in the document agreed to change the covenants. By private contract, they had agreed to restrict some of the C-2 uses on this property. He noted the North Central Neighborhood Association and City staff supported this proposal. In addition, this rezoning request was consistent with an established long range plan the City had in place for some period of time. He understood this area had been the subject of significant debate within the Special Business District in terms of where they saw an expansion of downtown. This corridor running up through Tenth Street and to the east through the railroad tracks had historically been M-1 zoning, but they believed that would be the most likely expansion of downtown in the future. They felt a C-2 use was consistent with the notion of the expansion of downtown. He understood there were a couple of comments made at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting regarding the similarities between this request and the Livingston request on Locust Street. He felt there were significant dissimilarities. They had M-1 to the west and north of this property. The people on Hubbell had M-1 to the west of their property. This was a neighborhood in transition and not a densely residential neighborhood. It was also a neighborhood that was slated and expected to change and convert into downtown uses in the future. He stated his client wanted to further the concept and vision of an expanded downtown and felt this was an acceptable way to deal with this property.

Mr. Sturtz understood this covenant would extend to all of the owners of that property after the people who presently owned it were gone. Mr. Walther stated yes and explained the restrictions were not tied to any individual person. It was to the owners of lots 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the Hubbell Subdivision. Mr. Sturtz asked for the location. Mr. Walther replied it was on the south side of Ash Street.

Linda Rootes, 402 N. Eighth Street, stated she was the President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association (NCCNA) and noted what they had at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was an example of differences in communication, style, setup and representation. She explained the NCCNA made decisions by the vote of the Board of Directors. At their August meeting, the Board of Directors voted in favor of supporting this. At the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, there were many people from Hubbell who opposed it. She commented that regardless of what the City did with its neighborhood policy, they would not be able to overcome differences of opinion. She explained they supported this as a Board because this area was the North Village area in their overlay document and was seen as a future arts district with mixed-use zoning to include a combination of businesses and residences. She stated they were happy Mr. Ott had purchased the property and had plans for the property. They supported the downzoning of the M-1 property and the upzoning of the two residential properties. She was glad the people who owned houses on Hubbell were able to meet with Mr. Ott and come to an agreement that was satisfactory to them. She reiterated this was supported by the Board as it was in conformance with the Metro 2020 Plan and the overlay ordinance they were proposing.
Tracy Greever-Rice, 602 Redbud Lane, thanked Mr. Ott and his colleagues for working with them to find a solution that was in the best interest of the neighborhood on Hubbell Street and noted they had agreed to exclude all of the uses they were concerned with. She read the list of excluded uses so the Council could understand the uses that were not friendly to residential areas in a downtown. It included automobile repair facilities, service stations, bus stations, car washes, parking lots or garages, hospitals, packaged sales of alcoholic beverages and self-service storage facilities. She stated they were not being trivial in their concerns as these were very intense uses and they did not expect anyone else in the City to live next door to these uses either. She felt it was reasonable to protect downtown neighborhoods. She commented that she felt this was a good example of how desperately they needed to look at allowed uses in the downtown area. They had discussed revising the zoning codes and the fact there might be some uses that were appropriate in the downtown 30 years ago, but were not appropriate today. She thought they needed a new strategic long range plan for the entire City and the downtown, and hoped the Council would support the efforts of revisiting the 2020 Plan during the next budget cycle. She noted this area was already an arts district as it had been an authentic and organic location where artists and art related businesses had chosen to be. She felt it was the genesis of the concept that was now being commercialized. She pointed out Hubbell Street was over 50 percent owner occupied and they all worked in the arts business. The other speakers had talked about this being a neighborhood in transition, but Hubbell Street was an old and established neighborhood. The new plans for downtown discussed for the last 5-10 years involved mixed-use, mixed-income, downtown residential, etc. and that was what they had. She thought they could do better in protecting neighborhoods in downtown Columbia.

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

Mr. Sturtz felt this was a very positive outcome and was pleased. He thought this was a good model of different groups coming together and commended Mr. Ott and the people on Hubbell Street for talking this out.

Mr. Skala stated had been leaning toward not supporting this and thought this was a creative way of coming to a successful conclusion with regard to the uses in these zoning categories. He noted revisions to the zoning categories were on the agenda for next year.

Mr. Wade stated the revisions were on the agenda for this fiscal year, which began on October 1, 2008, and he hoped they would not wait another year before getting started. He explained he came in ready to support the C-2 zoning, although he was reluctant to go against the strong Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation. He felt planned commercial was even more inappropriate and needed more revisions than C-2. He did not find it appropriate to shift from C-2 because it needed to be redone. He felt planned zoning also needed to be redone as it worse. The purpose of C-2, which had the problem of outdated uses, was to encourage development in the downtown area that exhibited downtown characteristics. He believed they needed to continue encouraging this instead of strip mall characteristics. He was delighted by the agreement because the Council did not have to choose between twozonings that needed to be modernized.

Mr. Janku stated he was pleased to be able to support the compromise. With regard to the excluded uses, which might be provided as a precedent for future amendments to the
zoning code, he noted they had a number of hospitals in close proximity to residential areas. As downtown became more residentially dense, he thought medical and dental services might be needed by those residents. He stated he was unsure of that exemption, but would go along with the compromise.

Ms. Hoppe commented that in terms of hospitals, she thought they needed to look at the location to determine what might or might not be appropriate, so she would not uniformly rule it in or out. She stated she was pleased to see the restoration and renovation of the 100-plus year old home on the corner and was glad it was in the hands of someone that would do it well.

B282-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B283-08 Approving the Regional Catholic High School O-P Development Plan located on the north side of Gans Road, approximately 1,500 feet west of the Gans Road and Gans Creek Road intersection.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was an O-P development plan on a site of approximately 22.78 acres on the north side of Gans Road. The proposed plan would allow for construction of a 150,000 square foot high school and associated athletic facilities. Staff had determined the plan met all zoning regulation requirements and the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the proposed development plan.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Ray Beck, 201 Sappington, stated he was the volunteer project director for the new Regional Catholic High School being planned for Columbia. They were proposing a school for about 400 students located just west of Highway 63/Gans Road interchange. They had several volunteer committees working the areas of curricula, site, building plans, financing and fundraising. The curricula committee had developed a first class educational and athletic program complete with building and other space requirements. The building committee had been working with Peckham and Wright Architects to design a state of the art master plan for both the site and facilities. They made sure what they were proposing complied with the development parameters of the already approved Bristol Lake development plan. During the planning and design process, they had communicated and worked closely with their development neighbors to the east and west. The plan approved by the committees was presented to the parishes and approved by the diocese in Jefferson City. In addition, they took it upon themselves to invite over 75 neighboring property owners to an informational meeting, which included all neighbors 2,700 feet north and south of the site, from Highway 63 on the east to Rock Quarry Road on the west. Only two neighbors attended and they believed they had answered all of their questions to their satisfaction. He explained they had worked closely with City staff throughout the process and there were no inquiries at the August 11, 2008 informational meeting hosted by the Planning and Development Department. In addition, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval. He commented that although they had an outstanding school system
in Columbia, they felt this high school would be another outstanding addition. He asked for Council’s approval.

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

Ms. Hoppe stated she met at length with the committee and architects and noted it looked like a commendable plan in terms of design, passive solar, stormwater provisions, green space, the method to be used for the clearing the land, etc. She commented that did not see anything negative and planned on supporting it.

Mayor Hindman pointed out it appeared as though they had done a good job of landscaping the parking lot and felt it should be the model.

B283-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B284-08 Amending Chapter 23 of the City Code as it relates to banners.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained that earlier this year, Council directed staff to prepare an ordinance that would allow the Columbia Library District to hang banners on City street light standards and library light and sign poles. The Special Business District, University, colleges and hospitals were all currently allowed to hang banners on City street lights. This process required a change in the sign ordinance. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of a slightly revised banner proposal in that the size of the banner was reduced by about half. He understood no one spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Teddy stated the banners in the Library District’s revised exhibit met the 16 square foot standard.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Tom Richards, 407 Russell Boulevard, stated he was representing the Library District Board and noted they would appreciate the Council’s support.

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

B284-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B285-08 Authorizing a pole attachment agreement with Columbia Library District.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was the standard pole attachment agreement and was required in order to allow the banners to be hung on City poles.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

B285-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:
B288-08  Authorizing construction of a traffic calming speed hump on Upland Creek Road within Eastland Hills Subdivision.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the proposal was to create speed humps on Upland Creek Road in east Columbia.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Skala expressed his and his constituents’ appreciation for this. He commented that he first heard about this when he was campaigning about eighteen months ago.

B288-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B293-08  Authorizing construction of the County House Branch Trail project from the Twin Lakes Recreation Area to Stadium Boulevard.

B294-08 Authorizing acquisition of easements for the County House Branch Trail project from the Twin Lakes Recreation Area to Stadium Boulevard.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Hindman explained staff had asked for these hearings to be continued. He understood it had been advertised appropriately, but a letter had been sent late so they could not act upon it tonight.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Christopher Sorlien, 1104 Maplewood, stated he would like to see this happen as he and his family would use it. He thought it was important to have off-road pieces like this rather than putting bike lanes down busy roads. He felt there needed to be a way to get around town without being on busy roads.

Pamela Gibb, 2000 College Park Drive, stated she owned the home that was just south of Stadium and noted she was very supportive of the idea of this program, but was concerned because if the trail went under Stadium, there was a strong possibility people would go behind her house. She understood the idea was for people to go up a steep hill that went in front of their home, but did not think many people would do that in actuality. She hoped there was a plan to divert traffic away from her backyard.

Mayor Hindman stated he was sure she would be given the opportunity to work with staff and suggested she make her ideas known with regard to that issue.

Tom Richards, 407 Russell Boulevard, stated he lived in the neighborhood and loved the idea of this trail. He felt it would be a great addition to the neighborhood. He noted they had young kids and would definitely use the trail.

There being no further comment, Mayor Hindman continued the public hearing to the October 20, 2008 Council meeting.

Mr. Wade made a motion to table B293-08 and B294-08 to the October 20, 2008 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.
(A) Determining final design of a new parking garage located at Fifth Street and Walnut Street.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained they would be asking Council to provide guidance with regard to the proposed parking garage on Walnut Street, across from the Post Office, after the public hearing. He noted staff would come back to Council one more time after the plans and designs were done in order to obtain their input. Right now, they were looking at concepts to ensure it met approval as the design moved forward. In addition, they wanted to obtain public input.

Mr. Glascock stated they hoped to start construction on the parking garage sometime in the next year and noted the consultant, Dave Ryan, with Walker Parking would provide a presentation.

Dave Ryan of Walker Parking Consultants stated he was in attendance tonight to present their schematic design documents for the parking structure at Fifth and Walnut. He provided a powerpoint presentation and commented that in looking at the isometric, they had a one way double threaded parking structure system. It would have a one way traffic pattern with angled parking throughout the facility. There would be an entry into the facility from Fifth Street and an entry and exit from Sixth Street to the east. He stated the lower level shaded in blue would be designated for the segregated police parking area and the yellow area to the north would be designated as the first floor retail area. As one entered the structure from either Fifth Street or Sixth Street and made their way up, there were several opportunities to cross back over to get into the down-bound circuit. Once at the top, there was no dead end space. One could continue immediately down the facility to the exit. He showed the ground level and noted the ramp to the south represented the entry point into the police parking area located off of Fifth Street. He pointed out the parking structure, as currently laid out, provided for about 661 parking spaces and 47-48 spaces for police parking. He noted there would be two stair elevator towers located at the northwest and southeast corners.

Mr. Wade asked if public restrooms were designed into the proposal. Mr. Ryan replied no, but there was space so they could. Mr. Wade stated he would like Council to consider restrooms at a later time.

Mr. Janku asked for clarification regarding the cross over and asked how many tiers there were. Mr. Ryan replied there were eight supported levels and explained the reason for the cross over was so someone who parked in a middle level would not have to circulate all of the way to the top. They could cross over and come back down.

Mr. Sturtz asked if this was engineered in a way where floors could be added to the top for parking or offices. Mr. Ryan replied it was not. He stated nine levels were supported and noted it could be designed for future expansion, if desired. Mr. Sturtz asked how much that would add to the cost. Mr. Ryan replied it was probably not very significant in total. He explained they were really talking about adding to the existing foundation numbers and without having a complete understanding of the foundation system, it would be hard to provide a solid number. Designing it now as opposed to trying to retrofit it in the future would provide a big savings. Mr. Glascock pointed out they did that on the garage behind City Hall, but the building codes had changed so much for earthquake standards that it was not
feasible to expand it now. Mayor Hindman understood it could still be done on this one. Mr. Glascock stated they could, but he thought it would have to be beefed up a lot more than it was worth. This was why they were suggesting a new garage. It was more cost-effective. Mayor Hindman understood, but noted they could do it with the new one. Mr. Glascock stated they could. Mayor Hindman understood it was a risk they would be taking due to the building codes changing.

Mr. Skala asked if the justification for the number of levels had to do with the amount of money that could be recovered to pay for the structure. Mr. Ryan replied he thought it was dictated by the number of spaces. Mr. Skala thought it had grown taller since it was first proposed. Mr. Glascock stated they were initially looking at three-fourths of a block to include the bank property and the credit union property.

Mr. Wade understood they were looking at the demand from the parking study as defining the spaces and size. Mr. Watkins stated they had a good idea of how many spaces they would need to meet the demand in the area.

Mr. Wade asked if the top floor was parking or a roof. Mr. Ryan replied the top floor was currently parking. Mr. Janku understood building a roof was expensive. Mr. Wade commented that parking garage roofs became a likely candidate for solar installations.

Mayor Hindman stated he was concerned with the traffic that would be generated by nearly 700 spaces in the area and asked if there had been a traffic study. Mr. Ryan replied they had a traffic consultant on board that was going to look at that issue during the design development phase since they now knew where people would be coming in and out of the parking structure. Mayor Hindman believed it would likely add quite a bit to peak traffic.

