City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, February 5, 2018 7:00 PM	Regular	Council Chamber Columbia City Hall 701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 5, 2018, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS (Ms. Peters left at approximately 12:53 a.m.), and TREECE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

Mr. Trapp asked that counseling be changed to coaching when discussing the reason for his abstention on B376-17 and REP102-17 for the December 18, 2017 meeting minutes.
The minutes of the regular meeting of December 18, 2017 with the change requested by Mr. Trapp were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Pitzer.
The minutes of the regular meeting of January 2, 2018 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Pitzer.

Mr. Pitzer asked that B29-18 and B33-18 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.
Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Pitzer to abstain from voting on B31-18 and B32-18. Mr. Pitzer noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he had a professional conflict of interest with the counterparty to the agreement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.
Mr. Thomas asked that B25-18 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.
The agenda, including the consent agenda with B25-18, B29-18, and B33-18 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI2-18 Presentation by the Columbia Disc Golf Club to the Mayor and City Council.

Joe Douglass, 4855 Roemer Road, explained Columbia had history with disc golf as its first course had been designed by legendary disc golfer Ed Headrick and built in 1980 at Albert-Oakland Park. It had been third oldest course in the State of Missouri at the time, and there had only been a few hundred courses throughout the country. He noted Columbia was also home to the famous Mid-America Open, which was one of the oldest running active disc golf tournaments, and this year marked the 34th consecutive year of the tournament. There had been 25 different world champions and 33 different members of the Disc Golf Hall of Fame that had played in tournaments in Columbia. He pointed out Columbia was known as the birthplace of Hall of Famer “Crazy” John Brooks, and it would likely be the birthplace of many future Hall of Fame disc golfers. In 1994, two

founding members of the Columbia Disc Golf Club had formed a partnership with the Columbia Parks and Recreation Department and had published the Columbia Disc Golf News, which had been distributed across the country and had been known as one of the biggest influences in disc golf during that time. He commented that Columbia was also known for having the first Ice Bowl, which was now a nationwide event that raised money for charity. He noted Columbia had recently been able to add to the history of disc golf as Harmony Bends Disc Golf at Strawn Park was now the top rated disc golf course per Disc Golf Course Review. In 1980, there had only been a couple hundred courses throughout the country, but now there were over 8,000 courses, and it was the top rated course. He explained there had been so much buzz about the course that Disc Golf Course Review had decided to do something different this year. He asked those in attendance and in support of disc golf to stand, and approximately ten people stood. He thanked the many volunteers, the Columbia Parks and Recreation Department, designer John Houck, those that had played and reviewed the course, and the City Council, and presented the City with the Disc Golf Course Review Award for the 2017 Course of the Year. He noted Harmony Bends in Columbia, Missouri would be forever known as the first city to win this prestigious award. Mayor Treece thanked Mr. Douglass for the award.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC1-18 Paul Love - City ordinance on conflict of interest.

Mr. Love stated he was present to notify the Council that he believed there had been a serious ethics violation and a violation of Columbia ordinances by a member of the Council. He explained Mr. Trapp, the Second Ward Council Member, had received a contract from the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) at $100 per hour for some services for a total of about $25,000. In and of itself, that was not a problem if he was the lowest and best bid. The problem arose with the consideration of the recent tax increment financing (TIF) that had been awarded to the Broadway Hotel. The TIF had been turned down by the TIF Commission, and had then been appealed to the Council and overridden. Since it required a supermajority vote, it would have failed had Mr. Trapp abstained, which he felt should have been done. He commented that $2 million of taxpayer money had not only been applied to the Downtown CID for causes related to the CID, but one of the CID Board Members, Mr. Parmely, was the owner of the Broadway Hotel. He stated he found it offensive that Mr. Trapp was being paid $100 per hour by an organization that was influenced by the man that had received a TIF of $2 million. Mr. Love commented that Section 19-40 of the Columbia Code of Ordinances discussed specific instances by which a council member could be removed, and Section 19-41(c) of the Columbia Code of Ordinances indicated a city employee should not engage in any business activity or transaction and should not have a substantial financial or personal interest, direct or indirect, which might reasonably be expected to interfere with the proper discharge of the employee's official duties, or which would impair the employee's independence of judgement or action in the public interest, or impair the employee's independence of judgement or action in the performance of the employee's official duties, and that the standard would apply to an employee's personal and outside activities, including outside employment. He noted council members were compensated at $6,000, with the exception of the mayor, who was compensated at $9,000, and all would receive a W-2 or 1099 form. He felt this constituted them as employees or as being employed by the City of Columbia. He explained Section 19-42 of the Columbia Code of Ordinances stipulated penalties, and Section 19-42(c) indicated the forfeiting of office for violating the prohibitions set forth Section 19-41(a) only. The other violations fell within

Section 1.8 of the Columbia Code of Ordinances, and indicated a misdemeanor was punishable by a fine of up to $500 and three months in jail. He stated he wanted to offer Mr. Trapp the opportunity to immediately resign, and if he chose not to, he asked the Council to act to take appropriate action based upon the actions of Mr. Trapp. He commented that he believed the Council would need to ask the public to support taxes, which would be difficult if the public did not feel the Council was honest. He also asked if there was anyone in the audience that was paid $100 per hour or more, and one person raised his hand. He asked if there was anyone in the audience that felt being paid $100 per hour for a $25,000 contract might not have a potential influence on the way one voted, and one person raised his hand. He believed most people felt a contract of $100 per hour would influence decisions. He disclosed he was a candidate in opposition to Mr. Trapp, and it was impossible for him to file an ethics complaint at this time due to a blackout period. He noted he intended to file an ethics complaint if Mr. Trapp did not resign when he was allowed regardless of the outcome of any action by the City.

Mayor Treece explained the practice was to not comment at this time, but noted they took his concerns seriously. Mr. Love stated he would appreciate the action of the Council at the earliest opportunity, and to be informed of any decision.

SPC2-18 Lynn Maloney - Are CALEA certification and COP competing interests for CPD?

Ms. Maloney noted her comments were regarding a lack of leadership evidenced by comments made at the last council meeting following a presentation of a resolution regarding community-oriented policing. When the conversation had begun, the City Manager had indicated he did not have anyone on his staff, or the skill or time, to implement a resolution of that sort, and she had appreciated his candor, but he had also not indicated he would solve that particular problem, which reminded her of comments he had made regarding the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence whereby he had stated it was not uncommon for City staff to not implement recommendations made by the Council. She explained she was concerned since no other suggestion had been made for how the resolution might be implemented except that the Columbia Police Department (CPD) might be able to assist. She did not feel that was a good management tool because they had also indicated they would not implement such a resolution due to their current workload, and understood the CALEA accreditation had been mentioned as a reason. She stated CALEA accreditation had been mentioned by Chief Burton since 2009 as a priority, and wondered why, in 2018, the CALEA accreditation was an urgent priority that would preclude acting on recommendations made by the Council. She believed the CALEA accreditation would actually align with the resolution. She understood another concern expressed involved the number of calls for service, and noted they had all observed that community-oriented policing had reduced the number of calls for service. She felt the potential for a further reduction in calls for service would be a great motivator for the CPD to implement the resolution, and not a reason to say they could not implement it. She asked the Council what would be done if those paid to lead the City did not intend to implement it.

SPC3-18 Suzanne Bagby, Race Matters, Friends - Mike Matthes' speech at the Diversity Breakfast.

Ms. Bagby commented that as an uncomfortable black mother, she would not apologize for what Mr. Matthes had indicated made him an uncomfortable white man, which she understood involved being uncomfortable with the way black children chose to dress and express their heritage. She explained as a black mother, she was uncomfortable when her children left the house. She worried about whether her child would be racially profiled or not make it home. She was also uncomfortable with having to explain to her child he did not get a job because of the way he chose to wear his hair or that they could not move because they lived in a community that still supported segregation. In addition, it

was uncomfortable for her to hear from her child that when he entered a store, bank, or restaurant, the uncomfortable white man tended to move aside and look at him funny. She pointed out, as a black mother, she was uncomfortable with being a Columbia resident and still being victimized and disrespected by Mr. Matthes and other uncomfortable white men. She commented that the Columbia Values Diversity Celebration was supposed to be a joyful event, but it had been disrupted by Mr. Matthes, the uncomfortable white man, when he had used ridiculous racist examples about his perceptions of black people. She believed he was continuing the misrepresentation that distracted them from the root cause of their economic and racial injustice. She noted she, as an uncomfortable black mother, could say racism unlike Mr. Matthes. She stated she would not allow him to turn racism around by blaming African-Americans. She asked that he stop making it their fault for his discomfort. She commented that she believed he was not an uncomfortable white man, but a white supremacist, and asked him to resign so the community could begin the healing needed to put his ignorance to an end. She stated she was an engaged, uncomfortable black mother and woke. She asked those in support to stand, and approximately seven people stood.

SPC4-18 Mary Ratliff - In support of City Manager's Diversity Breakfast speech.

Ms. Ratliff, 211 Park de Ville Drive, explained she was the President of the Columbia NAACP, and had spent 25 years as the President of the Missouri State Conference, which she had left on her own accord in order to retire. She pointed out she had not left the NAACP and had not intended on leaving the NAACP. As the State Conference President, every year, she had attended the FBI training in Kansas City for a six state region where they had been taught about racial biases. The pictures used by the City Manager had been similar, if not the same, as the ones used by the FBI to train and discuss personal biases. She commented that the City Manager had discussed the biases they all had. She understood the pictures had offended some people, but they had not offended her since she had seen them multiple times previously. She explained people tended to make judgements based on looks when they did know the person. She noted one of the reasons for the ban the box ordinance was because they sometimes made decisions based on what was in front of them. She commented that she thought the City Manager had done a courageous thing and applauded him on his keen understanding of what it would take to make Columbia the model community all citizens envisioned. She asked those with the NAACP in support of the speech Mr. Matthes had given to stand, and approximately six people stood. She noted he had done exactly what they had asked during the community meetings as the only way to resolve racism was to discuss it in its totality. She stated the NAACP would continue to do this without allowing anyone to derail them. She also pointed out those who had stood were not the only ones in support as those in attendance were from the Executive Committee of the NAACP. She noted she believed Mr. Matthes was poised to lead them with community policing unlike anyone else that had been in the City Manager's seat, and stated she supported him and the resolution before the Council on community-oriented policing.

Valerie Shaw explained she was speaking in support of City Manager Mike Matthes. She explained she had attended the Columbia Values Diversity Celebration, and much of the information in the presentation had been incredibly informative. While, as a community, they were not where they needed to be in terms of diversity and the gap between blacks and whites, they were making progress. She realized the photos in Mr. Matthes' comments had caused controversy for some, and she did not want to be unfair to those who were offended. She stated that being uncomfortable was a way of life for black citizens, and believed it took the courage of people, like Mr. Matthes, to have difficult conversations. She also felt they needed to continue to have those difficult conversations if they were going to move forward. She noted she did not speak for the NAACP, and that she, personally, appreciated the slides that showed the need for more funding for the C.A.R.E. program and the need to hire black people since there had been a lot of businesses representatives in the room. She also liked the fact the income

disparities had been shown in slides. She commented that she had wanted a copy of his slides, which was why she was surprised by all of the controversy the following day. She reiterated she supported Mr. Matthes.

SPC5-18 Sara Senff - Race and police policies in Columbia.

Ms. Senff commented that she was a doctoral candidate and graduate instructor in the Department of Theater, and specialized in community dialogue and transformative conversations. She also noted that she had lived in the Sixth Ward for about five years. She stated she was strongly in favor of the resolution for community policing that was scheduled for a vote in a couple of weeks. She understood this was a loosely defined and somewhat nebulous concept, but was heartened the resolution appeared to include plans for involvement from the community during each stage. She believed the community whose daily lives would be most impacted by these policies should have a central role in shaping them and reevaluating them on a regular basis for continued improvement. She encouraged the Council to reach out to the University of Missouri Extension Office for assistance in facilitating productive community based initiatives of this nature as they had extensive experience in navigating complex and contentious issues. She commented that women of color tended to be disproportionately affected by police violence and the fear of it. Not only were they subjected to the same kinds of violence and detainment at similar rates nationally, but many cited a reluctance to report serious crimes, such as domestic violence or sexual assault, for fear that calling the police would result in the death of their partner. She did not feel that was acceptable and had a hard time fathoming this as a white woman raised in rural America. She noted women of color had long been ahead of the rest of them when it came to justice, and she had learned to take a cue from them, which meant she found herself less willing to call the police for assistance herself even if it meant finding herself in greater danger as a result. She commented that they were stuck in a vicious cycle marked by deeply engrained mistrust. She stated her heart had shattered in a way it would not recover the first time she had heard one of her black friends describe giving the “talk” to her son instructing him on how to survive an encounter with the police by telling him all that mattered was that he was able to come home safely. This was not the experience of white families in America. She noted the police and the people they were called to serve and protect were alienated from each other. The community saw a lack of accountability for police misconduct and brutality, and the police saw a lack of community support for jobs that were difficult and dangerous, which was causing them to grow apathetic and hostile. She urged the Council to include in the community policing plan increased accountability for police misconduct and brutality with more reliable and transparent reporting mechanisms and systems for ensuring reports were deliberated upon swiftly, thoroughly, and fairly. She felt the police should be as accountable as any citizen for discrimination, excessive violence, and other misconduct, and a regular review of the racial makeup of traffic stops and searches in comparison to the demographics of the City of Columbia as a departmental whole and each officer needed to be included. She believed actual accountability would lay the groundwork for trust to be rebuilt, and noted a true community approach did not include simple policy shifts here and there. A paradigm shift away from incident responsive policing was needed, and it was a matter of being proactive rather than reactive. She understood some cities had reductions in crime with fewer arrests after implementing the community policing approach, and listed Cincinnati, Ohio as an example. She encouraged the Council to read the 2015 article by *The Atlantic* on Cincinnati’s experience with community-oriented policing as it had illustrated that while the road was long in part due to the resistance of the local police to embrace the changes, the benefits to the community had been undeniable. It would take time and it would be hard, but healing was a painful process. She commented that she was doubtful this healing would come under the leadership of City Manager Mike Matthes. His comments at the Columbia Values Diversity Celebration were only the most recent example of the very kinds of racism and implicit bias the City had to train all of its

employees to recognize and root out. Unconscious associations of blackness with poverty, violence, and drug use led to material differences in ways one responded to blackness. When split-second decisions mattered in high stake situations with life or death consequences, these biases were more than just ill-mannered or uneducated as they were deadly. She urged the Council to vote in favor of the pending resolution and to find a City Manager prepared to support these changes, which would allow all of Columbia's residents to thrive and feel safe in the community.

SPC6-18 Steve Callis - Legalization of private haulers to collect organic waste for composting.

Mr. Callis, 6304 W. Normandy Lane, provided a handout and explained he was the 2018 State Coordinator for International Compost Awareness Week. He noted the City of Columbia had over 300 licensed businesses that generated food waste, and food waste accounted for about 20 percent of the waste stream in Columbia. He stated the ideal way to deal with food waste was through composting, which had many benefits, such as being good for the soil, environment, and economy. He understood the City of Columbia collected food waste from fewer than 30 food waste generators, which was less than 10 percent. He also understood food generators would like their food waste to go toward composting, but needed the food waste to be picked up more than once per week, and the Solid Waste Division needed an increased demand before they could commit additional resources for more frequent collections. He commented that the Columbia Code of Ordinances currently indicated it was unlawful for anyone other than an agent of the City to haul any garbage from any location within the City. Private haulers could lawfully carry raw sewage, but could not carry garbage, to include food waste. He explained the handout he had provided included a summary of proposed changes, and noted the changes were consistent with the City's commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and would also help slow the rate at which the landfill was filling up. He asked the Council to review the proposed code changes, obtain staff input on the changes, obtain public input on the changes, and approve the finalized changes.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH1-18 Voluntary annexation of property located on the northwest and southwest corners of the Brushwood Lake Road and Scott Boulevard intersection (Case No. 17-238).

Mayor Treece explained this item had been withdrawn by the applicant.

PH3-18 Proposed construction of the Shepard to Rollins Trail Project (Trail Alignments 1 and 3).

Discussion shown with B28-18.

B27-18 Authorizing construction of the Shepard to Rollins Trail Project (Trail Alignments 1 and 3); calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

Discussion shown with B28-18.

B28-18 Authorizing the acquisition of certain interests in real property for construction of the Shepard to Rollins Trail Project (Trail Alignments 1 and 3).

PH3-18 was read by the Clerk, and B27-18 and B28-18 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Anderson and Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that this project had always been relatively controversial, which was why it had been delayed in terms of development. He asked about the differences

between low water bridges and span bridges, and what it meant in terms of expense, the process necessary for approval, and how they functioned. Mr. Griggs replied a low water bridge was more economical. Many people did not like them because they were a bit more environmentally hazardous to the creek. He also understood the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) did not like them, and would require assurance that there was enough fish access through them. He pointed out there were tall banks on both sides of the creek in this instance, so a low water crossing would not work.

Mr. Pitzer understood the proposal included a concrete trail, and asked for the difference in the effect on the Hinkson Creek between concrete and a permeable surface. Mr. Griggs replied the Bear Creak Trail was a gravel trail, and every time it flooded the gravel washed into the creek requiring them to restore it with rock quarry rock. If the proposed trail was to be gravel and it flooded out, they would have to go into the area with trucks to repair it. The cost tended to be $30,000 to $60,000 for the existing trails in terms of repairs due to flooding. He noted the square feet of this trail was not much in comparison to other trails, and pointed out they would improve the site in terms of stormwater.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the trail would run within the 50 or 100 foot creek buffer. Mr. Griggs replied the only time it would vary was when they got to the bridges. Ms. Anderson agreed and noted it would also occur when they tied into Bluff Dale Drive on the east and when they crossed into the University of Missouri property to tie into Rollins Street.

Mr. Griggs pointed out the University had reviewed and agreed to the easements, and thought they would have had the signed easements by now.

Mayor Treece asked how many were willing sellers versus those forced to participate in the negotiation/condemnation process in terms of the other necessary easements. Ms. Anderson replied they had not gotten that far yet. Mayor Treece asked if they had a sense from the stakeholder meetings. Ms. Anderson replied she did not know. Mr. Griggs stated he had spoken with two of the three owners involved. One was the apartment complex, and they saw it as a benefit, so he assumed they would be helpful in the process. He had also spoken to one of the sons of the Altis tract, which was in a Trust managed by an attorney, so he tended to defer to the attorney.

Mayor Treece asked how much of this was in addition to what they might already have with the sewer easement. Ms. Anderson replied the sewer easement was for sewer only, so they had to obtain a trail easement on top of it to construct the trail.

Mayor Treece understood Trail Alignment 1 would be funded with GetAbout funds. Ms. Anderson stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood it was 100 percent federally funded. He also understood Trail Alignment 3 would be funded with voter approved park sales tax funds whereby the project had been listed as a ballot project. Mr. Griggs replied it had not been a listed project. The project was in the Trails Master Plan and would be funded with the 2010 parks sales tax funds.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition, which was a member based organization representing over 7,000 people, including 33 businesses and organizations, and they were in strong support of the Shepard to Rollins trail and its Alignments 1 and 3. She commented that this was the most important trail connector for Columbia's entire trail system. It was crucial in bridging the gap between all of the trails that converged near the area, but were not currently connected. The Shepard to Rollins trail would provide critical connectivity to the University of Missouri campus, the District, and the downtown area. She noted they had a hole, and where they had a hole, they also had a hill. She displayed the elevation of a trail route that had started with the MKT and would then go to the MU recreational trail and the Hinkson Creek trail. She stated the hill on Old 63 was mammoth compared to the other elevation changes along the trail route, and hills like the one on Old 63 were huge barriers to choosing walking or biking, or using a wheelchair, instead of driving. It was not easily accessible to children, older adults, people with disabilities, or anyone new to walking or biking for transportation. She commented that the engineering study

the City had done on the trail alignments in 2014-2015 had shown Alignments 1 and 3 as having the highest rankings for mode shift potential because they would serve the highest number of people and would provide the flattest routes. The study had also indicated Alignment 4 would have a negligible effect on mode shift potential and would require climbing the steepest grades. The negligible effect was no surprise as there was not any comparison between the safety and appeal of walking or biking on a trail to climbing a hill on the side of a high speed state highway. In 2015, the Council had authorized staff to proceed with plans and specifications for the Shepard to Rollins trail, including Alignments 1 and 3. As a result, she felt the issues before the Council tonight involved proceeding with the acquisition of the easements and calling for bids to begin the construction of the Shepard to Rollins trail. In terms of whether the alignments proposed tonight were consistent with those approved in 2015, she described Alignment 3 as it had been proposed in 2015 and displayed a diagram of Alignment 3 as it was proposed tonight, and noted it was functionally equivalent. She also described Alignment 1 as it had been proposed in 2015, and noted City staff had still been in negotiations with the University of Missouri on the exact route for the west side of the creek in order to avoid impacting the veterinary programs. She understood the trail route would either go north around the University's buildings or south around the buildings and the parking lot, and both options had been included in the council materials in 2015. She displayed Alignment 1 as it was proposed tonight, and noted it was functionally equivalent to the route proposed in 2015 made up of the segment east of the creek and the southern option on University property. Both routes were consistent with the concepts presented and approved in 2015. She commented that she believed the public input process on this project had been extensive, and that the public had shown overwhelming support for the trail. In January 2015, the City had held an interested parties meeting whereby 200 people had attended. In addition, 220 people had submitted comments at either the interested parties meeting or in the following weeks, and 75 percent supported Alignments 1 and 3. In March 2015, the Council had held a public hearing on the project that had lasted several hours, and the Disabilities Commission, the Public Transit Advisory Commission, the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission, and the Board of Health had all endorsed the trail. Since then the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission had once again submitted a letter of support for the trail. In addition, in the last couple of weeks, nearly 400 people had independently sent an email to Council in support of the trail. She asked those in the audience in support of the trail to stand, and approximately 100 people stood. She commented that those present in support of the trail represented only a small fraction of the now 82 percent of Columbia households that used the trail system. She urged the Council to vote to proceed with acquiring easements and calling for bids to begin construction of the Shepard to Rollins trail for the benefit of all of Columbia.