Mr. Skala asked about the pedestrian access between the Post Office and retail spaces. Mr. Ryan replied that at this time there was no mid-block access because the Sixth Street intersection was signaled and the Fifth Street intersection would be signaled with this project. They wanted to get people to the crosswalks to get them to the Post Office.

Chris Davis, an architect for Peckham and Wright Architects, commented that after the Council work session at the end of July, they walked away with marching orders of one scheme mixed with another. The site plan in the Council packet changed with vehicle access on Fifth and Sixth Streets as well as the back side of the retail spaces. The front, which was on Walnut, still included separation between the public sidewalk and a closer storefront sidewalk. They moved the stair tower from the northeast corner to the southeast corner to provide more room for retail. The northeast corner afforded itself to a two-story space due to the slope of the parking structure. Most of the rest of the retail or office space, as it worked up Walnut, would be single-story spaces. They envisioned red brick on the lower levels in the image and a buff-colored concrete element above it. They were expecting most of it to be precast due to cost factors. There would be a lot of storefronts on the north side and on both of the north ends of the east and west elevations. The southwest corner included the entry for the police and public. It also had access for deliveries and back of the house operations for retail and office. It also showed the two-story space for the northwest corner. The stair tower in the southeast presented itself more to Broadway and the northeast corner showed retail and office and an entry for cars to the left. Due to the level changes in the retail as
Sixth Street came down in elevation by about 10 feet to Fifth Street, he noted they had areas to the side that stepped as well.

Mr. Janku asked how wide the space for pedestrians was between the wall and trees. Mr. Davis replied 8-10 feet. He explained they adjusted the location of the building a little to afford more there as well as off the alleyway to take advantage of compactors, generators and other things they needed to add.

Mayor Hindman asked if the entrance to the retail would be on the inside sidewalk. Mr. Davis replied yes. Mayor Hindman asked about the entrance for handicapped people as it looked as though there were stairs. Mr. Davis replied there were stairs, but noted each access was a level access. He showed how the access would work on the overhead.

Mr. Sturtz understood the exterior finish, as it went toward the top of the building, became buff-colored concrete and noted there were a lot of innovative techniques being used to colorize and give concrete more texture. He asked if a low cost way, such as that, had been discussed. Mr. Davis replied they were envisioning a light buff color to it. It would not be gray. The brick side would have the in-lay brick, which would give it a red color. Mr. Sturtz understood it would not look like the Hitt Street garage. Mr. Davis replied he thought they had chosen a light gray, which did not seem natural.

Mayor Hindman asked about the texture. Mr. Davis replied as they moved up 30-40 feet, a lot of the texture would get lost, so they would look at something that fell within the budget unless the Council had a specific request. The brick down low would have a texture and appearance of some of the other brick garages around town. Mayor Hindman asked if it would cost a lot more if they wanted texture. Mr. Ryan replied no. He thought they would look at a sandblast finish, which was a standard finish for a precast. There were several finishes they could do in the same range of cost that would accent the color and look different on different pieces depending on how they were finished. He stated they could do several economical finishes that would give it a different look, so it was not the plain gray concrete. Mayor Hindman stated he was thinking about pressed concrete that looked like brick or stone. Mr. Ryan understood he meant stamped concrete and explained they were currently looking at something similar to that for the brick. It was a thin-set brick that was imbedded in the concrete. If they did a stamped form on anything above that, it would be more of a cost premium than the sandblasting or the other types of finishes that could be done after the product was made.

Mr. Wade understood the kind of finish that could give some variation did not cost any more. Mr. Ryan replied it would cost more. Mr. Wade asked how much more would it cost. Mr. Ryan replied 10-15 percent more per piece.

Mr. Skala commented that on their way back from Portland, he and Ms. Hoppe stopped at the airport. Ms. Hoppe passed around a photograph of a garage there. He noted cascading plants would be dramatic in terms of texture. He understood it might be problematic in terms of maintenance and other things, but asked if that had been previously been addressed in order to give the building a dramatic textural feature. Ms. Hoppe commented that they might want to consider whether this was a Percent for Art possibility. It would address the look of a parking lot on the upper floors in a very green and attractive way. The Portland airport garage had greenery on each level of the parking structure and some
supporting mechanisms. She thought it was pretty year round and needed to be watered occasionally. Mr. Skala pointed out it was Portland. Mayor Hindman agreed and noted their climate was milder. Ms. Hoppe understood and agreed it would need to be adjusted for Columbia.

Mayor Hindman noticed there were no trees on one end and asked if that was an oversight or if there was a reason they were not included. Mr. Davis stated the site plan showed a little planting on the east side. There was not a lot of opportunity for it along the west side. He noted they could look for trees at the curb edge similar to what they had on the other side streets in the downtown if they wanted. Mayor Hindman stated he wanted to see trees. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mr. Sturtz asked when they would kick started the Standing Committee on Public Art with regard to Percent for Art. He thought it would be positive to have them weigh in early in the process. Mr. Watkins replied he thought they had begun meeting on this, but understood it would take a while.

Mr. Janku noted the Council had received an e-mail suggesting solar panels be placed on either the roof or the side of the building and asked if that was feasible without any extra structural costs. Mayor Hindman asked if he was asking if the infrastructure would be there if they decided to add solar panels at a later date. Mr. Janku replied yes because he thought the weight of the panels would need to be taken into account. Mr. Ryan stated he was not sure of the weight of those. They had done things hanging off of a structure. He thought it was something they could work out with the precaster depending on the weight. He had also seen them done at the top of the stair towers where there was already a structural roof in place. He thought there were opportunities at the top to pick up some panels.

Mr. Glascock noted they would be looking into plug-ins for electric cars as an add-alternate. He stated they would also look at solar, but they would not have answers tonight.

Mayor Hindman asked if there were plans for bicycle parking. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mr. Ryan commented that back when they were looking at the three different site options, one of their first tasks was to present opinions of probable construction costs for each site. The site chosen was option one and the estimated cost was $10.5 - $13 million. He noted that estimate did not include the basement portion, which was another $1 - $1.5 million. They recently confirmed with the general contractor that the design still fell within that range. It included the new architectural treatments, the selection of the cast and place structural system and updated drawings. If approved the design development phase would be October 7 to December 5, 2008. They would get into construction documents December 8, 2008 to February of 2009 with a bidding phase of approximately one month. They anticipated awarding the bid in April, 2009 and 12-16 months of construction. These dates included City reviews.

Mr. Janku asked for clarification on how the parking structure was being paid for. Mr. Watkins replied it was being paid for by parking utility revenues. He noted the people who parked in all of the garages paid a monthly charge and pointed out City employees were charged a departmental charge to their departmental budgets based on the going rate, so they paid the same amount as a private sector person. He commented that they were
subsidized to some extent by parking meter revenues. Part of the parking meter revenues paid the debt service on the parking garages. Mr. Janku understood there were no general fund taxes other than employee parking. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct.

Mr. Watkins understood there had been discussion as to whether this many parking spaces were needed and explained that, currently, every covered space in all of the garages were spoken for. The Water and Light Department would be moving to City Hall once the building was completed and they would need approximately 100 spaces for personal and departmental vehicles, which were currently parked at the Williams-Keepers Building. They felt that by the time the garage was built, they would have most of the spaces filled. Inquiries had already been received from the Post Office and the County. The parking study done in 2001-2002 had predicted this number of spaces and he believed the analysis was pretty good.

Mr. Wade noted this also fit into the larger context of the work that had been going on and the investments being made toward a major revitalization of downtown. If people were to come downtown to make it a dynamic and vital area, there needed to be adequate parking. The more they used surface level lots for parking, the less land they had for higher intensity uses. In addition, commercial, office and residential buildings had higher values, which made dramatic differences in the property valuation and property tax revenue. This was not just to create parking spaces. It fit within what was essential to continue to build a stronger and economically viable downtown.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Kurt Albert, 400 E. High Point Lane, stated he was concerned with the seismic potential and durability and asked that it be addressed. Mr. Ryan replied the seismic design would be addressed based on the 2006 Edition of the International Building Code (IBC). They also had a geotechnical report, which would be used in conjunction with the IBC to dictate the seismic design of the parking structure.

Elton Fay stated he and his wife owned the building located directly west of the proposed garage and previously wrote a letter to the Council dated January 29, 2008. He explained they attended each of the public input sessions City staff had, and at all of those meetings, plans were presented for a maximum of six levels of parking. After the public input phase, they began hearing it would be 8-10 levels. He understood it was now eight or nine levels. He felt the time he and his neighbors spent at the public hearings was wasted if they were going to come back with a different plan. He noted he had some specific concerns as well. He was concerned with the general view and character of the parking garage. As he parked in the parking garage across from the Courthouse, which he used almost daily, he could envision that garage being nine stories tall and more usable than where it would be at Fifth and Sixth Streets. It could be connected to City Hall and would be closer to the Courthouse. A structure of 3-4 stories, similar to the one at Flat Branch, would be much more aesthetically fitting in the neighborhood than something that was ten stories high with nothing around it that matched. He thought it would be better if the City built a 3-4 level garage there and put the tall building between the Courthouse and City Hall. He felt it would be more usable and a better structure. He noted his building was surrounded in the front and back with City properties. The Blind Boone home was in the back and the City parking lot
was in the front. If they put up a nine story garage, the front windows of their office would not receive any sunlight. He commented that the traffic was already horrible and they still did not have a crosswalk at Fifth Street and Walnut. He had nearly been hit 3-4 times in the last month trying to take postage to the Post Office because there was no crosswalk. With regard to the retail space, he asked the Council to ensure those that rented had to pay school taxes like everyone else because the City would be using tax dollars to build competing retail space. If they took it off of the tax roles, they would not have to pay school taxes. He thought they needed to set a firm policy on an in lieu of tax payment for school taxes.

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

Mr. Janku understood the possibility of expanding the Plaza parking garage was examined and asked Mr. Glascock to explain why they decided not to pursue it. Mr. Glascock replied the looked at it because it was built with a foundation where they could potentially add floors at a later date. The problem was that the seismic designs had changed since it was built. It would cost half as much to add two floors as it would to build a new structure. He thought the cost was $6 million to add two floors. They felt it would be better to build a new structure and put the money toward more spaces.

Mayor Hindman understood they were not deciding to build the garage, but were coming close since they were asking for the detailed drawings and specifications, which was a large investment. It would not make sense to make the investment and not build it, so they really were making a major decision tonight. He thought some of the things Mr. Wade stated earlier were right on with respect to the value of having a garage that went up, assuming the parking spaces were needed. The City Manager along with the parking study made a good case that the parking spaces were needed. There were issues in his mind with regard to traffic congestion. He wanted to be satisfied this would not create a bottleneck that was unworkable in the downtown because it was a confined area. He understood the issue of whether the City should build competing retail spaces had been brought up and noted he was a firm believer that all of the downtown would benefit from the removal of surface parking lots, which left big vacant spaces in the retail area, and compressing retail as much as possible because the people who utilized the downtown were on foot. They did not want to walk past open parking lots. They wanted a concentrated area where there was human activity. He pointed out they were not putting retail there to get a return on their investment. They were doing it for the benefit of downtown. The Special Business District had endorsed this idea heavily. He thought they would all agree they should have an in lieu of tax payment. He understood the University did that in the downtown area and thought the City should do the same. He reiterated the purpose was to benefit the downtown and believed putting retail in would benefit downtown. He commented that he recently returned from a trip to Europe where they went into several parking garages and there was a very distinct difference between those garages and the City’s garages. Their garages were immaculately clean and beautifully lit. There was not a piece of trash to be seen and they were constantly painted. He believed the City’s parking program should involve rates sufficient for the parking garages to be extremely attractive. If they were going to put this kind of investment into parking, he felt they should make it something that was truly beneficial to the City.
Mr. Janku stated parking structures could be controversial. They had heard similar comments before they built some of the new ones and had rehabilitated the ones at Eighth and Cherry. If they looked at how downtown was starting to redevelop, he noted Fifth and Cherry used to have an old meat packing plant. They now had multi-story buildings, which prominently advertised their proximity to the Sixth and Cherry parking structure. In addition, when they had major events downtown, such as the Roots N’ Blues Festival this past weekend, the parking structures supported and made those types of events possible. They not only supported weekday business, but they also supported evening and weekend events that contributed to the downtown.

Mr. Skala commented that when looking at extra retail space, it could be looked at as extra competition or as drawing more people to retail in the downtown, which was the utility of a parking structure. He asked if they planned to have surveillance capacity in this garage along the same lines as the other parking garages. Mr. Watkins replied yes.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff and the architectural team to proceed with the design development and construction document phases. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Ms. Hoppe stated she could not imagine the intersection on Fifth and Walnut would not be greatly improved after the traffic study since it was already a problem. She also thought it was clear they needed a parking structure of this size at this point in time, but was hopeful and optimistic, as they promoted biking and walking and improved the mass transit system, the need for future parking would diminish. Mr. Janku stated he hoped any surface lots would now develop into structures. Ms. Hoppe agreed structures were more efficient and better for downtown development than flat parking.

The motion made by Mr. Wade and seconded by Ms. Nauser was approved unanimously by voice vote.

R226-08 Approving a Citizen’s Participation Plan as part of the City’s Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan; authorizing appointment of a Fair Housing Committee.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a resolution approving a plan that was required by HUD for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME funds. It would be part of the Consolidated Plan for the years 2010 and 2014. He noted something fairly different about this plan was that staff was proposing the City Manager appoint a Fair Housing Committee to help provide the necessary information and recommendations to prepare the required piece of the Plan dealing with Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. In addition, the Community Development Commission and the Community Services Advisory Commission would be involved in preparing the Consolidated Plan. He commented that they had the basis of an Affordable Housing report already and would update it. As part of their plan, they talked about having a permanent Fair Housing Committee to provide advice on fair housing issues and improvements.