Ginger Owen, 5775 E. Heller Road, played a video of the proposed trail beginning at the top of Old 63, going down Southwood Drive and Woodlea Drive, and then going further along the trail route. The video indicated the grades would not be great in certain areas, and the length of a football field would be needed in order to cross the creek. The video also showed the mowed area within Alignment 3 that would be covered with cement and go to the end of the floodplain to connection to Alignment 1. Ms. Owen commented that a hill would also need to be traversed to get to the University of Missouri campus, and access to this trail with trailheads would not be ADA compliant. She challenged those on the Council to travel the route, and suggested they allow the citizens of Columbia to vote on the issue.

Alice Reese, 112 S. Garth Avenue, explained she would propose an alternative to address the gap by following the pedway and creating an entrance and exit at the bridge over the Hinkson Creek. A video showing the alternate route was displayed, and it included a proposal to construct sidewalk entrances on to the existing sidewalks, a potential guardrail, and an exit sidewalk at the pedway on Ashland Road.

Rena Ruth, 807 N. Valley View Drive, provided a handout and stated she loved bicycle trails that made sense. She noted she was not protesting the bike trail, but her concern was with spending $2.3 million on this particular trail and bridge that was not needed. She commented that the PedNet Coalition had left off the fact there was a safe connection already in existence along Old 63 and Stadium to the University on the map it had circulated. She challenged the Council and others to walk the area, envision how a wheelchair could possibly manage it, enjoy the natural beautiful sanctuary environment, and visualize a bridge the size of a football field and a large cement ramp leading up to it. She understood the Council had received many calls and emails urging them to approve this project, but wondered how many of them knew about the already existing connection and the terrain for the proposed project. She questioned whether they understood it was just as hilly as the existing one and that it would end at the University parking lot requiring them to navigate a hill steeper than Old 63 for about a block. She felt there were other ways they could spend this tax money to really help bicyclists, those in wheelchairs, and children. She suggested utilizing the funds in other areas of the community, funding driver and bicycle education classes, or purchasing the land as a sanctuary whereby school children could visit a natural wildlife area. She asked the Council to vote to keep this beautiful sanctuary free from unnecessary cement.

John Stansfield, 1852 Cliff Drive, stated he was representing the Mizzou Cycling Team, and explained this trail would impact the various courses they had been developing in the valley since 2005. Even with these impacts, he noted they were in favor of the trail because they believed trails were good. He commented that they had been shoveling dirt there since 2005, and tended to find trash because it was a former landfill, sewer easement area, etc. It was not anything like wilderness. He believed filling the gap with a great trail would be a great thing. If he still had grade school kids that were dependent on the trail to get to soccer games, he would welcome this as it would better than sending them up Stadium Boulevard and a bridge that was not safe. He noted they had spent many years on this and encouraged the Council to endorse and fully fund the project tonight. He reiterated the Mizzou Cycling Team fully endorsed Alignments 1 and 3. He explained he wanted this project to move forward so they could then rebuild what they needed in order to host another regional championship like they had done in the fall of 2016. The concrete trail would also make their cycle courses more accessible to the community and bike racers.

Jason Patrie, 2800 Pepper Tree Lane, commented that he was a member of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission, but was not representing that body this evening, and noted it was challenging to commute by bicycle on Stadium Boulevard. As a resident of the Shepard neighborhood, he was left with only two options if he wanted to go by bicycle or foot to the downtown area or to the University, and that was to either take Stadium Boulevard or Broadway. He currently traveled down Old 63 and up Stadium Boulevard. He noted a letter had been sent to MoDOT recently regarding concerns over incursions into the bike lane on Stadium Boulevard, especially during the morning rush hour near College Avenue. This project would provide a direct route for those living in the Shepard neighborhood without having to travel on Stadium Boulevard or Old 63.

Lynne Hooper, 2515 Brookside Court, explained she had quite a bit of experience with the Hinkson Creek as she had done her Master's research on that creek from 2013-2015, and had seen areas along the creek where the riparian corridor had been completely lost. She noted this particular area of the creek did not have that problem as the riparian corridor was intact along with much of the floodplain. She commented that the Hinkson Creek Collaborative Adaptive Management process stakeholder committee had formed a riparian subcommittee that was considering projects to restore the Hinkson Creek riparian corridor. As a result, it did not make sense to her that they were considering destroying a portion of the riparian corridor for the sake of this bridge and trail while they were also considering acquiring funds to restore the riparian corridor. She noted soils in the floodplain were special as they absorbed the water. She commented that they did

not know why the Hinkson Creek was impaired except that it was likely the result of stormwater, and anything done in the riparian corridor to disrupt nature's ability to absorb stormwater and pollutants would work against the Hinkson Creek instead of for it.

Virginia Brundage stated she lived on Bluff Boulevard and felt they should leave the Hinkson Creek alone. She noted she did not want this trail.

Susan Franck, 627 Bluff Dale Drive, commented that she had lived at this location since 1964 when she was a one year old, and had watched Columbia lose pieces of wildness over and over again. She noted this was one of the last existing pieces of wildness within the City. She played a video, which she felt spoke for itself, and pointed out a ten foot wide concrete trail was not wildness.

Gerald Neuffer stated he had stood on a hill overlooking this property 60 years ago with Mr. Shepard, who had loaned him money to build a house on property in this area, and he had lived in that house ever since. He noted he had mowed the trail from his house to the area over the past 60 years. He understood Mr. Shepard had wanted the area to be a park and had offered it to the City of Columbia, but for some reason the City had not accepted it. He commented that he would like to see the area be a park as had been envisioned by Mr. Shepard with a trail through the middle so it could be of use to people in the future. He stated he was in favor of this trail and asked the Council to approve it.

Diane Suhler, 902 Timberhill Road, expressed her appreciation for the biking community and applauded their dedication to non-motorized transportation. She only wished her lungs and legs were strong enough to join them. She stated she had concerns regarding the Shepard to Rollins trail project. She understood the City had already spent over $20 million of federal money on GetAbout and non-motorized projects without adequately addressing whether the spending had been equitably distributed among all stakeholders in Columbia. She believed this had been a critical missing piece of the discussion of the projects to date. Prior to proceeding any further, she asked that an analysis be done to determine if all segments of the population in terms of social, racial, economic, wards, and geographic areas had shared equally in the benefits of the projects and had been afforded opportunities to share in the goal of mode shift for which the funds were intended. She felt a rigorous analysis of the use of the funds was needed before another $1.55 million was spent. In light of the City's strategic plan and its focus on social equity and income equality, a primary way to alleviate inequity came from providing equal opportunities to all citizens and included the ability of low income groups to access non-motorized methods of transportation in areas of Columbia that would link the areas people worked, attended school, and shopped. She asked Ms. Peters, the Ward 6 Council Member, to request an accounting of the use of GetAbout funds by ward, project type, geographic area, etc. She believed it would be prudent for the final vote on this project to be delayed until such information was available. If analysis of the data indicated expenditures had equally benefited all stakeholders in Columbia, they could proceed knowing the City's strategic goal of social equity was being fostered. If that did not turn out to be the case, it would allow the City time to align its use of GetAbout funds with the goal of the strategic plan. She commented that a second concern was related to the cost of this project and the current fiscal situation of the City. She stated Mr. Matthes had made the community very aware of the City's flat revenue growth combined with ever-increasing financial needs. This project required $800,000 in Parks and Recreation funds in addition to $1.55 million in federal funds. At a time when budgets were being cut, she wondered if there might be other projects that would provide greater benefits to a larger number of people in more diverse segments of the community. She did not feel there was a shortage of projects, and thought the question was whether the alternative uses had been properly examined using quantitative methods of economic cost-benefit analysis to determine the best use of resources.

Barbara Hoppe, 607 Bluff Dale Drive, explained she had served on the Council for the Sixth Ward for nine years until April, 2015, and these trails had come before her twice during that time. The first time it had come before the Council she had voted against it

due to environmental and routing concerns. After that vote, she had gathered a variety of people from the various neighborhoods within the Sixth Ward to review alternative routes to determine if there were better and more environmentally sensitive routes. She noted Ms. Peters, the current Sixth Ward Council Member, had participated in several of those expeditions, and the review had included the route suggested along Old 63, but it had problems. She pointed out this diligent effort had lasted for about a year, and explained they had also met with Gary Ward at the University of Missouri to determine if there was a way for the trail to be on University property instead of Clyde Wilson Park so a lot of mature trees would not be impacted. That discussion had been successful as the proposed alignments displayed tonight would not impact Clyde Wilson Park. When this project had come before her again in 2015, she had enthusiastically voted in favor of it. Since then, many people had asked her what was taking so long and when the trail would be completed. She commented that having a trail that people could bike and walk on was environmentally friendly and good for public health. She noted her daughter lived at the end of Bluff Dale Drive where the Alignment 1 would begin, and she, her husband, and other neighbors were enthusiastically waiting for the trail. She stated this had been a long time coming, and it had been analyzed. She believed this was the most positive and environmentally friendly configuration possible, and urged the Council to vote in favor of this and the subsequent ordinances.

Cara Joos, 1504 Lowe Street, commented that she had lived at the end of Ashland Road for the past seven years, which was right to this, and explained she was an avid runner, cyclist, and user of the trail system. She noted she had moved away from Columbia for a job for nine months, but had chosen to come back, and the trail system and the expansion of the trail system was a huge part of that decision. She stated she was also a wildlife biologist by profession as her job was to assess and determine how to make habitat good for wildlife, particularly birds. In reference to the claim, the land in the Shepard to Rollins trail would cross a pristine natural environment, the facts were that the land was private property owned by the Altis family, and it was not owned or managed by any of those that opposed the trail. She understood the Altis family was open to considering an easement for land for the trail. She commented that it was a highly disturbed piece of land and was full of honeysuckle, cedar, and Bradford pear trees, which were all exotic or invasive species. Two sewer trunk lines had been installed in the area in the 1950s and the 1980s, and had required extensive tree removal and environmental disruption. In addition, the property already contained several above ground concrete structures and fencing that were a part of the sewer and gas lines as well as soft surface utility roads. The soils were already disturbed, and this area had already been churned as everything that had grown back thrived in disturbed areas. The property was littered with debris and fill material that had been left over from when the road was built so the soils were not pristine. While the land had many trees, it was also covered with invasive species that needed to be removed. She pointed out the trail would also largely be constructed on existing right-of-way.

Jessica Wehner, 1307 Ashland Road, explained she and her husband, Jordan Sorrick, had lived in this location for almost six years, and it had a lot of families. She understood the opposition had suggested existing sidewalks, and she did not believe parents would want their kids walking or biking along those current locations. She noted she and her husband would often cycle or run along the existing route, which was alongside traffic, but explained they were 30 year old adults that could make the decision to risk their own lives. This trail would offer an opportunity for kids as families would not have to drive to another location to access and safely use the trail. She thanked the City for making the decisions they had in the past with regard to the trail system they currently had, and hoped the Council would approve this trail as well.

Jordan Sorrick, 1307 Ashland Road, commented that the trail would only be ten feet wide, and it would allow them to not be so close to cars when cycling. He noted he had almost been hit by cars before, and it was not a fun experience.

Mihaela Popescu, 1018 Sycamore Lane, stated she had lived in Columbia since 1994 and for over 15 years on Bluff Dale Drive, and still had relatives residing on Bluff Dale Drive. She commented that she opposed the building of this trail at least as it was currently proposed since it would end up on a very steep street, Rollins Street. She was not sure how many people had walked it, and noted the hill there was just as steep as Old 63. She wondered about the connection once one made it to Rollins Street as the other end of the trail was about a mile away, and would require people to navigate through pedestrians and cars. College Avenue had a narrow sidewalk and no bike lanes so she wondered how people would traverse it. She commented that it was similar to Forum Boulevard, from Green Meadows Road to Wilson's where the trail was located, and believed those issues needed to be addressed. She believed those problems were much more urgent than this trail for which there was an alternative. She noted a bike lane was marked on Stadium Boulevard, and felt connections to it needed to be addressed first. If any money was left, she would then be agreeable to doing something that would cross the Hinkson Creek, but nothing to the extent proposed. She understood many complained about the length and steepness of the hill at Old 63 and wondered why people felt the Greenbriar trail was a masterpiece. She understood there had been a suggestion to use electric bikes on the trail and wondered if that was the shift they desired. She suggested using these funds for other programs that would encourage children to bike or walk, such as the Walking School Bus. Any time she asked about that program, she was told there was not any money for it. The cost had been $75 at her son's school for bike safety lessons, and she felt that was unacceptable. She asked the Council to consider other options and to vote against this proposed trail. She reiterated the need to educate children and adults on the use of cycles and cars on the road, and felt that was the reason many were not biking and walking.

Mary Christian understood Mr. Thomas would appreciate the new trail since he rode a bike and utilized the bus system. She noted those that were afraid to ride bikes on bike lanes along the road could ride on the trails to get to other parts of town and those that did not want the trail would not be forced to use it. She asked the Council to not allow those opposed to prevent others from biking safely for health.

Anissa Lockett, 3612 Grant Court, commented that she did not believe this trail would interrupt the enjoyment of nature. She noted her children had attended Fairview Elementary, and there had been controversy with regard to a concrete trail in an area known as the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary a few years ago. She pointed out that once the trail had been built she had visited it when she had never visited it previously. In addition, her children were then able to bike to Fairview Elementary. They had seen numerous birds and had enjoyed numerous nature outings as a result of the concrete trail. She stated she was an avid biker and had biked in the Grindstone Nature Area this past year, and it was beautiful. She commented that nature was the reason she biked, but she would not have had that enjoyment without concrete trails. She asked the Council to construct another one to allow all of Columbia to enjoy the nature around the ugly concrete trail. She noted it would be in a location she had not yet visited, but would once it was built. She commented that she had ridden on Old 63 and it was not safe. She explained she volunteered in the summer to help new bikers learn the safety and rules of the road, and one of the first things she told them was to not bike on the sidewalk. They needed to ride on all of the road paths and road. She stated biking on the sidewalk on Old 63 was very dangerous, and noted she would never cycle on Stadium Boulevard because it was also very dangerous.

Brian Johnstone, 711 Bluff Dale Drive, commented that he had attended the interested parties meeting in 2015 and had been disappointed as he had felt he needed an engineering degree in order to understand what would occur. Subsequently, he had not had the experience of anything changing. They had discussed proposals at the meeting and different lanes of travel, and it had been confusing. He stated he had not had the vocabulary to understand what they were saying, and had come to find out that the

vocabulary changed as the process moved along. They had started out with proposals, which he thought were stationary and by which decisions would be made. It had then turned to a plan, which he felt would be more stable, but had actually been more fluid. There had been a lot of people there talking about the different trailways and how it would be wonderful, and also about how dangerous it was to ride a bike up Old 63 or to engage in going up the hill. He commented that he had a modest bike with 28 gears and many low speed gears, and if it was still too challenging, he walked. He understood an alternate route from Bluff Dale Drive was to go to Old 63 to Stadium Boulevard to Ashland Road, and there were established pedways and bike lanes all along the route. He noted he had contacted MoDOT to learn about the dangerousness of that alternative route, and had been told the speed limit on Old 63 was 35 mph, which was standard for a residential area and was not a high speed highway, and the speed limit on Stadium Boulevard was designated at 45 mph. He understood one had to be on Stadium Boulevard for about 100 yards before getting to Ashland Road, and it was bracketed by lights at the intersections of Old 63 and Ashland Road. It was not a high speed dangerous section of road, and it allowed a quick way to the University. He understood someone had mentioned traveling Broadway, and felt they were traveling too far as they only needed to travel to Ashland Road through the area in which the Veterinary School was located to College Avenue. It was an uphill ride, but not radical.

Linda Schust explained she was the Executive Director of Jabberocky Studios, which was a non-profit arts and community building organization located on the Business Loop, near Hickman High School, and read a letter on behalf of Pat Kelley, a member of the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association. The letter indicated Ms. Kelley's strong opposition to the Shepard to Rollins trail project and suggested the funds be used for the alleys in their neighborhood as those alleys could include walking trails aligned with native plants and community art. Ms. Kelley understood a bike trail was slated to be install on East Forest Avenue, just a half of a block away, and believed there were many creative ideas for how the alley project could be a landmark on the bicycle trail. It was an opportunity to show what could be done in a strategic equity planned area, and it could be done at a price that probably less than the cost of upkeep of the Shepard to Rollins trail over a couple of years. The letter indicated she was afraid they would hear there was not any money for their neighborhood due to an expensive project elsewhere. Ms. Kelley felt there were many places in Columbia with a need for greater accessibility that could be provided at a lower cost than the trail project. There were not any sidewalks on many streets in central Columbia, and where there were sidewalks, there were not benches for seniors to rest or shade trees to provide protection.

Avery Abbott, 3000 Linden Way, commented that he was about a mile away from Bass Pro and frequently commuted by bicycle to the south side of town near Las Margaritas South. This ride involved him going down the Hominy Creek trail to Old 63 South from Broadway to Nifong Boulevard. He then traveled Nifong Boulevard to State Farm to his office. There were only a couple areas where he was particularly cautious, and one was the portion on Old 63 as people tended to drive in the bicycle lane, too fast, or honked their horns for enjoyment. He understood the City had conducted a study with regard to the impact of this project on the watershed, endangered species, etc., and that the Federal Highway Administration had vetted the study and had approved the project.

David Leuthold, 2000 Valley View Drive, stated he lived on the hill above and just east of the Hinkson Creek and his property extended almost to the floodplain just west of the proposed bridge leading to Rollins Street, and he was in support of the proposed trail. He noted the proposed trail would be in easy walking distance to the University. He pointed out he had walked to the University for ten years until his retirement in 1992, and could not cross the creek when it was flooding, and it was flooding increasingly now due to development upstream. He noted he had found this opportunity to be good for his physical and mental health. He had been attracted to the area by its beauty and its closeness to the University, and some of his neighbors were attracted to it for the same

reason. He believed this trail would open the neighborhood up to easy access to the University by bicycle or by walking and would increase the demand for housing and help house values. At present, there were walking trails on some of the subject property that were used some by people in the neighborhood that were aware of the trails, and some of those trails were available due to the sewer easements, but some of the most used trails were only available because his neighbor, Gerald Neuffer, had mowed them regularly for over 60 years. He noted he had helped some, but he had often been out of town when the mowing needed to be done. The present connector trail between Stephens Lake Park and the Grindstone Nature Area followed Old 63 and included the problem of the steep hill, which peaked near the intersection of Old 63 and Shepard Boulevard. In 2008, he had been bicycling up that hill when he began having heart palpitations, which had resulted in him going to the emergency room for what had been diagnosed as a mild heart attack. He had not cycled that hill since then, and appreciated the reluctance of other bicyclists in using that route.