Mr. Teddy noted that besides guiding the development of their Consolidated Plan, which was a five year strategy for investment resources, such as CDBG, HOME and other sources for similar purposes, this document would provide guidance on how to handle
amendments to the Plan, how they developed annual action plans and how they handled such things as complaints or grievances.

Mr. Watkins pointed out this was not the Consolidated Plan. It involved how they would utilize citizen input in preparing the Consolidated Plan.

Mr. Janku commented that the consent agenda included an item which would set a public hearing for the 2009 Action Plan and understood ideas for policy changes should come up when discussing it versus tonight. Mr. Teddy asked if it was a policy pertaining to citizen participation. Mr. Janku replied no. He explained he was talking about policy changes related to the 2009 expenditure of CDBG funds. Mr. Teddy stated 2009 would be the last year of the current Consolidated Plan. What they were laying out in the document being considered tonight was the plan for completing the next five years of the Plan. He noted those documents could be amended at any time.

Mr. Wade understood the Affordable Housing Committee recommended the Fair Housing Plan and asked why the recommendation was for a City Manager committee rather than a Council committee. Mr. Teddy replied the report by the Committee was not that specific. It was just the way staff put this resolution together. He stated they were just thinking of expediency because this committee would put together the update to the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, which was a document required to accompany the Consolidated Plan. It was part of their duty to affirmatively promote fair housing in the community. He noted it would be a working committee. They would also review the City’s policies on adjudicating fair housing complaints and potential actions that could be taken to reduce impediments to fair housing.

Mr. Wade stated he considered all of the Council committees to be working committees and considered it their responsibility to do what was said for the Council. Mr. Watkins noted the City did not have a Fair Housing Committee. The task force completed their report and disbanded.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Skala stated he was also concerned about the precedent of advisory committees that were supposed to serve the Council. He thought the final say about this advisory committee should be at the purview of the Council at some point. He understood this was a matter of expediency due to deadlines and the requirements necessary to proceed, but was uncomfortable.

Ms. Nauser noted the Mayor had appointed committees which the Council concurred with in the past. Mr. Skala pointed out the Mayor was part of the Council. Ms. Nauser commented that she was using it as an example, but also thought it might be nice to have applications for the Council to review.

Mr. Janku believed the City Manager was trying to expedite the process since the Council had not acted on it since last February.

Mr. Watkins stated it was not a problem for the Mayor to make the appointments, but noted they needed to move forward.

Mr. Wade understood they needed to move forward as they were working under a HUD deadline. He felt they were talking about a staff function in regard to the HUD
requirement and the committee would perform on a short term basis. He noted he did not have a problem with that. He stated he would have a problem if that became a permanent City fair housing committee. Mr. Watkins agreed. Mr. Wade commented that he would not support a permanent City committee, but would support it as a functional committee for the purpose of completing this document. Mr. Watkins explained that was their intent.

Ms. Hoppe thought the City Manager could recommend names for Council approval and appointment. Mr. Watkins commented that if the Council wanted an advisory committee to them, he did not believe the City Manager should have anything to do with the appointments or recommendations.

Mr. Skala agreed if this was a staff function, the City Manager should have the purview to deal with those functions. Mr. Watkins pointed out it would not be composed of just City staff. They would also go out and get people from the community to assist. Mr. Wade asked if it would sunset when the report was finished. Mr. Watkins replied yes. He noted the recommendation might be for a permanent Fair Housing Committee to be established. The Council would then have the opportunity to act. Mr. Watkins stated the alternative would be to appoint a permanent committee and go through that process up front. Mr. Wade thought this work should be done first.

The vote on R226-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**OLD BUSINESS**

R164-08A  *Officially recognizing the North Central Columbia Business District and recognizing it as an official neighborhood organization for the area described in the by laws of the District.*

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted they had a request to change the name to the East North Central Neighborhood Association if they decided to go with a neighborhood association. He pointed out Council considered this back in July and tabled it to this meeting. If this resolution was approved as a business association, it would be the City’s first recognized business district under a policy that was approved several years ago.

Ms. Messina pointed out there were two different resolutions in the information supplied to the Council. One would approve a business organization and the other would approve a neighborhood organization.

Phebe La Mar, an attorney with offices at 111 S. Ninth Street, stated she was present on behalf of an organization that originally applied to be recognized as a neighborhood association under the policies that were established by the Council. Later, there was discussion about the possibility of recognizing that association as a business organization instead. Since the time they had submitted their request to change the name, there had been discussion to change it to a different name entirely in an effort to alleviate concerns they were engendering confusion. They were now suggesting this be named the Shoe Factory District Neighborhood Association. It was suggested by Mr. Sturtz and the Board agreed it was an appropriate name and approach. She noted she had also sent an e-mail to the members of
the association this afternoon informing them of the change. The responses received were positive as well. She explained her clients wanted to have this recognized as a neighborhood association. She displayed a map on the overhead showing the boundary lines of the proposed association. It was all currently within the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association (NCCNA) and was technically supposed to be represented by them. She noted there were a substantial number of the people in this area that did not feel they were being represented by the NCCNA. At this point, they had received responses from 90 percent of the property area within the boundary requesting to be a part of this new association. That number included 84 percent of the parcels within the area and 70 percent of the property owners within the area. She noted there was overwhelming support by these people to be a member of a different neighborhood association. As a result, they were asking the Council to recognize this association as a neighborhood association. It was open to property owners, residents, business owners and tenants of the area, but was not open to the general public of the City of Columbia as was potentially the case with the NCCNA. She felt it fit within the parameters of a neighborhood association. It was not necessarily an interest based organization and was not just for businesses. It was for everyone in this area and was based on geography. It incorporated the Columbia College area, a substantial amount of business area and some residential area. She reiterated the majority of the people in this area had indicated they wanted to be a member of this association. She understood the Council had some options this evening. They could recognize this association and allow it to have overlapping boundary lines. If that was not the Council’s desire, she thought they could redraw the boundary lines of the existing neighborhood association to create a situation where both of these organizations could represent the areas they were requesting to represent without having overlapping boundaries. If the Council did not want to redraw the boundary lines, she thought they could make their approval and recognition contingent upon their application to withdraw at such time there was a mechanism to do so. She believed it was appropriate to move forward with this particular organization and rewrite the policies in the future.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification regarding the NCCNA having membership outside of the geographical area which they represented. Ms. La Mar replied their bylaws indicated that if someone had any interest whatsoever in this property, which was undefined and did not say anything about what that interest might be, they could become a member of the NCCNA. She understood there were several members who did not own property, were not residents and did not own a business in this area. Mr. Janku stated that was not a bad thing because it brought support at the very beginning.

Ms. La Mar noted she brought proposed bylaws if the Council decided to recognize them as the Shoe Factory District Neighborhood Association. Mayor Hindman asked if they were standard bylaws. Ms. La Mar replied they were the same bylaws except for the name of the association.

Linda Rootes, 402 N. Eighth Street, stated she was President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association and explained in 1993, when some residents of the Coats and Fairview area decided they were interested in looking into a neighborhood association, she was sent to the City’s Planning Department. They took the advice of the
City in setting their boundaries and formed their bylaws based on a composite on file in the Clerk’s Office from the few other associations that were recognized at that time. She pointed out they had participated in every planning initiative that had come down the pipe in the last 15 years and had often been very disappointed with the people who did not feel as excited as they did about the opportunities for planning and getting involved. Business people usually begged off because they were busy and institutions seemed reluctant to meddle in neighborhood affairs, and so they forged ahead doing the best they could. Now a group of business owners were asking to be involved. She commented that she could not be opposed to a citizen’s desire for participation and looked forward to any plans they might develop. If they proposed projects to improve the neighborhood and requested City funding, she would be there to support their request. She was not opposed to these neighbors having a strong voice in City affairs, but asked the Council to not feel pressured to act rashly since they were planning on making changes to the policies. While it might seem simplistic to divide the area, there were property owners and members of the NCCNA who were within the boundaries of the proposed Shoe Factory District. If they divided the property, she wondered if they would lose their opportunity to be members of the NCCNA. She noted one of their new members was Paul Land who claimed he had an interest in NCCNA because he represented property owners in the area. They were happy to have him join in hopes he would participate, but that had not been forthcoming. Another member not in the neighborhood was Scott Cristal, who claimed because he had a business that sold products in different areas, to include the NCCNA, he had an interest, and he had participated some. Another member was Paul Sturtz, who asked to be involved before being elected to the Council. In the past Karen Miller had been a member because her office was in the NCCNA. She explained people had asked to be involved and if someone wanted to participate, they did not turn them away. No matter how this issue was resolved, she stated she wanted to make it clear that she was eager to work with any of the individuals anywhere in the NCCNA, the Shoe Factory District, the central City or City at-large. She hoped this issue would be resolved so they could all get on with their work.

Ms. Hoppe understood the bylaws of NCCNA would allow members within the Shoe Factory District to remain members of the NCCNA if they had an interest in that Association. Ms. Rootes explained some of the people she was considering were residents and property owners on Alton Avenue. Where the line was now, people on one side of the street would be in one neighborhood association and people on the other side would be in another neighborhood association. She did not think that was a practical way of solving problems on a street. The same was true for Pannell. In addition, one of the major property owners who had been very active was Brian Pape and they did not want to lose him. Under the circumstances, she noted she would prefer to have an overlap for the time being rather than a forced partition.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, stated he was the Vice President of the NCCNA and commented that he, for the most part, did not question the business owners’ interest in the City, nor did he worry about their care and concern for the property they owned in North Central Columbia. In addition, he welcomed their participation in neighborhood politics, but felt the argument put forth in support of formal recognition of the neighborhood association
was specious. The proposed remedy would deal a severe blow to participatory neighborhood organizations in Columbia. They claimed they were not represented by the NCCNA and wondered how they could be represented when they never showed up. He noted the NCCNA had been in existence since 1993, was a 501(c)(3) organization and had held monthly meetings for every one of those 15 years. Every year, they publicly solicited new members and renewing members. They publicly advertised their annual association meeting at which the Board was elected. In the 15 years of meetings, only two or three of the people who were petitioning the Council for this new neighborhood association had ever bothered to participate. They were not represented because they were not there. He did not feel their conspicuous absence constituted a reason to grant them a competing neighborhood association status. He believed this would open the door to splintering each neighborhood association into whatever unresolved group issues happened to be there. If this group truly had neighborhood interests, he thought they should join the NCCNA because they could vote if they did not agree with what the NCCNA was proposing.

Amir Ziv, 904 N. Eighth Street, suggested the Council ask Mr. Atkins or his representative why they would not talk to them. He commented that he had extended an olive branch to Mr. Atkins to no avail. He was stymied by the fact he did not want to talk to them.

Scott Atkins, 3909 Day Lilly Court, commented that Mr. Ziv asked him to talk to them about a month ago. At that point in time, he felt their group had a clear objective. He noted he had been elected the Chairperson of the group, but had not solicited the position, and did not feel he had the charge of negotiating the varied interests. At this point, the group was requesting to seek Council approval to become a group. He felt that was his charge. He noted Mr. Ziv did not explain he had indicated he would be happy to talk to him after the new group was formed. He felt they had a long history of talking to them and looked forward to it.

Annette Greenlee, 2738 Northland Drive, stated she was President of the Northland-Parker Neighborhood Association, which was founded in 1972 and was the oldest and first neighborhood association. She could recall when the NCCNA began, and at that time, the presidents of at least five or six neighborhood associations, including hers, were active members in the NCCNA. In addition, the NCCNA participated with the Northland-Parker Neighborhood Association when they had issues as well. She suggested the Shoe Factory District consider putting into their bylaws something that would allow other neighborhood participation because they would gain strength by getting ideas from other neighborhood associations. She pointed out they did not have a voting membership in the NCCNA, but were able to attend meetings and provide input. She felt it was a valuable tool.

Robert Sweat, 310 Alexander, asked why they were charged $20 to take a dog to the Human Society. He did not think they should be liable for that. Mayor Hindman suggested Mr. Sweat to talk to the Council about this subject at the end of the meeting because it was not on the agenda and they were currently discussing another topic.

Mike Martin, 206 S. Glenwood, stated he owned property in the North Central area and would be considered a business owner living outside the area that had been involved in the neighborhood association for about seven years. While it was true a lot of the business owners, such as Mr. Atkins, had not attended NCCNA meetings, it was also true they were a
neighborhood of extremes. They had extremely good neighbors, like the Atkins, who took
good care of their property. They also had extremely bad neighbors, such as the person he
addressed in the Columbia Business Times, who did not take good care of his property. He
asked the Council to think about that as they were considering this issue. They were one of
the few neighborhoods in the City that had those extremes. For whatever reason, those
extremes were not modulated and had never been mitigated. He thought part of the reason
was that everyone lived in their own little provincial world. He believed the neighborhood
association, as it was currently composed, was a way to bring everyone together. He was
not sure if it needed to be enhanced or broken into two neighborhood associations, but
pointed out they had a lot of unique challenges. He suggested the Council be cautious with
the moves they might make to rearrange things. The way this was put together would
determine how the neighborhood would work together in the future. He commented that the
downtown was thriving and they needed the residential areas around the downtown to thrive
as well.

Ms. Hoppe stated it was obvious this group was adamantly opposed to working with
and being a part of the NCCNA, which was formed long ago. In addition, there was no
provision for changing the boundaries or membership in the bylaws of the association or the
City’s policy. She wondered if he thought neighborhood associations should stay static or
have some provision to change boundaries, members, etc., given the changing times and
constituencies. Mr. Martin replied, with respect to this neighborhood, nothing had changed
and that was the problem. The extremes remained. The really good neighbors had a lot of
moral, ethical and financial authority that could be brought to bear on some of the problems
that had plagued the neighborhood for years. Whether they broke off into their own
association or remained as part of the NCCNA was something to consider, but they were not
in a dynamic period. They were stagnating because there was a tacit acceptance of the idea
that crime was okay in that and other low income neighborhoods. He believed if they broke
off into their own association, the NCCNA would be diminished. If they stayed and used their
moral authority, it would help, but if they did not participate, he felt they would continue to
stagnate. If they left and formed their own association causing them to work together in a
better and more meaningful way, he thought it should be done. He felt it was about getting
the people together that could make stuff happen.

Charles Gibbens, 3300 Westcreek Circle, stated he joined this organization because
they were all business people. He could go to his neighbors to tell them to remove a tree that
was degrading to the area, but he could not go to neighbors asking them to pick up their trash
or fix their garage door. As a business person, he felt he could talk to other business people
about keeping a consolidated area looking good.

Cedar Albert, 1009 Rangeline Street, stated she purchased a drug house across from
Field School about 5-6 years ago. The house had been built in 1919 and had been
converted into five units in the 1980’s. She commented that she started working on the
house and had put her heart into it. She attended a neighborhood association meeting and
was pleased to be there because she had taken the worst house on the street and turned it
into something adequate. She probably had the best house on the street now in terms of
presentation. In addition, now there was a whole row of houses that looked civilized. She
commented that she had tried to be a member of the neighborhood association, but did not make a connection. As a result, she thought there could be a very real need for a separate organization of like-minded folks. When the neighborhood association was formed, they did not discuss the issue of separation and thought that might be needed to be done now.

Larry Grossman, 3205 Westcreek Circle, stated he was the Vice President of the proposed Shoe Factory District Neighborhood Association and noted there was a perception that this was the Atkins show. It was not. Mr. Atkins was reluctant in taking a leadership role in the organization. There were dozens of business people who were actively involved in it. He did not want the City to think the Atkins’ were pushing this. It was obvious the NCCNA was a huge area and it was reasonable the area could be represented by more than one organization, which was what they were asking Council to allow. With regard to why they did not participate, he commented that the Vice President of the NCCNA had said some unkind things at the last meeting, so he felt it was obvious there were irreconcilable differences. He thought there was also a perception that they were formed to fight one issue, but noted they intended to be around a long time taking positions on a number of issues. He felt they would be standing shoulder to shoulder with the NCCNA and there would be two powerful voices representing the neighborhood in the future.

Diane Oerly, 1712 Skylane, stated she was President of the Oakland Manor Neighborhood Association and encouraged the Council to not to confuse the definition of a neighborhood association. If this was a business association, she felt it should be treated as such. She did not believe it should be a business association called a neighborhood association as it could be confusing. She felt neighborhood associations represented where people lived and business associations were not the same animal.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he was involved with the Columbia and Boone County Neighborhood Alliance and the NCCNA for a long time and felt most the discussion tonight was beside the point. He understood the resolution passed in 1977 envisaged neighborhood associations of adequate size in area and adequate support. The purpose was to make neighborhood associations quasi-governmental entities. They were to have a large enough geographic area so people, who lived, worked, resided or owned property in a given area, could actually come together. If Council voted to approve this organization in any form, he thought they would be going against the goals of the resolution. He felt they would kill the idea of neighborhood associations of adequate size and adequate resources to actually serve the public function of allowing the people of those areas to come together so they were not calling Council members one at a time. He noted they had come to many agreements in the past through the NCCNA with many of the people who were requesting this other association. He urged the Council to reject this application and rescind the business organization rules until they were reviewed. He felt the notion that the people who were in business did not have access and could not make proposals for capital projects was nonsense. By splitting the NCCNA, he thought they would kill the entire idea of using neighborhood associations as a key component of citizen involvement.

Mr. Sturtz commented that as discussed in the pre-Council session, there were bigger issues involving the neighborhood association policy that needed to be tackled tonight or within the next few months. He felt Mr. Martin had brought up some good points with regard
to how they brought more attention to the neighborhood and worked on making it better. He thought it went toward the issue of better ordinances, more enforcement and more incentives. These were things the City as a whole needed to take on and he did not think they would drop the ball, whether there was one or two neighborhood associations, because they all wanted the center of town to be more vital and safer. He noted Mr. Cullimore had mentioned the danger of splintering, which was something he was concerned with as well. He did not like the idea of groups coming into conflict with one another and splitting off into another group. He wished they had started mediating and bringing people together a few years ago. He noted a number of people had come forward saying it was irreconcilable at this point. If they decided to create two different associations, he hoped they would not create a wall or demarcation that people were not able to jump over. He felt there were a lot of good and well-meaning people on both sides of this, who believed great stuff could be done in this neighborhood in terms of preserving housing and good businesses. One of the concerns he had was with the name of the new group as it would be confusing. The NCCNA had been around for a long time and was a model for what a neighborhood association could accomplish. He thought what they had done as a group in the last ten years was remarkable. The persistent communication that went on amongst the group was commendable. He stated he felt the new group had made a very convincing case in that they had a fair amount of participation and were sincere about going on beyond this one issue. He was not sure on how to proceed, but thought there was room for two associations, whether one was called a business group or neighborhood association. He was hopeful everyone would come to the table to work on the overlay district, whether it became what was originally conceived or simply guidelines. He stated he came from a neighborhood in Portland, Oregon where a guidebook was put together that made suggestions on design. It had a catalytic affect in making that neighborhood one of the best sections of Portland while retaining a lot of the original neighbors. He noted he was proud of coming from a place where neighborhood guidelines and design standards worked in such a way.

Mr. Skala noted they had discussed in the pre-Council session that they would have to look at some of the neighborhood association policies. In the last few years, the neighborhood associations had received more support and tended to represent people more adequately than they had in the past, which he felt would continue. He commented that they would have to address a number of issues to include overlapping boundaries, which he believed was a mistake. He thought there was some consensus at the meeting when they tabled this item in that they needed to straighten out the idea of overlapping boundaries. Although it was within the purview of the Council to change the boundaries, he was not prepared to do it prior to taking a look at the improvements or revisions needing to be made to the neighborhood association policy. He did not think he could do anything to bring these groups together, but wanted to do something that would prevent them from perpetuating this feud. He noted Ms. La Mar stated in a letter to Mr. Watkins that if the Council chose not to recognize them as a neighborhood association organization, but instead recognized them as a business association, it was vital to their membership that such a business association be granted all of the rights, privileges and status currently granted to neighborhood associations. He agreed with that statement and felt any group that represented a particular interest, even
within a neighborhood association boundary, ought to be listened to as attentively as any other group within that neighborhood association. The letter went on to say recognition as a business organization with equal standing should then mean the NCCNA was no longer the Council recognized body representing the new area. He took that to mean these groups would essentially continue to fight and split the vote. He thought they should avoid perpetuating the identity of these two different groups and their representation. In addition, he felt both groups should have an equal voice. He suggested this group be a business organization within the context of where the neighborhood association was right now, until such time they were able to solve some of the policy issues with neighborhood associations. Although they had a provision for a business organization, they would be creating something they had never created before. In this instance, it would be a temporary fix and would buy the Council time in addressing the issue of overlapping boundaries. He recommended they accept the resolution creating the business organization with a name that was sufficiently distinct from the NCCNA. The Council should then work on the neighborhood association policy.

Mayor Hindman asked if this would have a geographic boundary. Mr. Skala replied yes and noted they had identified it by the map on the overhead. Mayor Hindman understood it would include non-business people. Mr. Skala stated yes. He explained it would be the organization they had defined with their geographic boundaries and bylaws the way they had written them. Mayor Hindman stated he was curious to know how the non-business people fit in. Mr. Skala explained the non-business people would still be members of the NCCNA, so they would not be left out. Mayor Hindman asked if they could be a member of this new organization. Mr. Skala replied they could.

Ms. Nauser noted the NCCNA had been around for some time and things had changed. They now had a group of people who were asking to no longer belong. She understood they would be setting a defacto policy of allowing people to abdicate from existing associations, but felt they should have that option. She wanted to preface that statement by pointing out she did not want to see people block by block wanting to leave associations to go off on their own. She commented that she was not sure they would be able to address this in a timely manner since they had so many other issues pending. She noted there were differences between a neighborhood organization and a business area organization and did not know if they could provide a business organization all of the rights conferred to a neighborhood association this evening. She felt they should allow these people to have their own neighborhood organization status with the understanding this would be added to the work session schedule as time allowed.

Mr. Janku asked for clarification from Mr. Skala with regard to his comment indicating the Council needed to change its business organization policy. Mr. Skala replied he thought they needed to make them consistent with the neighborhood association policy. He saw nothing in the business association policy that necessitated it being different from the neighborhood association policy. As far as he was concerned this was a temporary fix in lieu of redrawing boundary areas and breaking up neighborhood associations. He thought this could buy them time if these business people were represented ideologically with their positions. He stated he disagreed with Ms. Nauser from the perspective that they could not
have the same rights and privileges and as a neighborhood association. He noted they also needed to do work on the neighborhood association policy, but felt that would take some time.

Mr. Sturtz understood Bill Cantin indicated the Council adopted a business area recognition policy in 2003 that emulated the neighborhood policy in formalizing communication between the City and business organizations. He thought the only thing that was different was that this business organization could not apply for grants under the umbrella of the City. Mr. Skala agreed that was the distinction made in the pre-Council session.

Mr. Boeckmann pointed out the City could not just provide grant money. In the past, they had contracted with neighborhood associations to do something that was for a public purpose. The resolution establishing neighborhood associations specifically mentioned it. The business organization resolution did not include it. He pointed out the Council could contract with anyone to do anything. They did not need a resolution to authorize that action. Mr. Skala understood that would not be an impediment to this situation. Mr. Boeckmann replied no, but urged the Council review both policies. If they wanted them to be the same, they needed make them the same.

Mr. Wade stated he agreed with Mr. Clark in that the business association regulations served no function and needed to be eliminated. They had no clear purpose that any interest group could not perform. He commented that he did not know what the original intent of the neighborhood association resolution was in 1977. Adequate size would probably never be defined because they varied from small to large. He stated Mr. Clark was correct in that the City had never clearly understood what they wanted neighborhood associations to do. In addition, the City had never provided them the kind of support and structure necessary for development. He believed the only justification for neighborhood associations was to be a basis for having a stronger citizen base for civic engagement. If that was not the outcome, he thought they should eliminate the neighborhood association structure. He commented that they had two very distinct problems. One involved how they would begin re-establishing a strong basis for a citizen-based civic engagement through the neighborhood structure. They needed to determine why they existed, how they connected to City activities and how the City would relate to it. On the immediate level, he felt they had a legitimate claim for a neighborhood association. He disagreed with Mr. Clark in that he did not think it would destroy the neighborhood structure or undercut the strength of the NCCNA. It would diminish in size, but would have the ability to build itself with a stronger capability. If the other group was serious about being a strong and vital neighborhood association, they had an opportunity for two strong neighborhood associations. He also hoped they were not starting a process of balkanization of neighborhood associations. He stated he was concerned the Shoe Factory District was not recognizing the legitimacy of the residents and tenants that lived in their area. There was no indication of how many residents there were as opposed to businesses because all of the participation was in terms of property and property owners. He was concerned by the comment made by the gentleman who indicated it was simply an interest of business people. It was an interest of everyone with property and residential interests in the area. He commented that they had a conundrum with no good outcome, but did not believe
the bad outcomes of either option would occur. He thought he would end up supporting the
creation of the Shoe Factory District Neighborhood Association and noted they needed to
move this forward.

Mr. Skala asked if he was suggesting they redraw the boundaries. Mr. Wade replied
yes. Mr. Janku asked if the boundaries should be based on this map or another drawing. Mr.
Wade replied they only had this map and he believed they needed to address the issue on
the agenda in spite of all they had to do in a broader sense to make neighborhood
associations work. Mr. Sturtz pointed out these boundaries basically mirrored what was in
the overlay district subarea plan for the Shoe Factory subarea.

Ms. Hoppe commented that this was a very difficult decision. On one hand, the
NCCNA had been very active and had done a lot of positive things. It also had a lot of
challenges before it. On the other hand, there was a huge segment that refused to
participate. She felt not allowing a change would further this nonparticipation and opposition.
She thought they had the opportunity to create two organizations that would hopefully be
strong and effective and be two voices working together on many things. She did not believe
keeping it the same was an option. She liked the business district option. As a Council, she
felt they needed to create provisions within their policy for changing boundaries and
membership. She thought that should also be included in association bylaws.

Mr. Janku thought they were all in agreement they wanted a strong organization. The
issue was the structure. Even if they had a business organization, they wanted it to have the
same authority as a neighborhood association. Mr. Skala agreed. He explained he did not
want to redefine boundaries for neighborhood associations until they had thought about some
of the improvements they wanted to make to the neighborhood associations. He would be
happy with having a business organization, which had all of the rights and privileges so they
had an equal voice. Mr. Janku understood the third option presented by the applicant was to
approve this contingent upon developing a way to redraw the boundaries. Mr. Skala stated
he was amendable to that option.

Mayor Hindman understood if they decided to approve the group as a business
association, they would remain in the NCCNA as part of that neighborhood association. Mr.
Skala stated yes. Mayor Hindman understood that would create overlapping boundaries. Mr.
Skala agreed. Mayor Hindman commented that if the business organization had the same
powers and authority as the neighborhood association, they would essentially have
overlapping neighborhood associations.

Mayor Hindman commented that the NCCNA had done a tremendous job with a
difficult situation and he wanted to support them. He also understood they were at a point
where they had a distinct area that was absolutely not willing to participate for legitimate
reasons in their minds. He stated he was inclined to agree with the proposal that they split
the neighborhood association and call the new association the Shoe Factory District
Neighborhood Association. He was not comfortable with the idea of overlapping authority.
Ms. Hoppe noted other neighborhood associations had expressed concerns about
overlapping boundaries and the precedent for their neighborhoods.