Sutu Forte commented that she was grateful for everyone even though they did not always agree on everything, and pointed out there was not any litter in the sanctuary because she picked it up daily. She also noted a gravel trail, which would need to be replaced if constructed, was not needed in the sanctuary because the gravel was rooted by grass and it was mowed by Mr. Neuffer and Mr. Leuthold. She stated she and others loved the wild nature and believed in its relevance and importance to their quality of life and the animals who resided there. It was a beautiful and complete civilization they wanted to keep uninterrupted. She displayed a video and suggested a Columbia Wilderness Sanctuary and Nature School for relaxation, rejuvenation, inspiration, exploration, education, and fun with a motto of bike to it, walk through it. It involved well-established mowed soft grass paths, and those natural forest trails were all in the sanctuary right now. She noted she would bring in Jourdan Keith, the founder of the Urban Wilderness Project, a model that already existed in Seattle that allowed children that could not get out of the city to tour wild areas in order to build self-esteem and feel better in terms of health. She displayed a list of health benefits from forests and mentioned possible funding sources for the project. She commented that they would get in touch with the Children and Nature Network in terms of how to get started along with a review of the Urban Forestry and Urban Greening Journal. She asked the Council to allow what was suggested and noted it would not cost the City anything. She stated imagination was everything and asked the Council to help them save the sanctuary.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Forte how often she was in the sanctuary. Ms. Forte replied every day. Mayor Treece asked if there were people that never ventured into the sanctuary. Ms. Forte replied yes. Mayor Treece noted the trail might help introduce people to nature that might not otherwise get there. Ms. Forte stated she appreciated that and wanted them to be there. She agreed it was not her forest and believed there was accessibility as there was a road that went into it. She explained they wanted to organize volunteers to pick up children in various locations of the community to visit the wilderness. Mayor Treece commented that if the proposed trail was approved tonight, it would allow people to wander off of that trail on to the grass paths, and the Parks and Recreation Department might be able to identify what to look for in terms of trees, birds, etc., which would help with what Ms. Forte envisioned. He asked if that was a start. Ms. Forte asked that the trail not be concrete and for bridges not to be built. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Forte if the school she envisioned was a virtual school or a physical place. Ms. Forte replied they did not want to construct a building because it would interrupt the residents that had lived there for hundreds of years. She explained they wanted to make it as costless as possible with qualified people, like Lynne Hooper, providing guided tours to introduce people to the area.

Rod Robison, 2504 Shepard Boulevard, stated he agreed the sanctuary was a beautiful place and believed more people would enjoy it if there was a trail going through it for accessibility purposes. He noted the trail projects constructed by the Parks and

Recreation Department were all beautiful. He understood it was rough during construction as trees were cut down and dirt was disturbed, but once construction and restoration were complete, it was beautiful again. The trails were great for visiting nature and one usually would not get far before seeing a deer, turkeys, etc. It allowed those that lived in the city an opportunity to see nature up close and personal. He noted he did not use the trails for transportation, and only used it for recreation and exercise. He explained he had lived in the Shepard neighborhood for 25 years, and believed this trail had been on the table for discussion for most of that time. He encouraged the Council to approve it tonight in order to move forward.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that the non-motorized transportation demonstration project was not about recreational trails or seeing nature. He believed the 30 mile vision around Columbia was about recreation and amenities, and it was not about what it should have been about. He felt they had misspent so much of the money that it had not allowed them to get enough of a benefit from it with regard to the mode shift of getting people out of their cars and walking or biking to work. He believed those that used the trails for recreation drove to work, school, shops, etc. He did not feel they had benefited from much of a mode shift. He noted the 30 miles was already complete and suggested something be done about the 100 yards along Stadium Boulevard. He pointed out they had provided walking paths off of bridges to go over highways so he believed something could be done to make that section safe. He felt there were better uses for this $2.3 million, especially in light of comments made by City officials indicating they were out of money and more revenue was needed. He did not feel it was appropriate to spend this money south of Broadway instead of in Wards 1, 2, and 3. He understood the Parks and Recreation Department had run out of money. Columbia had grown 60 percent in 25 years, and their bond to debt ratio had gone up 9.18 times. Building something new that would need to be taken care of with money they did not have was bad policy. He encourage the Council ask for a vote on this to be tabled until the next meeting so the information they had requested from the Finance Director could be received as that information would allow them to meaningfully analyze equity issues.

Gregg Suhler, 902 Timberhill Road, understood the equities market had substantially declined since January 26, and today marked the single largest down day in terms of the Dow Jones Industrial Average. He believed it might be worth reconsidering the reliance of matching funds from the federal government, and felt the next few weeks would provide for a better idea on how continuing resolutions were handled and what would come forth in the budget for the next fiscal year. He noted they would know a lot more in six months. He commented that leverage funds were popular, but the ability to deliver on those might very well be jeopardized. He noted generating local funds as match money was endangered by declining sales revenue and increasing online activities. He suggested the City broaden its referenced time frame as what they were currently considering might be a luxury. If the Council was to obtain the analytics from the Finance Director and others, and had a better handle on what was coming from the debt driven markets, they might be able to better predict what would happen over the next ten years.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluff Dale Drive, commented that she did not believe this trail was necessary. She noted the Council had voted this trail was not a necessity in 1995, and again, in 2008, and stated it was still not necessary. Some people felt it would be wonderful for recreation, but it was not supposed to be for recreation. The money for Alignment 1 was supposed to be spent on transportation projects. She understood $13.5 million had been spent on parks and trails in a one mile radius of the Bluff Dale Drive cul-de-sac, and wondered if that would be considered equity throughout the community. This project involved another $2.5 million, so $16 million would be spent in their tiny neighborhood of a one mile radius. She believed sidewalks were needed in other parts of the town. She commented that they had been told this was needed to complete a loop, but understood that was also the reason the sidewalk had been constructed along Old 63. She stated the Old 63 pedway was supposed to have been the compromise since

prior Councils had voted against the trail. She noted some had indicated it was too steep of a hill, but the other day, she had gone up and down it three times within an hour and was still there to tell them about it. She stated those in the neighborhood were used to the hill. She reiterated the loop had been completed when the pedway had been completed with GetAbout funds, and was walkable and cyclable. She understood it was not compliant because it followed the roadway, but it was definitely accessible because her friends had used it. She believed there were needs throughout the Columbia that were greater than this, and noted the City would only be out consulting fees if the Council voted against this tonight. She understood Mr. Griggs had indicated gravel trails tended to wash away with flooding and suggested a study be done to determine why the gravel road in this area did not wash away with flooding. She believed it was due to the fact it had healed for 38 years. It was an established riparian forest. She understood the west side might have been a dumpsite and the reason Stadium Boulevard was built as Rollins Street could not be extended because it not stable since the land had been shale and a dumpsite. She pointed out the east side that had been a dairy farm was turning into a forest, which was a natural progression of nature. She agreed there was bush honeysuckle as they would all have it in their yards if they let it grow, and it could be dealt with later. She asked the Council to look at this trail as it was more of a luxury than a necessity.

Tim Beissinger, 412 W. Walnut Street, explained some people, like him, traveled 100 percent of the time without a car, and noted he either rode a bike or walked. He commented that he had ridden his bike to the meeting tonight, which was not necessarily safe since the road were slick. He believed it was safer to ride on a trail in that instance because cars, which were 3,000 pounds, could slide off of the road and hit him. He felt it was important for those that chose not to drive to have more safe routes that separated bikers and walkers from cars.

Lilly Kraxberger stated she was a senior at Hickman High School and was in support of the trail. She explained she had a lot of friends at the University of Missouri that lived in the student housing areas around Old 63, near the location of this trail. She noted she was also considering attending the University of Missouri, and would likely live in student housing there. She understood many of her friends used the shuttle system to get to campus now so they were already not driving their cars because it was not convenient. The trail would make it easier for them to get to campus and would allow them to go to campus whenever they wanted because they would not have to rely on the shuttle. She stated this project also fit well with Columbia's long term vision of more people biking and walking to places, and encouraged the Council to approve the project.

Darwin Hindman, 1223 Frances Drive, commented that the ultimate decision on desired public improvements, if they could be paid for, should rest on their benefit to the general public as opposed to any negative impact from them. In this situation, the trail had enormous evidence based public benefits to the individuals of Columbia, to include transportation, recreation, health, economy, connectivity, mode shift, the environment, accessibility, and education. The claimed negative benefits were truly relatively few and highly debatable. That was true today, just as it was in 2015 when the Council chose among the various proposed alignments, approved the concept, and directed the staff to proceed with plans by a 6-1 vote. As a result, money and staff time had been spent and used. A consultant was hired, the Parks and Recreation Department, the Public Works Department, and the University of Missouri had participated in an innovative cooperative project, plans were drawn, and financing was identified. It was ready to go, and only needed Council approval. He commented that he did not believe that meant they needed to rehash all of the old arguments since the Council had decided on the matter previously. The point now was to move forward by reviewing the plans and alignments to ensure they conformed to the concept approved and were practical and acceptable, and by considering any new, not previously considered substantial development that would affect the project. In this case, the plans and alignment fit the concept perfectly, the

financing had been determined, the benefits remained the same, it remained popular, and the complaints remained the same. He understood the Federal Highway Administration had indicated it would approve the plans if the Council approved them, and if the Council decided to turn this down without good cause, it would require the refunding of more than $140,000. He commented that a refund to the federal government was not a reason to vote for the trail project, and felt the reason to vote for it was that it remained a wonderful idea. He asked the Council to vote in favor of this great public improvement, and believed citizens would benefit, use and thank them for it for generations to come.

Lee Ruth, 807 N. Valley View Drive, stated he viewed the Hinkson Creek area as part of his extended backyard. He described a summer he had spent in Colorado about 41-42 years ago when he and a friend had hiked to Floresta, Colorado, which was a ghost town, and noted it had been beautiful. He recalled the ruins of an old railroad wooden trestle that had been extended across a gulch between two ridges, and his only thought was how they ever felt this was a good place to build a railroad. He understood 82 percent of Columbians used trails, but did not feel that meant any particular section of the trail had 82 percent usage as the usage for some of the trails would likely be at 8.2 percent. He also noted that a step was not necessarily a step forward. He understood the project involved a 310 foot bridge, and did not feel there should be a trail in this location if a bridge of that size was required. He commented that he thought it would likely be ugly compared to the surroundings.

Aniqa Rahman stated she had lived on Bluff Dale Drive for 4-5 years, and during that time, she had spent a lot of time at the creek. For her, it had been a sanctuary similar to what Sutu Forte had described. She thought it was unfair to say it was not beautiful, wild, or a sanctuary. She agreed it was not pristine wilderness and that there had been a lot of development there, but considering it had taken 40 years to get it to where it was today, she felt putting in something as big as the proposed trail, which included a quite large bridge, was excessive. She suggested investing a fraction of the money toward making Stadium Boulevard a safer bikeway and walkway and re-conceptualizing the space as a nature sanctuary the entire community could use. She believed they should let it continue to heal from past development, remove the honeysuckle, introduce more native species, and make it more available to people throughout the community that could not get to pristine wildlife areas as it would be a great asset for Columbia.