Mr. Skala agreed this would provide for overlapping, but noted it was qualitatively
different in his mind because this was not an overlapping of ideology. It was just an
overlapping of geography. At some point in the future, they would have to correct the issue of overlapping boundaries. He felt this could be ameliorated to the extent that people would be represented adequately within this group and within the neighborhood association, at least in the short run.

Mr. Sturtz commented that the problem was that they were setting a precedent either way. They would either have overlapping boundaries or remove a section from an already existing neighborhood. Other than when the NCCNA took over some of what used to be Douglass, there had not been a case like this. In addition, the point had been made that Douglass was on a hiatus and had a different status than it currently had. He thought they wanted to recognize there was fluidity and that things changed over time. They needed some sort of policy for recognizing those changes. He suggested they recognize it as a business association and not take away from the already existing neighborhood until they could sort out the bigger issues. He thought they should ask the applicant if they were amenable to that. Mr. Atkins stated the name did not matter to them, but they did want to be a distinct district with the same rights and privileges. They had gone down this path thinking they could be a neighborhood organization. He felt their effectiveness would be reduced from the start if they were not a neighborhood organization because he would have to go back to the members trying to resell what they were. Neighborhood organizations had the recognized power at this time.

Mr. Sturtz commented that during the pre-Council session Bill Cantin had explained business areas were recognized in 2003. As far as he could tell, they had the same powers as a neighborhood organization. He understood it had not been invoked, but the powers were there. Mr. Atkins asked if the Council could then take them out of the boundary and call them a business organization because that would not be much of a change from what they thought they would be.

Ms. La Mar noted anyone in this area that was a resident or homeowner would be in a position where they could be a member of the NCCNA, if they chose. They could just indicate they had an interest. She did not think they would be denied admission to the NCCNA. The people she was representing wanted to be their own entity and that did not happen if they had overlapping boundaries.

Mayor Hindman asked if residents and tenants would be members of the new organization. Ms. La Mar replied she thought they would if the group was recognized as a neighborhood association. She thought the business association policy was only open to businesses, so they would not be able to be a part of that organization. By definition, a neighborhood association was open to all property owners, homeowners, residents, tenants, etc. It was open to everyone who was there. Mr. Atkins commented that to his knowledge they had not received any opposition from any of the residential parcels within their area.

Mr. Skala asked if only business people could be members of the business organization. Mr. Boeckmann replied the concept when the resolution was adopted was that it would be businesses, but he did not have the language in front of him and could not recall if that was the case. Ms. La Mar explained she was basing that statement on the handout given to the Council in the pre-Council session as it indicated it was open to businesses. Mr. Sturtz pointed out it stated it was intended primarily for businesses, so he did not think it
excluded other people. Mr. Boeckmann noted there would be an overlap and pointed out the bylaws allowed everyone in the area to be included. Ms. La Mar agreed that was the way the bylaws were written.

Mr. Skala understood this organization wanted distinct boundaries and wanted to withdraw from the NCCNA and noted he had a problem with that. Mr. Atkins stated they would have a hard time getting off the ground if they did not do that. He commented that the overlay was referenced and pointed out they were not the people against the overlay, but a lot of the people within this were. He believed that was a separate issue. Part of the problem with the overlay was that there had not been meaningful discourse and negotiation. If they were recognized, they would have something from this point forward.

Mr. Janku asked if they would have a problem if they were recognized as a neighborhood association for the designated area identified, but had an overlap with the NCCNA. Mr. Atkins replied they would have somewhat less of a problem, but felt it would be better if each group could represent within their own group. He thought that would be a way to start negotiating. Ms. La Mar pointed out that when they started this process, they did not believe they could get out of the NCCNA. The belief was they would be a neighborhood organization with overlapping boundaries. She stated the group understood from the beginning they might be recognized as a neighborhood association with overlapping boundaries, but they did not know a business organization policy existed. The website had information about a neighborhood organization, but not a business organization. She reiterated they had applied to be a neighborhood association and followed all of the rules to become a neighborhood association. They also created bylaws for everyone in the area to become a member in order to become a neighborhood association. They knew there might be overlapping boundaries as a neighborhood association, but did not know they would be put into a situation where they would be on a completely different footing with overlapping boundaries.

Ms. Nauser commented that the sheet that was provided to them at pre-Council indicated that a neighborhood organization could be formed when sufficient interest had been expressed by a substantial number of property owners and tenants in neighborhood. The business organization information indicated the opposite as it stated it could be formed when sufficient interest had been expressed by a substantial number of business owners in an area. There was no reference to tenants. She understood they wanted to splinter from the NCCNA and felt they should decide on whether they could separate themselves by a geographical boundary to be a neighborhood association, so everyone in that area could participate in that organization. She noted people in that area could still participate in the NCCNA, but this group had their own distinct ideas on which they wanted to move forward because the dynamics of this area had changed and they felt they were not being represented. She thought they would have to accept what the Council decided and noted they would have the opportunity to come back with a change in the future, if needed.

Mr. Janku understood that if they adopted the resolution authorizing the neighborhood association, they would have overlapping neighborhood associations because it stated “recognizing it as an official neighborhood organization.” If they were willing to accept that, it would somewhat meet their goal. The way he read the resolution, it did not remove them
from the NCCNA. Mr. Wade stated the way he read it, it did. He understood it stated “recognizing it as the official neighborhood organization.” Mr. Boeckmann explained they had R164-08A in front them. It was not one of the examples attached.

Mr. Boeckmann noted the Council had approved the NCCNA and had given them boundaries. There was no provision to take away from them, so he felt they would have to allow the overlapping or not do it.

Mr. Skala stated he did not want to change boundaries at this point.

Mr. Wade commented that he did not think they should create a business organization as it was an inappropriate category. He thought they needed to keep the neighborhood association structure within the geographic framework.

Mr. Wade made a motion to amend R164-08A by changing the name of the organization to the Shoe Factory District Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Wade understood it only defined the area of this neighborhood association. Mayor Hindman understood they had two neighborhood associations within this boundary. Mr. Wade stated that was correct because he understood Mr. Boeckmann indicated that was as far as they could go right now.

Mr. Skala stated he thought the business association label was useful due to this situation. Ms. Nauser pointed out they would then have less powers. Mr. Skala noted those could be restored.

Mr. Sturtz stated he hoped they could look at the neighborhood association policy at the first meeting in December. Mr. Wade thought there were far too many ramifications to have it ready by then.

Mayor Hindman understood they could not remove this association from the NCCNA tonight. Mr. Boeckmann stated he did not think they could. As a result, Mayor Hindman understood they would create overlapping boundaries, which would stand until they reviewed and worked out the policies. They could then do what was in accordance with the policies.

The motion made by Mr. Wade was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend the motion on the table by changing the name to the Shoe Factory District Business Organization with the same rights and privileges of a neighborhood association. The motion died due to a lack of a second.

The motion to amend R164-08A by changing the name of the organization to the Shoe Factory District Neighborhood Association made by Mr. Wade and seconded by Ms. Nauser was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R164-08A, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B289-08 Establishing Columbia, Missouri Sanitary Sewer District No. 159 along State Route K.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a sanitary sewer district in an area that did not have sewers, so the policy was to tax bill up to $5,000. The sewer district boundaries encompassed four parcels on south Route K. The expected cost of the project was $65,000
of which approximately $43,000 would be in deferred tax bills as provided for in Chapter 22 of the City ordinances.

B289-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE.
Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B291-08  **Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking along portions of Chapel Hill Road.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained staff was proposing four “no parking” areas that would prohibit parking 24 hours a day along portions of Chapel Hill. The first piece would be along both sides, from the west City limits to Cherry Hill Drive. The second piece would be along both sides from a point 360 feet west of Grant Lane to a point 360 feet east of Grant Lane. The third section would be both sides, from Madison Park Court to Mills Drive. The fourth section would be both sides, from Chapel Plaza Court to Colony Drive, in the Forum area. This would essentially prohibit parking from the City limits along Chapel Hill to its end, east of Forum.

Mr. Glascock noted most of these involved intersections with left turns. The only one that did not was the new section of Chapel Hill from the City limits to Scott Boulevard.

Mr. Skala asked if this was a retrofit because Chapel Hill was a little narrower than it should have been or if it was due to left turn lanes. Mr. Glascock replied roads were generally built without left turn lanes. Those were created after the left turn lanes were warranted. Chapel Hill was about 38 feet wide and three 12 foot lanes equaled 36 feet, so there was little room to park. They wanted to ensure safety around the intersections and some of this was in residential areas where houses were near the intersection.

Mr. Janku understood these were left turn pockets. He did not think there was a center turn lane down the entire road. Mr. Glascock stated it was not a two-way left turn. They were pockets at intersections.

Tammy Jones, 1900 Grant Lane, stated she was there on behalf of her family and a newly formed group temporarily named “Citizens for Sanity on Chapel Hill Road.” They saw this as a small part of a larger issue. The proposal to remove parking was a direct result of the striping of the left hand turn lanes. Residents in the area of Chapel Hill, Cunningham and Grant had observed the left hand turn lanes were causing more harm than good. She noted they increased speeding and explained that as a vehicle moved into the left turn lane, the vehicle behind it accelerated through the intersection. This happened in front of houses where small children lived and people were walking. It also made it impossible to cross at times and contributed significantly to the traffic noise. She stated she was an avid gardener and there were times when she could not hold a conversation with a neighbor. She recently observed three kids around the ages of 12-14 attempting to cross from Grant across Chapel Hill to Cunningham Road. A car had moved over into the left hand lane and motioned them across. Someone then came around the corner at about 60 mph and nearly hit the kids before they could get across that wide stretch of road. Parking was another issue. She noticed her neighbor had visitors, to include a lot of elderly people and a person in a
wheelchair, who had parked along Chapel Hill Road. Apparently a couple of the cars were
too close to the intersection and someone contacted the police. The police officer asked the
guests to move their cars. They were particularly concerned with the vehicles near the
intersection, but indicated they would feel better if all of the vehicles were moved. She stated
they did not want to lose their parking and reiterated this was a residential neighborhood.
She commented that the physical characteristics of the roadway dictated the speed. These
were not just pockets as the striping went past four houses. It was almost an entire block.
By taking out parking, they would be sending a message to motorists that this was not a
residential neighborhood, which she felt would be detrimental. She noted there were others
that were going to speak, but had to leave due to the time.

Mayor Hindman asked if there were crosswalks at those intersections. Ms. Jones
replied no and stated she could not see how they would be beneficial since speeding was a
problem.

Mr. Janku asked Ms. Jones to point her house out on the map on the overhead. Ms.
Jones replied it was on the corner of Grant Lane and Chapel Hill Road. Ms. Hoppe asked
which corner. Ms. Jones replied the southeast corner.

Mayor Hindman asked if she could park on Grant Lane. Ms. Jones replied she could,
but her house did not front Grant Lane. Anyone coming to visit would have to go around the
corner. There was another driveway there as well, so a visitor would have to go further down
the lane. She pointed out she was not the only one opposed to losing parking.

Ms. Hoppe understood there was not a light at Grant and Chapel Hill. Ms. Jones
stated that was correct. She noted this had been an issue for a long time. The first person
she had talked to about this was Rex Campbell. In addition, in 2001, a traffic calming study
was ordered by the Council, but she did not believe anything was done with it. She recalled
discussion regarding a round-a-bout at Grant and Cunningham/ Chapel Hill. She thought that
might be beneficial because it would stop people from using the straight-a-way as a
speedway.

Ms. Nauser asked if the bike lanes that had been striped on Chapel Hill had reduced
speeding. Ms. Jones replied she did not think there was a noticeable difference. She
thought it was because the street was so wide. Taking a small amount off for a bike lane did
not make a difference. She understood Ted Curtis with GetAbout Columbia indicated that
when they re-striped the lanes, they planned to make them wider. She thought that would be
about five years from now.

Mr. Skala asked if there was anywhere in town they used raised crosswalks for traffic
calming. Mr. Glascock replied they did on Rollins. Mayor Hindman understood they worked.

Ms. Hoppe understood the speeding was related to the left turn lanes. Ms. Jones
stated that was correct. Ms. Hoppe wondered if those could be taken out. Ms. Jones stated
they felt the left turn lane was more of a problem than a benefit at that intersection because
there was not a stop sign or any traffic calming device. In addition, it created an additional
obstacle for a pedestrian and caused everyone to accelerate through there because they did
not have to slow down for a turning car.
Mayor Hindman understood the purpose of the left hand turn lane was so people could keep going and for the road to handle more traffic, but the residents were complaining about speeding.

Mr. Wade suggested they defeat this bill and noted he would be making a motion during the comments section of the agenda for a comprehensive plan for speed management and safety for all of Chapel Hill. This was only a piece. He commented that he received more complaints about the speed and safety on Chapel Hill than all other roads combined. The problem was that Chapel Hill developed from Scott Boulevard to Forum Boulevard and housing also developed along it. He understood Chapel Hill was an arterial road, but there was no access management between Forum and Scott. He thought the four way stop at Limerick needed to be a two way stop with a speed table. The intersection of Fairview and Chapel Hill was awful as it was another four way stop. They then had a straight speedway from there to the City limits. He thought this would get worse and did not want to solve issues by bits and pieces. He asked the Council to defeat this proposal.

Mayor Hindman thought this was an example of overdesigning the streets for speed. He felt they needed to recognize it did not do much good in the long term because they had to figure out ways to slow traffic down after the fact, which was expensive.

Ms. Nauser commented that this had been an on-going issue since she had been elected. They were concerned the potential loss of parking along Chapel Hill. She had people calling her when the bike lanes were put in asking if they would lose their parking. She understood this had been a contentious issue for a long time. She agreed with Mr. Wade in that a comprehensive look at the road was needed to solve problems, especially while Scott Boulevard was being constructed.