Robert Schmidt, 1806 N. Garth Avenue, explained he was a junior at the University of Missouri and stated this was not a trail he thought he would ever use to get to campus since it was not on his way, but he believed all of the students that lived south on Old 63 or east on Broadway would love to have the opportunity to ride their bikes to school, walk, or run. He thought the desire for a way to not drive to campus was greater now than it had ever been. He pointed out the University had decided to build some greenhouses to expand their research, but had placed it on the best parking lot, so now the walk from the parking lot to class was even further. He commented that he preferred to ride his bike on nice days simply because he got to class sooner riding from his house rather than driving and having to walk across campus. He thought the students on that side of town would do the same thing given the opportunity. He asked the Council to vote in favor of the proposed trail.

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

Mr. Trapp asked Mr. Griggs to comment on the bridge and the kind of impact it would have. Mr. Griggs replied the Parks and Recreation funded portion of the trail involved two bridges, and one was about 167 feet and the other was about 190 feet. He thought the bridge mentioned was a part of the GetAbout funded trail.

John Zimmerman, a consultant with Trails Systems, stated the bridge as part of Alignment 1 had two separate spans that were about 165 feet each so 330 feet total. He explained those had been sited to avoid mature trees on the west bank, it had been aligned with the connection point of Alignment 3 on the east bank. Mr. Trapp understood they were two 165 foot bridges. Mr. Zimmerman stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer

asked about the change in elevation from one end to the other. Mr. Zimmerman replied it would go from the top of the west bank to about ten feet off the lower floodway, and would be on a 4.9 percent grade to meet the ADA requirement. It was about fifteen feet in elevation difference.

Mr. Skala asked Mr. Zimmerman if he had been involved with the Moon Valley bridge project. Mr. Zimmerman replied no. It was a separate project and separate company.

Mr. Skala understood the equipment to construct the bridges would need to be accommodated in addition to the bridge. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas commented that he appreciated the tremendous public interest in this important issue that had been discussed for many years. He felt they needed to look at the overriding purpose of the non-motorized transportation pilot program grant, known in Columbia as GetAbout Columbia, and explained it was to create a culture change in the way they moved around the community. It was part of a national program, which Congress had approved in 2005 to provide funding to Columbia and three other communities, and these were likely the last funds from the program. He believed the experiment had been extremely successful as they had seen enormous increases in bicycling and walking in the community as they had expanded various different infrastructure components of the system, such as trails, sidewalks, slowing traffic, crosswalks, etc. to improve the safety, access, and desirability for walking and bicycling. He stated this trail would provide tremendous community access to campus and downtown from east Columbia. There were dozens of student apartment complexes on Old 63 that would now be able to use the pedway to get on the trail and cross the Hinkson Creek to Rollins Street and campus or the downtown. A large apartment complex on Broadway, the Broadway Village Apartments, would now be connected through the Moon Valley trail under Old 63 and through the Bluff Dale neighborhood to the new trail. There was a potential for thousands of trips per day to be converted from cars and buses to biking and walking, which was the exact purpose of the non-motorized transportation pilot program. He commented that he disagreed with those that felt the non-motorized transportation pilot program was not about recreation. It had been well documented that people would gravitate to bicycle commuting by initially being recreational bicyclists. Building out the trail system and enticing more people to get on bikes and walk for longer distances in the natural environment was a step on the way to promoting people to become more regular active transportation users, and connecting the trail along the creek corridor at creek level and avoiding the hill, along with the plan for a 30 mile loop, was consistent with the goals of the non-motorized transportation pilot program. He stated he did not feel they were losing a piece of beautiful wilderness by building this trail. They would open it up to more people, and children from all over the community would be able to ride their bikes safely to the wilderness. The fact children did not get out in nature was an important issue, and a safe bicycle trail throughout the community that went through nature areas would enable it to happen. He commented that the alternative routes were remarkable in their inappropriateness. He noted he had biked from the intersection of Stadium Boulevard to Old 63 to Ashland Road, and it was not a nice experience even for him, an experienced cyclist. There was now a strip of paint, but one could still not rely on vehicles to stay out of that designated lane as they were moving at 40-50 mph just a few feet away. In addition, the right side had a relatively low parapet and a big drop to the Hinkson Creek. No one would commute to the University or work by walking or biking if that was the route they had to take. He pointed out they had gone through this process several times and there had been overwhelming public support every time as well as support from their commissions as five of the advisory commissions had endorsed the project. He felt this was a fairly straightforward vote they had to make to approve the plans, which were in conformance with what had been agreed to three years ago and to move ahead with acquiring the easements to build the trail system.

Ms. Peters thanked everyone for participating in the public hearing. She commented that

in 2015, the Council had voted to move forward with Options 1 and 3. She understood there had been some question as to whether GetAbout funds could be used for Option 1, and believed it had taken an extra year with three different inquiries to the federal government to ensure this met the GetAbout funding requirements. She stated she had seen all of the robo-emails and many personal emails from people in the Bluff Creek, Shepard Boulevard, Valley View, and Bluff Dale areas, and most were supportive of the trail. She understood there was a very vocal and passionate group of people that were opposed to the trail, and noted she was sorry they were not happy to have the trail. She hoped they would be happier once it was constructed. She commented that she did not feel they needed to decide on the trail alignments tonight as that had already been done. They only needed to ask staff to put this out for bid to determine if it would be able to be funded with the money they had available.

Mr. Ruffin asked for the projected time line if this was approved tonight. Mr. Griggs replied he thought they would go out for bids this summer with construction hopefully starting in the fall. Mr. Ruffin asked how long it would take until completion. Ms. Anderson replied she thought it would likely be about a year for the GetAbout portion. Mr. Griggs pointed out they would have to work around seasons, such as when the bats were hibernating. He thought it would depend on what they found once they started the project.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Griggs if he had any objection to involving some of the neighborhood and stakeholders in terms of remediation and tree planting. He understood that had been done with regard to the Flat Branch trail. Mr. Griggs replied they had made that offer with regard to future plantings. Mayor Treece asked if the interpretive suggestions he had made in terms of education with respect to trees, birds, etc. someone might come across was something they could do. Mr. Griggs replied yes, and noted he thought it was important to recognize the impact of what people might see when they rode through the trail.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been around for the 2008 vote and it had a lot do with prioritizing projects for the $13.5 million in GetAbout funds, and they had stayed away from the Shepard to Rollins connection because it had been relatively controversial even then. The conversation was that they did not exactly know where they would get more money for the other trail projects, such as this one and the COLT railroad trail that would go along Paris Road to service the north part of town. This trail had resurfaced in 2015, and he had been the one vote against it. It was not because he was not a fan of trails. He commented that he had received about 350 emails in favor of this, but almost every one of those had come through a group called Salsalabs with two subject lines and the same text. He assumed this had been from the PedNet website. He had also received about 40-50 emails in opposition, and nearly all of those had not been autogenerated. He stated he had always felt that Option 4 was the less expensive option and could serve as a pilot to determine what would happen, and that the comments by Diane and Gregg Suhler had resonated with him the most in terms of the cost when considering the fact sales tax revenues were down. He thought they had to decide where to maximize the benefit and what was in the best community interest, and he maintained that there would be other trails that would likely never be built, including the COLT railroad trail. He also believed they should consider the essence of the strategic plan, which was social equity, and felt the spending of $13-$16 million in a small area violated that plan. He commented that he was not proposing developments only in his neighborhood, but felt they should start making compromises with temporary solutions, like Option 4, rather than building out of the proposed trail. He stated he would vote no for primarily the equity and expense reasons.

B27-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B28-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH4-18 Proposed construction of the Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast intersection improvement project.

PH4-18 was read by the Clerk.
Ms. Anderson provided a staff report.
Mr. Thomas asked for the crash history of this intersection. Ms. Anderson replied she did not have that information with her.
Ms. Peters asked when construction would start if Council approved this tonight. Ms. Anderson replied they were waiting on a signed agreement from MoDOT, and construction was planned for 2020.
Mr. Skala understood there had been development in the vicinity recently, and asked if easements had already been acquired before those properties had been developed. Ms. Anderson replied easements had been obtained from the hotel development.
Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.
There being no comment, Mayor Treece closed the public hearing.
Mr. Thomas understood the memo had indicated zero fatalities and zero serious injury crashes in the last five years, and that there had been one serious injury crash prior to the time frame of the data provided in the memo. He asked about the traffic congestion and time delays at the location. Mr. Stone replied it was actually pretty extensive, especially for eastbound to southbound traffic and northbound to westbound traffic. There were many health facilities in the area, and he did not see that traffic decreasing. He thought it could increase some, and this would allow them to get in front of that. Mr. Thomas asked if it was a delay of a couple minutes during peak hour. Ms. Peters replied it was more like 15-20 minutes. Mr. Skala agreed, unless one cut through the grocery store illegally.
Mr. Thomas stated he would support the project as he believed roundabouts were generally beneficial to the traffic system. He pointed out this was not transportation planning with a Vision Zero lens in his view because it was not a safety issue. It was a traffic delay issue. He thought they would have to weigh the two issues at some point because they only had so much money. He felt they needed to look at where people were being killed and seriously injured in terms of where to invest in transportation improvements.
Mr. Trapp commented that there was terrible traffic there, and explained he had an elderly uncle he took to a lot of medical appointments and a partner with a special needs child so he was out in that area often. He believed this was getting ahead of the issue because the longer people had to wait, the greater their risk tolerance would rise in thinking they could make a turn. He noted he had seen some near misses, and felt it was appropriate in planning to also focus on near misses when analyzing risk. He believed this was a great project because MoDOT would share in the cost. He pointed out the biggest issue was for those on Keene Street because traffic flowed pretty well on the MoDOT roads. He thought they should take advantage of MoDOT covering half of the cost with their funding environment.
Mr. Ruffin stated he had used this intersection quite a bit, and asked how this design would address the visibility issue on I-70 Drive when one was on Keene Street waiting for traffic to clear. Mr. Stone replied the roundabout should provide really good visibility because one would yield to come into the roundabout. It would be a simple roundabout and all directions of traffic should be easy to see. In addition, the pedestrian crossing on south side would be behind the first set of vehicles like most roundabouts. Mr. Ruffin understood the addition of the curve would not impact visibility. Mr. Stone stated he

thought it would make it easier to see due to the raised median for the center section and the ability to provide some visual acuity to the intersection.
Mr. Skala commented that this had pre-dated Vision Zero by a considerable length of time, and it was a traffic congestion issue that had been ongoing for a while. In some cases, at certain times of the day, fifteen minutes would be quick in terms of getting through the intersection. He stated this had been long in coming and felt visibility would be enhanced. He noted he was enthusiastically in support of this project.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the proposed construction of the Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast Intersection improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH5-18 Proposed construction of the FY 2018 sanitary sewer main and manhole rehabilitation project.

PH5-18 was read by the Clerk.
Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.
Mr. Thomas asked for a summary of the data thus far on the basins that had already been rehabilitated. Mr. Sorrell replied a report had been provided about a year ago with flow monitoring data for the basins they had completed. He noted it had been successful in reducing peak flows and the total volume of flows. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Sorrell if he recalled the percentages. Mr. Sorrell replied no. He commented that this past year was not a good indicator because it had been a dry year, but they had seen a pretty good reduction in sanitary sewer overflows during rain events due to these types of projects and modifications to the plant. Mr. Thomas stated that was encouraging.
Mr. Thomas understood these two basins appeared to include the new trunk sewer from Stewart Road and Providence Road to Stadium Boulevard. Mr. Sorrell stated it encompassed most of the downtown area, a big portion of the University, and the area along the trail going toward Stadium Boulevard. Mr. Thomas understood the old trunk sewer had been leaky and had caused problems. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. It had been removed from Stadium Boulevard to Broadway at Sixth Street, and from Elm Street to Hitt Street. Mr. Thomas understood that combined with these projects should have a positive impact in the area. Mr. Sorrell stated they anticipated it would.
Mr. Pitzer asked if staff had already identified where the inflow and infiltration work needed to be done or if part of this project included the identification of that. Mr. Sorrell replied part of this project and some smoke testing would identify some of the lines inside of the greenish/blue area for inflow and infiltration purposes. The lines to be done for structural purposes had already been identified. Mr. Pitzer asked what the inflow and infiltration remediation looked like. He wondered if they would be tearing up the streets in the downtown again. Mr. Sorrell replied no. He explained this rehabilitation work would be done without excavation. They would install a cast in place liner, and rehabilitate manholes from inside the manholes. He noted they might interfere with traffic by having manholes open, but they would not cut the streets open or tear up the pavement. He pointed the smoke testing should also identify downspouts, sump pumps, or area inlets on properties connected to the sewer so they could be disconnected.
Mayor Treece asked if there was any opposition to adopting a more gender neutral maintenance hole term. Mr. Sorrell replied they would look into that. Mayor Treece noted New York had access covers stamped “MH” and had adopted maintenance hole. Mr. Sorrell thought that was reasonable.
Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.
There being no comment, Mayor Treece closed the public hearing.
Mr. Trapp commented that he preferred person hole and sewer plate cover for manhole cover, and noted the inflow and infiltration reductions he recalled from the report a year

ago were from 20-65 percent. The non-engineering explanation of lining was that a polymer was added to fabric so it hardened in the failing cylinder and would not involve the expense of excavation and replacing pipes. It was a less intrusive and more efficient process. He noted they had been bailed out by technology advancing. He commented that historically they had balanced sewer ballots with 80 percent expansion and 20 percent maintenance and rehabilitation. The 2013 sewer ballot had only 20 percent for a few targeted expansion projects, and almost all of the rest had gone toward remediation. He stated remediation was complex, and there were issues other than inflow and infiltration, such as private common collectors and other sources of inflow. There had been great success from monitoring this closely over many years, and this was the next step to addressing the issue. He stated he was very supportive of continuing forward. He understood it was a lot of money, but it had to be done if they wanted to enjoy clean water.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the FY2018 Sanitary Sewer Main and Manhole Rehabilitation project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

R185-17 Expressing support for legislation providing legal access to cannabis as a medicine together with the cultivation of cannabis for medical purposes; endorsing the Missouri Medical Marijuana Initiative.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Trapp commented that R185-17 in its existing form would add medical cannabis to the legislative agenda and encourage citizen support for Petition 2018-051. It had been referenced in the resolution as the New Approach Missouri petition, and there was an amendment sheet that would replace that name with the petition number based upon feedback received. He believed this was important due to a rise in opioid deaths, and noted there were huge economic costs to the opioid epidemic. He understood opioid overdoses had dropped by an average of 25 percent in states with medicinal cannabis laws and the percentage was higher the longer the law had been in place. He explained cannabis was opioid sparing in chronic pain patients, and noted opioid use in patients dropped by roughly 50 percent when they were provided access to cannabis. He commented that cannabis use was associated with not only the reduction of opioid consumption, but with many other drugs, including benzodiazepine, valium, etc. He pointed out most people got into opioid use disorders through the regular medical establishment of a legitimate opioid prescription because there were not safer alternatives allowed within the State of Missouri. He stated he thought of his 90 year old World War II veteran uncle who was struggling with terminal prostate cancer, on a fentanyl patch, and taking oxycodone, as it would be easy for him to accidentally take an extra one and overdose. He pointed out his uncle would not be included in these statistics because a 90 year old with cancer would not be counted as a death from opioid overdose. It would be considered natural causes. He noted Medicare and Medicaid costs were substantially lower in states with cannabis laws because people tended to use it over the dangerous prescription medications. He commented that he had seen some varying statistics with regard to medical marijuana and youth use, and displayed statistics from Colorado from 2009-2015. He explained his uncle's doctor had indicated he would have recommended high quality CBD oil for symptom relief if they lived in a state that had a medical cannabis law, and noted a majority of Americans supported medical marijuana. He pointed out this was not a social issue. It was a public health issue. He commented that they had tabled this issue in December to allow the Board of Health to weigh in, and the Board of Health had recommended support of the statewide legalization of medical marijuana and

Petition 2018-054. He pointed out Petition 2018-051 had the same text as 2018-054 with the exception of the name of the Secretary of State. He understood the Board of Health also recommended the Council support the National Academy of Science's recommendations for a national cannabis research agenda that addressed key gaps in the evidence of beneficial and harmful cannabis use in the short and long term. If they moved forward with the amendment sheet included in the packet, he would further offer an amendment to direct the City Manager to write a letter regarding that recommendation for research. He commented that the reason to add this to the lobbying agenda was so they could be at the table to protect municipal interests as this could impact all kinds of different city issues, and they wanted to ensure it was something that was good for the community and not harmful. He explained he wanted to cover everything, which was why it included lobbying and initiative petitions. He stated he had chosen Petition 2018-051 because it had stood out, was a constitutional approach, which would ensure implementation, and the petitioners had collected signatures and were confident it would be on the ballot. He pointed out there were two amendment sheets. The one included in the packet essentially dropped New Approach Missouri and referred to the petition as 2018-051. He noted Mayor Treece had also prepared amendments that had been handed out tonight, which he read. He explained it essentially got rid of the specific recommendations and moved to a general support of those policies. It also dropped support for a specific petition and moved toward a statewide policy. He stated it was a reasonable approach, but he preferred the amendment sheet that had been a part of the packet.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification between Petition 2018-051, which had been referenced by Mr. Trapp, and Petition 2018-054, which had been recommended by the Board of Health. Mr. Trapp replied the wording was exactly the same, except that Petition 2018-051 referred to Jay Ashcroft as Secretary of State.

Steve Faber, 3004 Woodbine Drive, thanked Mr. Trapp for all of his work on this. He thought they all knew cannabis was a safe and effective medicine by now. He understood some on the Council had wondered if this was appropriate for the City to engage in back in December, and listed health issues, such as exercise opportunities, trails, drug registration, and smoking, in which the City was already involved. He noted one of the tenets of Columbia was social equity and providing an opportunity. He thought allowing someone with PTSD or other medical issues to get off of zombie inducing drugs by taking something productive fell into that realm. He pointed out there were a lot of disabilities that could be treated with cannabis that were currently being treated with other medicines that kept people from being productive and alert individuals. He thought this needed to be addressed if they were serious about the health and safety of citizens and social equity.

Dan Viets, 15 N. Tenth Street, commented that as an attorney that had practiced law in the State of Missouri for over 30 years, he had represented many people that were clearly patients with a legitimate and serious need to access marijuana, who were treated under current Missouri law like the worst criminals in the justice system. He noted they were faced with penalties that included imprisonment for many years if they tried to cultivate marijuana for themselves or share marijuana with other patients. He did not feel they should be treated in that manner. He commented that he thought there were some misunderstandings about the initiative petition as he understood Mayor Treece had indicated on the radio that if the initiative passed landlords would be forced to allow marijuana cultivation in their apartments. He stated he had searched in vain to find any such provision in the initiative, and noted whoever had told him that had been badly misinformed. He pointed out it was legal to own dogs, but it did not mean the landlord had to allow a tenant to have a dog, and thought the same could be said about the growing of marijuana. He commented that a marijuana plant with one pound of consumable cannabis was rare, and understood concern had been expressed about patients being allowed to cultivate six plants for themselves. He noted insurance and

Medicaid did not cover medical marijuana, and most patients with a chronic and serious health problem were living on very limited income. The additional expense of purchasing cannabis was considerable, and allowing cultivation was a logical and reasonable alternative. He pointed out 30 other states allowed patients to cultivate it, and six was the typical number of plants allowed. He stated he felt there was a great deal of evidence of the causal relationship between allowing medical cannabis and a reduction in opioid overdose deaths, and believed reducing deaths of citizens was a good topic for the Council. He understood some believed there had not been enough research yet, and he recommended they visit pubmed.gov as there were 26,858 published scientific and medical journal articles about marijuana. He did not feel there was justification in denying patients access based on a lack of research as there was a ton of research. He understood the reason this had been delayed in December was because the Council wanted feedback from the Board of Health, and they along with the Commission on Human Rights were supportive. The Council also had a report from the Disabilities Commission from a couple of years ago on a related question. He believed it was appropriate for the Council to adopt the resolution.

Mr. Pitzer noted the Board of Health had also recommended supporting a national research policy. Mr. Viets stated he did not see any harm in doing more research, and was not opposed to more research. His argument was that it was not a reason to put patients in prison in the meantime.

Peter Beiger, 1411 Pratt Street, commented that he was representing those canvasing the State of Missouri for signatures in support of the New Approach Missouri initiative on medical cannabis, which according the recent polling was supported by Missouri voters overwhelmingly. He understood U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions had indicated those in support of cannabis were bad people, and he did not believe they were bad people. They were good people, who were well-informed, industrious, educated, honest, and kind. They were adults simply seeking opportunities of this native plant so as to grow it, share it, use it, sell it, and enjoy its medicinal properties. He stated they knew hemp and cannabis were useful and worthwhile. They were useful at healing and soothing all sorts of ailments, such as PTSD, AIDS, arthritis, Parkinson's, anxiety, depression, and migraine headaches. He understood a company in London was producing a cannabis extract called Sativex, which had been patented and manufactured in the form of a spray and administered orally to relieve pain. He pointed out when he was a young man he had been diagnosed as being manic depressive, which, today, would be called bipolar, and he had been successfully treated by a kind physician with cannabis sativa tincture and brownies, so he was living testament to its benefits. At 75 years old, he had all of the problems of aging, and would greatly appreciate a medicinal cannabis miracle. He also provided a handout.