Mr. Watkins asked if the study should eliminate the bike lanes on Chapel Hill. Mr. Wade replied he did not know. Mr. Watkins asked if that was an option. Mr. Wade replied yes. Mayor Hindman stated he did not think it was an option. Mr. Wade stated from his perspective everything needed to be looked at in terms of its impact. Mayor Hindman commented that bike lanes should slow traffic down because they made it a narrower street. Mr. Wade stated he did not want to take anything off of the table for consideration to address the issue in a comprehensive way. In addition, there were different issues when moving from Forum to the City limits. Mayor Hindman noted the intersections usually caused the problems. Mr. Wade stated the Cunningham and Grant intersection was the worst.

Mr. Glascock asked if access management was on the table as well. He wondered if they could cut off the driveways from going left. Mr. Wade replied he did not want anything to not be considered. After receiving the plan, he would meet with the neighbors. At this time, he believed the question of safety and speed on Chapel Hill was so serious that they might look at a lot of options that would not work or sell politically but felt they needed to be thought about and discussed.

Ms. Nauser agreed it was only fair for every option to be on the table for the people to provide comments and for Council to make a decision. She suggested they also look at planters similar to the ones on the new section of Chapel Hill.
B291-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. Bill declared defeated.

**B292-08 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to transportation fares for low income individuals.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was an outgrowth of discussions during the budget process. Staff was recommending a modification of their fare ordinance to expand the eligibility for those individuals who would pay half fares. The expansion proposed in this ordinance would include individuals who qualify for Medicaid and individuals meeting certain low income criteria.

Mr. Glascock stated they would continue to work with the Health Department and would monitor this for any other needs with regard to the half fares.

Mr. Janku asked if this was on all fares or just on the passes. Mr. Glascock replied all fares.

Ms. Hoppe understood an individual who could validate they were a person with an annual income equal to or below 185 percent Federal poverty level would be eligible and asked how they would be identified. Mr. Glascock replied the Health Department could identify those people. Ms. Hoppe asked if they would receive a card. Mr. Glascock replied he believed they would receive a card.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline Street, stated he had previously addressed the Council from the aspect of the poor and needy. Now, everyone’s accounts had dropped since there was a global meltdown. He wondered if it was time for Columbia to wake up and acknowledge he was right when he asked the Council to not raise the price of fares. He thought it was unfair to go forward when the poor knew what they were talking about.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was pleased to see they had expanded the half fares to low income people as it would help a lot of struggling people.

B292-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B295-08 Authorizing construction of Mexico Gravel Road from the Vandiver Drive Connection to the intersection with Ballenger Lane/Route PP.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a bid call ordinance for the improvements to about 3,700 feet of Mexico Gravel Road. This was one of the projects proposed to be funded primarily by the 2005 ballot issue. He noted they were also looking at the round-a-bout at Route PP that would improve a bad intersection. The expected construction cost of this project was about $2.4 million. As soon as they were well into the Hinkson Creek Bridge and the piece to the south already approved, they would move forward with this section.

Mr. Skala stated he was happy for any relief connected with Ballinger and Route PP. He understood they would address the rest of the street in the future.
B295-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B296-08**  
Authorizing acquisition of easements relating to the construction of Mexico Gravel Road from the Vandiver Drive Connection to the intersection with Ballenger Lane/Route PP.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a companion bill to the one just passed. It would authorize easement acquisitions necessary to build the road.

B296-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B299-08**  
Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish the Columbia Vision Commission.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would establish a committee to review progress with regard to the Vision Plan.

Mr. Janku anticipated this going into the future without a potential end and understood there would be a summation in five years. Mr. Watkins stated the goal was to constantly review the Vision Plan. In five years, they might not go through quite the same exercise, but a similar exercise to ensure they added components to the Vision Plan and removed the ones completed. Mr. Wade thought community Vision reports would need to be redone about every three to five years to remain dynamic.

Ms. Hoppe noted (c) on page 2 of the proposed ordinance stated “…every two years thereafter, the commission shall, after seeking input of other city boards, commissions, and departments, recommend implementation tasks to be undertaken…” and asked why the Council was not included.

Ms. Read, the consultant involved in the Visioning process, explained that involved a report that was prepared and sent to the Council for its review. Parts of the Vision Plan would get redone every 2-3 years. The overall Vision statements, which were intended to guide for a much longer period stayed in place. During the Visioning process, citizens talked about it being a 10-20 year plan. The strategy and action steps were already being reviewed and would be included in the implementation report the Council would receive in March, 2009 to consider with the budget process. The implementation report would be approved with the budget in October, 2009. It would establish some specific steps the City government would focus on. It would also bracket other things that were going on in the community for the next two year period. The Vision Commission was given the role of tracking and independent oversight in the Vision Plan in terms of a neutral window on the process. After being appointed, they would adopt a report format for tracking data, etc. by March, 2009 and would give the Council their first report in December, 2009. In December, 2010, they would give Council a set of recommendations in a progress report for things that should be considered for the period of time not covered by the implementation report that had previously been
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approved. If the City Manager decided to update the implementation report, the Council would receive it the following March. They would then have the period of March to October to consider what they did going forward. It would be a constant stream of information. Under this process, the Council always made the final decision.

Mr. Janku made a motion to amend B299-08 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B299-08, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. 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.

- **B286-08** Vacating utility easements located within Highlands Circle Subdivision Plat 4.
- **B287-08** Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation planning services.
- **B290-08** Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to remove metered parking spaces along a portion of the west side of South Ninth Street.
- **B297-08** Authorizing a cooperation and funding agreement with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for the Missouri Building Operator Certification Program.
- **B298-08** Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- **B301-08** Accepting a grant from the University Wellness Resource Center for overtime reimbursement of compliance check enforcement operations and neighborhood alcohol enforcement operations and for the purchase of equipment for the Police Department; appropriating funds.
- **B302-08** Accepting a Youth Community Coalition Grant from the Missouri Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse; appropriating funds.
- **B303-08** Appropriating funds from the Columbia Values Diversity Celebration for future programs.

R216-08 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for child care health consultation services.

R217-08 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the WIC Supplemental Food Program.

R218-08 Authorizing an agreement with Southwest Baptist University to provide health clinic experience for nursing students.

R219-08 Authorizing an Adopt a Spot agreement with Boone’s Lick Chapter of Missouri Master Naturalists.

R220-08 Amending a HOME agreement with Boone County Family Resources.

R221-08 Authorizing agreements with various cultural arts organizations.

R222-08 Authorizing agreements with Missouri Basketball Coaches Association, Stephens College – Department of Mass Media, Ragtag Programming for Film & Media Arts and First Night, Inc. for tourism development funds.

R223-08 Authorizing a mutual aid program agreement with the Missouri Public Utility Alliance.

R224-08 Authorizing an agreement for engineering services with Engineering Surveys & Services for geotechnical and construction material testing services.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ (except for R221-08 and R222-08 on which he abstained), JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

R225-08 Restoring the historic name of “Albert-Oakland Park” to the 81.5 acre park located south and west of Oakland Junior High School.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this resolution would officially name the 81.5 acre City park as Albert-Oakland Park. In their review, they had determined the Council had never officially named the park. The Parks and Recreation Commission recommended the entire site be officially named Albert-Oakland Park.

Patrice Albert, 400 E. High Pointe Lane, stated tonight's intent was to restore the historic name to Albert-Oakland Park and its facilities. There were two very different resolutions before the Council, which Mr. Boeckmann had approved. The resolution prepared by Kurt Albert had two objectives. The first objective was to add words of healing for the Albert family because 40 acres of the City-owned 70 acres came from the Albert family. The Albert family children went without during many Christmases and suffered to establish the park for future generations. In the late 1990's, the intentional removal of the Albert name from Albert-Oakland Park cut them deeply. They contacted City officials in 2003 and came before the Council in 2004 to politely ask that the Albert name be restored to the park and its facilities. Four years later the Council received an incomplete and misleading
Report F prepared by City staff. It failed to mention the three decade use of the Albert-Oakland Park name and hundreds of official City documents. The Albert family had been harmed and these wounds were no long felt by Paul Albert because he was dead. The rest of the family continued to endure the pain, injustice and lingering snide remarks about Paul A. Albert. She asked them to stop trampling on the generosity of Kurt’s mother, the Albert family name and their honor. She asked them to recognize the good that was done for Columbia. Kurt’s second objective was to provide more specific and acting clauses. They wanted to restore the Albert-Oakland Park name to park facilities. This was not addressed by the City and there was no indication of the intent to restore facility names. They also wanted to restore the full name to maps, flyers, website, signs and all forms of communication. In addition, they wanted the 20 acre Simpson tract to be known as the Marjorie Albert Simpson Tract. She commented that to address the City’s resolution would take more time than available, but noted the statement reading “whereas the park, as a whole, was initially referred to as Albert-Oakland Park but, in recent years, has been sometimes referred to as simply Oakland Park” was not factual, nor acceptable to the Albert family or anyone else who valued truth in government. In recent years, the Albert name was erased entirely from the annals of park history. It was not an accident and could not, by any means, be justified. She urged the Council to approve a naming resolution that would not only restore the Albert name to the park and its facilities, but one that would also help heal the wounds inflicted upon the family.

Peter Beiger, 1411 Pratt Street, provided a handout and stated he was in support of Kurt Albert’s mission to reinstate the designation of Oakland Park to its original Albert-Oakland Park designation. If the circumstances regarding the Albert name being removed from the Oakland Park designation were anything but an oversight, it did not speak well of City offices. He requested the Council correct this slight to the Albert family name as soon as possible. If removal of the Albert name in any way reflected retribution due to Paul Albert’s role as a citizen activist during his tenure before the Council, he felt the circumstances were inexcusable and reprehensible. Paul Albert spoke his mind to the most powerful because he felt this to be his duty as a citizen and many Columbians admired Paul’s audacity and fearlessness. If Paul Albert was a gruff public watchdog, he was the people’s gruff public watchdog. Paul concerned himself with parkland before it was Columbia’s signature. He consistently championed environmental consciousness long before being “green” was meaningful and popular. He did not think Paul was wrong in his efforts to place serious discussion and light upon City issues for public scrutiny as there was sometimes no polite way to inform powerful public figures they might be wrong. He did not feel the Albert name deserved to disappear for doing so. If the Council embraced diversity, he asked them to honor his contributions by reinstating the Albert name to this parcel of parkland. Paul and the Albert family’s concerns were on behalf of citizens of Columbia, the environment and honest forthright city governance. Certainly, Paul Albert was a radical who dared to speak to power, but it did not justify such an insult as for his name to disappear.

Cedar Albert, 1009 Rangeline Street, stated she was the oldest of the seven Albert kids and wanted to point out this parcel was given by her mother, who was raising seven kids on her own, instead of selling it, as she signed half of it away. She could have sold it to...
become a stay at home mom or to buy the kids shirts. She noted she bought the boys shirts in St. Louis after she graduated and mailed them to Columbia. She stated they were not wealthy. They were dirt poor. It was okay because there was a park, which the City used properly to put in a school and pool. It was something to be proud of as a member of the family even though Paul Albert was hard to take. She noted she lived with him for 16-17 years and she was the worker as he did not like to work. She wanted this for her mother, who had every right to not give the property to the City.

George Parker explained he came to Columbia in 1958 and had been in politics since 1961. When he was in the State legislature, Paul Albert would call him every Friday when he returned from Jefferson City wanting to talk for an hour. Paul had named Parker Street after him and he had been so embarrassed that he did not go to the dedication. If he had been asked about Paul in those days, he might have been a little negative. What he had come to learn was that this was one of the only towns he had ever been in where a citizen acted like an owner of this Country and personally did something about it. He found, as he grew older, there was no such thing as a free government without politicians or people. If they wanted to make it free and right, they had to participate. In looking at the voting record, one could see there were millions of people who did not vote in this Country but wanted freedom. Many citizens, who were enjoying the fruits of freedom, were not doing much to keep the freedom. He thought the volunteer Council should be paid and appreciated. He felt they owed Paul Albert something even though he was ill-mannered and made a lot of mistakes because the community needed more people who had the guts to ask questions the rest were afraid to ask.

Mike Martin, 205 S. Glenwood, stated that regardless of how Paul Albert was when he was alive, it was more of what he left after he died that they should be thankful for. He had lived in a lot of cities around the Country that did not have a Paul Albert, John Clark or Henry Lane who spoke the truth to power and felt it was a real gift. He thought it was an unusual irony that he would give that land to the City and be so critical of it at the same time. He had loved that place and that was the real gift he left. He left the gift of love for the community because he was able to step back and not care what people thought. He said what needed to be heard. He hoped the Council would vote to restore all of the park to Albert-Oakland Park.

Diane Oerly, 1712 Skylane, stated there was one house between her and Albert-Oakland Park, and as the President of the neighborhood association, she noted they supported recognizing the name of Albert for the park.

Annette Greenlee, 2738 Northland Drive, stated she was the President of the Northland-Parker Neighborhood Association and that Paul Albert had lived down the road from them for many years. She commented that she dealt with history on a professional basis and one of the most significant things about this park was that it probably would not have come into being without that initial 20 acre donation because the City would not have had any motivation to grow the park. Due to the donation, they had a large park that served as a model for future parks in the community. People who studied how the park system developed could go back to Albert-Oakland Park. She felt it was historically significant that the name be Albert-Oakland Park due to its importance in the development of the community.
She thought it was something other cities came to look at when they studied the development of the park system.

Kurt Albert, 400 E. High Pointe Lane, provided a handout and commented that history was watching, waiting, knew, and would not forget. This temporary phase called life moved forever forward into history. There was no stopping, reversing, rewinding or second chances. He stated history would be the judge.

Ms. Hoppe stated she felt Stephens Lake Park and the parks tax was a gift the people of Columbia gave themselves. It was a great thing now and for future generations. She also felt the donation of land by Mr. Albert was a great gift at the beginning of the park system to the people of Columbia. She thought they should continue to acknowledge that by adopting the second proposed resolution, so the website and various flyers included the Albert-Oakland Park name.