Heather Harlan, 302 Loch Lane, stated she worked in the field of substance abuse, but was not speaking for her agency. She commented that, most of the time, on an evening like this, there were more people in support of marijuana access, and believed those on the other side tended not to speak up for a variety of reasons. She noted most of the treatment issued in this country was paid for by the government, i.e. taxpayers, and by law, those agencies were not allowed to have a position on bills in the community or other states. She stated many agencies were afraid of losing funding by speaking out one way or the other, and those with family members that had struggled with addition would likely not come to a meeting to discuss those health issues because it was private information. She pointed out those in support of marijuana in Oregon had $4 million while preventionists only had $150,000. She did not feel this was about legalization, and believed it was about commercialization instead as there was a lot of money riding on it. She understood there might be medical benefits, but did not feel the Council should skip over the FDA, and pointed out they had gotten into the opioid mess with the supervision of the FDA. She commented that she would only change her mind if the Council could show her how they would keep marijuana out of the hands of young people. She stated

Columbia was already known as the drunkest community in the State of Missouri because they did not take keeping alcohol and other drugs out of the hands of youth who were most affected by the psychotropic drugs seriously. If the Council chose to move forward with this, she asked that they figure out how they would clean up the mess for family members. She noted she was aware of an 18 year old college student whose life had been taken over by marijuana use, and his family had used their retirement savings to send him to college, so they now had thousands of dollars of treatment bills on top of that. She again asked the Council to be prepared to deal with those issues. She also asked the Council to look at the science as the reduction in the death of opioid overdose with the use of medical marijuana was still correlation, and there were many moving parts to the issue. She felt there were likely more pressing legislative issues on which the City could spend its funding.

Rena Ruth explained she had taught all levels of school to include high school, and believed kids would drink and smoke whether it was legal or not. She stated she would rather a kid's life not be ruined for possessing marijuana, and thought it was better than alcohol. She also did not feel it was a gateway drug.

Tiffany Zane stated she had an incurable medical diagnosis called pseudotumor cerebri so inside her head lived every symptom of a brain tumor except for an actual tumor. This meant she had high pressure in her head and swollen optical nerves. She understood people who had this condition were moving to Oregon and Colorado because it had been found that certain strains of marijuana helped. She noted she instead took a prescription medication that was toxic to the liver and kidneys, and had a cost of $1,500 per month without insurance and $150 per month with insurance. It was her way of avoiding a brain shunt. She stated her brother had a medical condition whereby pain pills and pain medicine did not work for him for a variety of genetic reasons, and he had indicated to her that marijuana followed the 3A4 gene, but he could not try it since it was not legal here. She commented that she had dated a guy when she was younger who had smoked marijuana, and she did not feel it was a gateway drug. She just saw a bunch of young people acting stupid and getting hungry. Up until nine years ago, when she had been diagnosed, she had believed it was an awful thing and its medicinal use was hogwash. She stated she only wanted to put an impromptu face on a group of people the Council might not realize could benefit from its use.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated he was in opposition to breathing secondhand smoke. He was agreeable to the use of marijuana if it provided a benefit to individuals as long as it was not allowed to be smoked creating a situation where someone else could get high from breathing in the smoke.

Mayor Treece stated one of his concerns was that they had specifically named an initiative petition that they did not know would be on the ballot, and felt it would be safer and loftier to express support for a statewide policy that provided the legal framework. He thought his draft accomplished the same thing with respect to the support of those policies. Like most healthcare decisions, he felt this was an issue that was best decided between patients and their doctors, and that was where he preferred to leave it, but he also understood they likely needed the statewide policy to get there.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend R185-17 per the amendment sheet he had handed out that evening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala stated he was glad they had tabled this issue in order to obtain feedback from the Board of Health as they had clarified some of the issues. He pointed out he tended to agree with their recommendation to support medical marijuana, and understood they had reservations regarding some of the other issues, such as cultivation, licensing, etc. He stated he supported the idea of medical marijuana as he thought there was a good deal of correlational evidence. He was also convinced there were benefits of medical marijuana, but was uncomfortable with supporting a particular initiative petition and having their lobbyist advocate for it. He commented that he viewed initiative petitions as the business of the people, and did not feel this Council had any business telling the lobbyist

to lobby the State with respect to a particular initiative petition. He explained he liked the amendments proposed by Mayor Treece because it broadened the language they would provide the lobbyist and would allow him to advocate for the idea and the policy behind medical marijuana.

Mr. Thomas noted he supported the amendment as well. He believed they were taking a more general approach to what they were saying, and it was preferable to being highly specific with regard to specific legislation or an initiative petition.

Mr. Pitzer agreed with many of the previous comments. He felt if a patient and his or her doctor decided medical marijuana was the best treatment, they should be able to proceed without government involvement. In terms of the cultivation issue, he, like the Board of Health, had some trouble with it. He noted their legislative liaison had counseled them that a more focused approach on lobbying efforts was more effective than loading up the docket and advocating for a lot of different issues, and he believed there were other pressing and relevant issues where they needed to focus their lobbying efforts. He reiterated he supported the issue in general and was happier not support a specific initiative. While it might ultimately be the one that was successful and involve the best policy, there was also a chance it would not be or that it would have issues later. He did not what to take the chance of being on record for something that might cast a negative light in some way. He stated he would support the amendments suggested by Mayor Treece.

The motion by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend R185-17 per the amendment sheet he handed out that evening was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased they would make a recommendation and move forward on this. He appreciated the support as he knew it had been difficult. He felt it was important and that this would add emphasis and momentum to both of the efforts.

Mr. Thomas commented that he appreciated the advocacy of Ms. Harlan in reminding them there were serious consequences of marijuana use at a young age. It had been well documented that addiction to all kinds of substances had a higher propensity at a young age. He noted they had discussed that at length when they had raised the age of tobacco purchases from 18 years old to 21 years old within the city limits. While he would support the resolution, he thought they should search for ways to ensure it did not increase access to marijuana for young people. He agreed with some speakers in that the overall impact was beneficial when comparing it with the negative impact of terrible diseases for which marijuana provided relief. He pointed out he had known two people personally that had received tremendous relief from marijuana for multiple sclerosis prior to their deaths, and had also known people that were addicted to opioids and would have potentially not been addicted to it if they had access to marijuana. Those personal stories along with the preponderance of evidence and the support of the Board of Health were the reasons for his vote in favor of the resolution.

Mr. Skala pointed out there was a very large distinction between addiction and psychological dependence, and early studies had indicated that there might be some psychological dependence with THC, but it was really addiction when it came to substances like cocaine and opioids. He agreed with the comments made that they needed to be mindful of marijuana use as there would likely be some abuse on some level, and that they needed consider a balance due to its benefits.

The vote on R185-17, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B20-18 Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road intersection from PD (Planned District) to IG

(General Industrial District) (Case No. 18-18).

Discussion shown with B21-18.

R9-18 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Centerstate Plat 14 located on the southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road intersection (Case No. 18-35).

Discussion shown with B21-18.

B21-18 Approving the Final Plat of Centerstate Plat 14, a Replat of Lot 1 Centerstate Plat 13, located on the southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-17).

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk, and the resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood there was property on the west side, north of Menards and across Vandiver Drive, that was scheduled to be developed and asked if that had been zoned for multi-family purposes. Mr. Teddy replied an apartment complex with around 300 units had been proposed for that location.

Mr. Teddy continued the staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the issue with the preliminary plat for the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) had to do with the incursion of the flood zone and the driveway. Mr. Teddy stated the thought there had been the desire of some of the PZC members to see more control of driveway placement and the avoidance of the flood fringe in terms of best practice. The flood fringe had been delineated by a purple line in the diagram shown, and it had a one percent chance of inundation occurring in any given year. It was not as closely regulated as the floodway, which was an area where fill and structures were not allowed per ordinance. In terms of the driveway, a lot had to be at least 300 feet to accommodate a driveway. The City also reserved the right to require shared access, and would look at the specifics of the proposed construction when making that judgement.

Mayor Treece asked if there were a list of uses that were allowed under the industrial zoning per the new Unified Development Code (UDC). Mr. Teddy replied no residential was allowed in IG, and explained they had identified this site as not being a good residential site because it was surrounded by major roadways so it would have a lot of traffic impact and noise. He listed some uses that were allowed, not allowed, or allowed with a conditional use permit.

Mr. Thomas asked what additional uses, if any, would be allowed if they approved the change from PD to IG. Mr. Teddy replied heavy industry would be allowed with a conditional use permit. Mr. Thomas understood those were not allowed under the existing PD. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Commercial, meaning retail uses, and residential had been designated on the lot since 2008. He commented that it had started out as an all residential area, and the owner had requested the change for more of a commercial zoning after the Vandiver Drive project had been designed in this alignment. Now there was a request for further movement toward industrial functions. He stated the most significant change was really in procedure as there would not be a public site plan review if the PD designation was taken off of this site.

Caleb Colbert, an attorney with offices at 601 E. Broadway, provided a handout and stated he was present on behalf of Last Enterprises, LLC to ask for support for their rezoning request and approval of the preliminary and final plats. He explained the request for rezoning was from a planned district that did not have an approved site plan on it at this time to the open zoning classification of IG. The intent of that request was to facilitate light industrial uses. They were also requesting approval of a preliminary plat

and final plat, which would subdivide the existing seven acre lot into three smaller lots. He commented that the requests were not contingent upon approval of each other.

Mayor Treece asked what they wanted if the Council chose not to rezone the property. Mr. Colbert replied they would still like to move forward with the preliminary plat and final plat. He pointed out the opposite would be true as well.

Ms. Peters asked if the lot could be subdivided into three lots without the rezoning. Mr. Colbert replied yes, and explained it would just remain in the planned district.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Colbert if he could confirm any conditions in the plat that would be foreclosed upon if the zoning was denied. Mr. Colbert replied he did not believe so, but would defer to the engineers with regard to the conditions on the plat.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Teddy if that was an issue from his perspective. Mr. Teddy understood the question was whether subdivision was dependent on zoning. Mr. Pitzer stated that was correct. Mr. Teddy commented that he did not believe there was an issue as a lot zoned commercial could be divided into three lots as could a lot zoned industrial.

Ms. Peters asked if light industrial use was allowed with the PD. Mr. Teddy replied it was allowed under the