Mayor Hindman pointed out this was not to honor Paul Albert. He explained the contribution was made in the name of Mr. Albert’s mother, C. M. Albert, and the original agreement when Mr. Albert and his wife donated the 20 acres was that it would be named for her. Although there had not been an official naming of this park other than accepting the name for the 20 acres originally given, it had become customary to think of it as Albert-Oakland Park, and he thought they should perpetuate that name. He commented that they had heard some strong feelings about Mr. Albert and his contributions. There were others that had negative strong feelings with regard to some of the tactics used by Mr. Albert. No one came forth with those and he felt that was appropriate. He thought they should appreciate the 20 acre contribution because it led to the City purchasing another parcel of land from the Albert family and another family and working something out with the school to end up with the park they had. He suggested they recognize what they had basically done all of these years by calling it Albert-Oakland Park. He wanted to take the resolution proposed by the Albert family and modify it somewhat. He suggested the first whereas be removed, so it started with “whereas the Albert family donated the original 20 acres on April 8, 1964.” He commented that he assumed these statements were factually correct. He stated he would continue by including “whereas this donation was 29.4 percent of all of Columbia’s park land at that time; and whereas it was the largest donation of park land in the 138 year history of Columbia at that time; and whereas it was 45 percent of all donated park land at that time; and whereas the city purchased 20 more acres from the Albert family in 1972 which brought the property acquired from the Albert family to 57 percent of Albert-Oakland Park.” He stated he would remove the rest of the whereas statements until they got to “whereas the name Albert-Oakland Park has been known and used by mayors, councils, city managers, parks department staff, park planners, state and federal funding agencies, contractors and citizens.” He would then state “now, therefore, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri…the Albert-Oakland name shall be the official name of the park.” He did not think the language in Section 2 was necessary. He suggested they renumber the sections, so Section 3, which read “all signs, except the C. M. Albert Memorial Park sign, shall use the Albert-Oakland Park name,” was Section 2 and so on. He thought the language in Section 4, should read “C. M. Albert Memorial Park honors Clara M. Albert and must be known as a distinct subset of Albert-Oakland Park.” He explained that he felt by doing this
they would have accomplished their purpose and would avoid making a resolution that
took controversial positions.

Mayor Hindman made the motion to amend R225-08 so it would read as described
above.

Mr. Skala stated he came to the City and started watching the cable channel in 1980
and thought he became addictive to it because of Paul Albert. He commented that this issue
was about the Albert family and this oversight for whatever reason. He explained he had
lived near the park for several years and had always called it Albert-Oakland Park. He
thought it was a fairness issue to restore the historical name. He stated he received e-mails
from some who had an introductory paragraph that could be another whereas, but felt the
Mayor covered it in referring to the Albert family and their contributions. He proposed they at
least restore the Albert-Oakland name to the pool. He thought that too had a historical
precedent in terms of it always being called Albert-Oakland Pool. He did not think that was a
part of the document described by Mayor Hindman. He reiterated he thought this was a
fairness issue and that they should recognize the contribution of the family and move on.

Mr. Janku stated he had lived near Albert-Oakland Park for almost 20 years and that
Paul Albert was one of his constituents. He agreed this was about more than Paul Albert and
his role in the community. It was a family matter as it was a donation by the family, so the
Albert name was broader than Paul Albert. He thought it was appropriate to have the Albert
name on the park.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Mayor Hindman pointed out he had read from the Albert family’s proposed resolution
and had basically made subtractions and minor edits to it.

Mr. Skala asked if the renaming of the pool in addition to the park required an
amendment to the motion. Mr. Boeckmann thought Mayor Hindman had left in the facilities.
Mayor Hindman thought he had as well, but wondered if that might be going too far because
they might want to name some shelters differently. He stated he did not want to preclude
them from that possibility. Mr. Skala suggested it be that facility in particular. Mr. Janku
agreed. If they received other donations, they might want to name other facilities differently.

Mayor Hindman suggested Section 1 read “The Albert-Oakland name shall be the
official name of the park and be restored to the Albert-Oakland Park and its aquatic facilities.”
He asked if that could be treated as part of his motion, which had already been seconded.
The Council was agreeable.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman and seconded by Mr. Janku to amend R225-08
was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R225-08, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE,
HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

The following bills were introduced by the Mayor unless otherwise indicated, and all
were given first reading.
B304-08  Rezoning property located on the west side of Ridgeway Avenue, approximately 500 feet south of Worley Street (315 Ridgeway Avenue) from District R-2 to District PUD-8.3; allowing a reduced perimeter setback; allowing a reduction in the minimum lot width.

B305-08  Rezoning property located on the southeast corner of East Texas Avenue and North Garth Avenue (1610 North Garth Avenue) from District R-1 to District C-P.

B306-08  Approving the Final Plat of Tuscany Ridge, Plat No. 1 located on the west side of Brown Station Road, west of Mojave Court; authorizing a performance contract.

B307-08  Vacating excess street right-of-way along the east side of Range Line Street, north of American Parkway; accepting an easement for sidewalk, drainage and utility purposes.

B308-08  Authorizing construction of Hunt Avenue from Worley Street to I-70 Drive Southwest; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B309-08  Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to installation of automated traffic signal enforcement equipment.

B310-08  Accepting conveyances for road relinquishment, sewer, drainage and sidewalk purposes.

B311-08  Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.

B312-08  Authorizing the acquisition of land located west of Strawn Road (Route ZZ), south of I-70, for the future construction of the Perche Creek Trail.

B313-08  Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation for a Tree Resource Improvement and Maintenance (TRIM) grant for urban forestry managerial training for Parks and Recreation employees; appropriating funds.

B314-08  Appropriating donated funds for the Cosmo-Bethel Park Four Tennis Court project.

B315-08  Accepting the FY 2007 Missouri State Homeland Security Grant Program; authorizing a grant agreement; appropriating funds.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

(A)  Intra-departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Hindman noted this report was provided for informational purposes.

Mr. Janku asked if he could be provided information regarding the GetAbout Columbia striping plans for Garth and Texas. He wanted to know what they were proposing to do. Mr. Watkins replied he would provide him that information.

(B)  Request to Close Downtown Sidewalk.

Mr. Wade made the motion to approve the sidewalk closure as requested. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(C)  Internet Citizens Advisory Group Annual Report.

Mayor Hindman noted this report was provided for informational purposes.
(D) **Quaker Company Solar Rebate.**

Mr. Watkins explained this was provided for informational purposes as the ordinance indicated they needed to provide a report to Council with regard to what they did with rebates.

(E) **Green Space Easements.**

Mr. Watkins explained this was requested by the Council.

Mr. Janku asked if the City, as the easement owner, could limit or restrict the time an easement could be used. Mr. Boeckmann replied yes. Mr. Janku understood that could follow any acceptance of the easement.

(F) **Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission Report: Potential Removal of the Cunningham Road Extension from the City Manager’s Major Roadway Plan.**

Mr. Watkins explained that as they went through the process of changing Cunningham and potentially removing it from the Major Thoroughfare Plan, the request was sent to the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission. This was a report back from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission to the Council. He thought the report needed to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission as well.

(G) **Birch Road Commercial Vehicle Prohibition.**

Mr. Watkins explained this was a request by Council having to do with the prohibition of commercial vehicles along Birch Road, which was within the Grasslands. It connected Bingham and Burnam. Staff could live with it now, but it might need to be revisited due to the Burnam/Rollins/Providence project.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to prepare an ordinance in respect to this. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(H) **Cinder Report.**

Mr. Watkins explained this included the official breakdown of what was in the cinders.

(I) **Barnwood Drive Parking.**

Mr. Watkins stated Council asked staff to look at prohibiting parking on one side of Barnwood Drive.

Mr. Glascock explained Barnwood Drive was a steep roadway with an S-curve. One of the reasons it was not being recommended was because the speeds would increase if they removed parking.

Mr. Janku stated he appreciated receipt of this report. He noted this was requested by a constituent and it might have been the person residing at 1500 Barnwood Drive. Mr. Glascock thought it was. Mr. Janku stated he would not ask for action tonight. He would think about this further. He commented that when this street was built, there was some minor traffic calming installed to try to slow speeds.

(J) **Additional Emergency Phone – Stephens Lake Park.**
Mr. Watkins explained Council asked them to look at installing a third emergency phone on the south side of the lake. Staff was recommending additional signage in lieu of installing the phone. If Council decided an emergency phone was needed, the cost of installation would be about $1,200 and there would be a monthly service charge of $20.

Mr. Hood stated this was a judgment call and not an easy one. They looked at it in several different ways and tried to explain their reasoning in the report. If the Council felt the third phone needed to be put in, they could install it. They were responding primarily to the recommendations of the Child Fatality Review Board.

Ms. Hoppe thought the signs were a great idea. She asked if they had already been put in. Mr. Hood replied at least one had been put in. He knew they had a second one. He also asked staff to look at the possibility of another one or two located at certain strategic areas, particularly at the ends of the boardwalk. He thought one was already posted at the entrance to the swimming area. Ms. Hoppe agreed the island and ends of the boardwalk were good locations. She thought it might have prevented this tragedy if people had called the non-emergency number when they were swimming outside of the swimming area. She wondered if they had considered putting a sign on the beach by the life preserver. Mr. Hood stated they could look at that.

In terms of the third emergency phone, Ms. Hoppe commented that although people used cell phones, they could not be relied upon. She thought the signs were a good first step. She was equivocating on the third emergency phone, although she believed it could be used. She felt the issue was whether to spend that amount of money on it and wanted the thoughts of the other Council members.

Mayor Hindman stated it was like many other things where they could never do enough. They could have one every ten feet for a maximum advantage. He commented that he was inclined to follow the recommendation of the group that investigated child deaths as they were theoretically the experts.

Mr. Skala thought the warning signs were important. With the proliferation of cell phones, there was a little less pressure with regard to contacting the authorities. He felt the signs were crucial and probably more important at this point.

Mayor Hindman asked if they needed a motion with regard to the signs as he thought they were already being put up. Mr. Watkins replied staff would proceed with the signs. If a phone was wanted, Council should provide direction by a motion.

Ms. Hoppe understood staff would look into the one sign at the beach and she was okay with this for the time being as it provided more protection.

(K) Final Citizen Police Oversight Committee.

Mr. Watkins explained this was the final report from the Committee. It was placed on the Council agenda for Council to accept. It would be scheduled as part of a work session later this month.

Ms. Nauser stated she had not been in favor of the citizen review process from its inception. She pointed out that during a three year period, there were 25,681 arrests and only 82 people lodged 130 complaints. That was only three-tenths of one percent of those arrested during the three year time period. She was concerned with moving forward with this
and how it would affect moral at the Police Department and the City’s search for a Police Chief. She noted the consultant indicated the new Professional Standards Unit had not been in existence long enough to know how well it would function. She thought they should allow that process to go forward to see if it would solve the problems within the community. They could look at a different solution if that did not work. She noted they had other things they needed to address during work sessions, but understood that might not be the consensus.

Mr. Skala stated he disagreed and thought it had the potential for increasing moral as well as the interaction between the Police Department and the community, which was where he thought the real problem existed.

Mayor Hindman made a motion to accept the report and to put it on a work session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting no.

(L) Proposed Historic Preservation Demolition Permit Policy.

Mr. Watkins noted that earlier this year the Historic Preservation Commission came back with a series of updates to its ordinance. After consultation, staff recommended four sections be removed. One was the demolition permit policy. They had now had language they felt addressed the concerns.

Mr. Janku suggested this be referred to the Historic Preservation Commission and that they be asked to hold an advertised public hearing on the issue, so they had input before it came to the Council. Mr. Skala thought that was a good idea.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing the Historic Preservation Commission to hold an advertised public hearing on the proposed historic preservation demolition permit policy in its draft ordinance form. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(M) North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association Urban Conservation Overlay District.

Mr. Watkins explained this was the report from the Planning and Zoning Commission. It was being sent to the Council with a 4-4 vote, which was essentially no recommendation. Staff was suggesting it be put on the work session topic list. He understood the neighborhood association concurred.

(N) Zoning, Subdivision and Real Estate Assessments.

Mr. Watkins explained Mr. Teddy contacted Mr. Schauwecker regarding this Council request and he suggested they reserve some time for him to come and talk to them.

Mr. Skala thought that would be useful. Mr. Janku asked if it was something they could fit into a pre-Council meeting. Mr. Watkins thought it could and noted they would work with Mr. Schauwecker to find a date.

(O) Consent Agenda Voting on Zoning Amendments and Development Plans.

Mr. Watkins explained the Council requested they review an ordinance that would follow the suggestion of the Process and Procedures Stakeholders Group. The draft
ordinance would provide for zoning amendments and development plans that received a
decisive majority of support from the Planning and Zoning Commission to be placed on the
consent agenda. There was also a procedure where they could be taken off.

Mr. Janku understood this included a provision that if someone testified in opposition
at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, the item would not be put on the consent
agenda. Mr. Wade noted he would oppose that. He thought they needed to keep it to
objective criteria, which was the vote of the Commission.

Mr. Janku suggested the neighborhood associations be notified so they would be
aware of the fact this item would be discussed by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Hoppe noted the report indicated the Commission would reserve the right to
recommend an item for old business regardless of the vote, but the proposed ordinance did
not include that provision. She thought it should be added to (1)(a) on page 2 of the
proposed ordinance. Mr. Boeckmann stated he would add it to the proposed ordinance. Mr.
Wade commented that he assumed the Planning and Zoning Commission could take these
comments into consideration to alter the ordinance and then hold the public hearing. They
could then include any further changes in their recommendation to the Council.

Mr. Janku asked how this would affect advertising by the City Clerk’s Office. Ms. Amin
replied with the way this was written, there would be no public hearings at the Council level
so she would not have to worry about advertising. It would either go under old business or
consent.

Mr. Wade made a motion to refer this issue to the Planning and Zoning Commission
for their consideration and a public hearing to be held, and for them to provide their
recommendations to the Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved
unanimously by voice vote.

(P) Columbia Vision Commission (CVC) Nomination, Application and Selection
Process.

Mr. Watkins explained the ordinance passed earlier in the evening had a slightly
different process in terms of allowing nominations by individuals rather than applications.
Staff was suggesting, through this report, the process that would comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Wade made a motion to approve the process identified by the report. The motion
was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(Q) Mid-Missouri Rural Transit Pilot Project.

Mr. Watkins explained this report was requested by Council earlier this year. Mr.
Tatlow of the Boone County Community Partnership made a presentation to the Council
seeking to establish a rural transportation service in northern Boone County and in southern
Boone County and Cole County, and had asked the City to contribute about $114,000 on an
annual basis. Staff felt funding was not available at this point. He noted it was a very
significant part of what he needed to make the project work. The number was also a couple
years old. Given gas prices, he thought it might be a little low.
APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mayor Hindman noted there were some people in attendance that would be asking about information regarding tasers. He understood Mr. Berg had made two requests regarding taser information. One was more complex than the other. He looked at those requests and felt he would like the information requested on the more modest/restrictive of the two requests. He was proposing they make the request for that information to be provided to the Council. It would then be available to the public as well. He thought that would also reduce the number of other requests that might come forward.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to provide the Council a report with the taser information requested by Mr. Berg in his more modest/restrictive request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Kurt Albert, 400 E. High Point Lane, stated tonight he had asked for a gift for his mother who had been in and out of the hospital twice this week. He noted he had first come before Council 50 days ago. He commented that there was no precedent for un-naming a park or for staff to ignore the historic will of past Councils by renaming a park and its facilities, violate the law as set in ordinances or resolutions, deceive the present Council as to the historic name of a park or withhold documents requested by the present Council. He wondered how long the Council would have confidence in city managers who had allowed false and misleading reports to be given to the Council on the history of Albert-Oakland Park. He believed the park had been named as Albert-Oakland Park by B47-72 and R24-72 and felt changes to the name were unsupported and illegal.

Robert Sweat, 310 Alexander, asked why they were charged $20 when trying to do the right thing in taking a dog to the Humane Society. He also wondered why they were charged another $100 when trying to take the dog back if the owner was not found. He did not think that was just. He commented that City police officers could stop people for minor infractions, but he could be walking on a street with traffic going 100 mph and the officers did not do anything. He felt kids could be killed and did not feel they were doing their job. He also wondered why a person could not get a business license in Columbia if he had not been out of trouble for ten years. He did not believe that made sense if he was trying to do the right thing in society.

Mary Hussman, 5306 Rice Road, provided a handout and relayed a story about a taser incident in Brooklyn, New York, where a man fell to his death after being shot with a taser and an officer fatally shot himself with a handgun because he was distraught by that death as he had authorized the use of the taser. She felt those events were sad and tragic and noted taser victims lived in Columbia as well. To date, they were mostly hidden away in records and reports that were filed, forgotten and silent. She thought they needed to act to protect the civilian population and police force. She was asking for the taser events, reports and statistics to be provided to them. The sunshine law request they submitted was not
meant to be a “gotcha” request. She wanted the Council’s assurance that this information would be released directly to them through their representative, Ed Berg. They thought the information should be provided to Council as well, but did not believe there should be any barrier or filter to their possession of these documents. They wanted this information to be provided directly to them, without charge and in a timely manner.

Linda Green, 206 Anderson, stated she was representing Mid-Missouri Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) and when she learned the Council would receive the report and share it with the concerned groups, she was encouraged by the fact they would be receiving the records. After further reflection and discussion with others, she realized an unfortunate precedent would be set by the records being released first to the Council and secondarily to their group by allowing them to copy those records. The implication was that the sunshine law did not apply to citizens. They would have to go through the Council to get records. This would put a burden on the Council to have to intercede with each sunshine law request. State law indicated citizens had the right to get this information directly. She was therefore asking the Council to direct the Police Department to provide the records directly to them free of charge.

Mr. Boeckmann explained some of these records were open and others were closed per the sunshine law. He understood the Council was asking for those records that were open. The effect of that was that they would be located by the Police Department and provided to the public at ten cents a page. They would not have to pay for the search time. In addition, it would be available to the public at the same time it was available to Council.

Ms. Green stated she did not believe they should have to pay for the work of having it done because they were a citizens group. She commented that it would cost them eight cents a page to copy them at Office Depot. She thought the issue was that they should have access to the records directly.

Mr. Skala stated that as soon as the Council received the document, it was a public document. He noted he would make his copy available to her so she could copy it anywhere she wanted. Ms. Green stated she did not understand why they could not receive those records directly per the sunshine law. Mayor Hindman pointed out the sunshine law specifically provided for the charging. Ms. Green understood the Council had the power to tell the Police Department to release those records free of charge. Mayor Hindman explained they had to be careful as they could have an endless amount of requests. He thought the information being requested was valuable to the Council, which was why he was requesting it.

Ed Berg, 1215 Fairview, understood the Council was proposing to obtain a copy of the documents requested and that they would be provided a copy immediately at ten cents a page. Since they made the request, he wanted to ensure they received the document. He stated he was also concerned with regard to the precedent because as he read the statute on the sunshine law, it read “documents may be furnished without charge or at a reduced charge when the public government body determines a waiver or reduction of the fee is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to the public’s understanding of the operations or activities of the public governmental body and is not primarily in the commercial
interest of the requestor.” His concern was that others might be faced with the same stumbling blocks they had in making requests for documents. Mayor Hindman stated they could and noted it was a matter of judgment. He explained they were not trying to set precedent and this was the way Council had decided to handle it. Mr. Berg asked if they were making a finding it was of significant interest to the public. Mr. Janku replied they were not making any findings. Mayor Hindman agreed. They were just saying it was of significant interest to the Council.

Patrice Albert, 400 E. High Point Lane, provided a copy of Mr. Albert’s remarks and stated they were sorry they had to go that far, but had expected to receive more healing information in the resolution. At this time, they did not know what the resolution would say in its final form. She asked the Council to read the comments in their own time and to think about it. She thought things that had happened in the past needed to be addressed to ensure those types of actions did not happen in the future. Once that issue was addressed, they could actually heal.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline Street, stated he was a part of the effort of $100 million credit union that came to Columbia on April 1st of this year and was never recognized. He wanted the Council to know how important the issue of tasers was because it could be their spouse, friend or child affected by the matter. When the subject was brought up, they had radio conversations with someone within the Police Department who was just getting educated on subject and was training to train others. He told the interviewer he received an “edumacation” on the subject. Mr. Elkin did not believe this individual had taken the subject of tasers seriously and he did not think much of it as someone who was just listening to a radio conversation. If he was to train officers, he needed to take it seriously. He noted Chief Herring of Hallsville was disabled because he did not handle his taser properly. They had also lost someone in Moberly, Missouri.

Mr. Sturtz stated people had approached him regarding the wall at Shiloh, which he thought had temporarily been put up, but now seemed to be semi-permanent. He asked for a report from staff regarding its status.

Mr. Janku thought it was a historic structure on the National Register, which would limit what could be done.

Mr. Skala understood the wall was the result of a nuisance complaint. Mr. Watkins stated they were fined. Ms. Nauser understood it was due to the noise ordinance. Mr. Skala did not think that was the solution to the problem. Mr. Watkins stated the solution to the problem was redoing the noise ordinance for the downtown and staff was working on it. He thought they would see it at the next meeting or two.

Mr. Sturtz noted they received a letter Barbara Buffaloe, who was representing the Environment and Energy Commission, requesting they direct staff to conduct a self-assessment of the programs related to the twelve action items listed in the Mayor’s Climate Protection Agreement.
Mr. Sturtz made a motion directing staff to conduct a self-assessment of the programs related to the twelve action items listed in the Mayor’s Climate Protection Agreement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku congratulated the organizers of the Roots N’ Blues Festival held this weekend. He thought it was a great success. He wanted to recognize the hard work by them, the volunteers, City staff, etc. He hoped it would be repeated next year.

Mr. Janku stated they had met with the Community Services Advisory Commission and there was discussion as to how priorities were set with regard to funds being distributed. He thought there was a sense of the Council wanting them to provide suggestions to consider adopting as policy.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing the Community Services Advisory Commission to provide recommendations of priorities that should be considered for funding with the monies allocated for those services. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku noted a constituent had asked him about the status of Parker Street on the Major Thoroughfare Plan and CATSO Plan. He thought it had been removed, but wanted confirmation. Mr. Watkins stated he would check.

Mr. Janku understood there had been a change in ownership to the property on the north side of both corners of the intersection of Providence and Business Loop and wanted staff to look into the possibility of an adopt-a-spot at that location to enhance the entryway into the community.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding the possibility of an adopt-a-spot at Providence and Business Loop. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman asked what the change of ownership had to do with the adopt-a-spot. Mr. Janku replied he thought the new owners might have an interest in upgrading it.

Mr. Janku stated one of the issues discussed in the past was communication and the streaming of videos on the internet was one possibility of reaching people that might not get cable. He wondered if they had ever explored the possibility of providing access to the City channel to satellite television providers. Mr. Watkins replied they had. Mr. Janku asked if it was feasible. Mr. Watkins replied it was not feasible due to the cost.

Mr. Skala referred to Clark Lane near Hominy Creek where the accidental death occurred and stated he wanted to get a better handle on the public/private partnerships in terms of City oversight and the problems with that particular project. He asked Mr. Glascock where they were with that project. Mr. Glascock replied the bypass washed out during the rain storm. Staff had talked to the developer and understood they were working six days a week to get the box culvert finished. They thought it would be finished around the end of October. Staff asked them to either open the piece of box culvert that was there or route a
detour through their site to get traffic around that area. They indicated they would do that. Staff was trying to get that set up by Friday.

Mr. Skala thanked the Police Department for allowing him to participate in the taser training as it was useful for him to see how the Department handled the technical aspects of it. He had several suggestions as indicated in the previous meeting and understood some of those suggestions had already been incorporated. He commented that he would submit a few suggestions in written form as a result of the taser training. One involved wanting to see more emphasis on decision making during taser training.

Mr. Wade commented that a great deal of the success of the Roots N’ Blues N’ BBQ Festival was based on the superb contribution and skills of City staff.

Mr. Wade made a motion expressing the Council’s appreciation and thanks to the City staff for all of the work done in connection with the Roots N’ Blues N’ BBQ Festival. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to complete a comprehensive plan for speed management and safety enhancement for the entire length of Chapel Hill. He thought this would be better than taking individual actions one at a time. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to provide a report on the possibility of changing the designation of West Boulevard from an arterial to a collector and restricting truck traffic over a specified tonnage to local traffic only. It would not limit service vehicles making pick-ups or deliveries to individual homes. He explained when West Boulevard was designated an arterial, it was the main route across that part of Columbia. Since then, Stadium had been completed and it was designed to carry heavy truck traffic. Currently, there were a large number of heavy trucks, particularly from Boone Quarry, using it because they could travel with three stop lights versus ten stop lights on Stadium. West Boulevard was not designed for heavy truck traffic as it was a completely residential area. He felt the character of the area and its design made the designation of arterial for West Boulevard inappropriate.

Mayor Hindman asked if he was getting complaints from constituents about it. Mr. Wade replied yes. He explained he had constituents who could provide daily counts and identification of truck traffic. He stated he could provide that to staff if it would help.

The motion made by Mr. Wade was seconded by Mr. Sturtz and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe noted they had authorized a 25 mph pilot study with the goal of allowing neighborhoods to have a 25 mph speed limit for the whole area. When checking to see how that was proceeding and if the neighborhood association had been contacted, she found out only two streets in the Shepard area would be changed to the 25 mph speed limit. She understood the Council’s recommendation was to study the 25 mph as a neighborhood area. She noted she had also proposed there be an educational campaign to go along with the 25 mph speed limit. In discussing this with the President of Shepard Boulevard, Ian Thomas of
PedNet and the consultant doing the study, they agreed the study would be more meaningful if the entire neighborhood was 25 mph versus just two streets, but it would be okay to just measure two streets within the neighborhood.

Ms. Hoppe suggested staff sign the perimeter streets going into the Shepard Neighborhood as 25 mph. The consultant could still designate and study two streets, so it would not change the cost for the consultant. She reiterated she had talked to the consultant who thought that would be a fair and good way to do the study. She wanted the study to be meaningful and valuable with regard to what they were trying to measure and PedNet was willing to do the educational program at no cost for both neighborhoods involved in this pilot project. The consultant indicated they could do a three stage study instead of a two stage study where they measured speed limits before the signs were in place, after the signs were in place and after the educational campaign. They felt it was a valuable and interesting study for them and they would do it at no additional cost to the City.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to sign the perimeter streets going into the Shepard Neighborhood as 25 mph, so the whole neighborhood was designated as 25 mph, allow PedNet to conduct an educational campaign and allow the consultant to do the three stage study versus the two stage study, as it would not affect the cost to the City.

Mr. Skala thought the purpose was to have two pilot sites to provide an indication as to whether or not this was effective without having to sign everything as he was shocked when he learned it would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to change the signs. He did not believe that was the point of this. He thought part of the point was this educational campaign and having residential areas at 25 mph. If there was no additional cost to the City, he did not think this was an unreasonable way to proceed with the study.

Ms. Hoppe reiterated they indicated it was a more interesting and valuable study for them with the three stages.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe was seconded by Mr. Sturtz and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman explained the League of American Bicyclists had a Bicycle Friendly Communities program where communities completed a form, etc. to be rated and understood the Chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission was interested in this.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission to look into the Bicycle Friendly Communities program to determine if it was suitable for them to head the pursuit of submitting an application to receive a rating in the program. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 12:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk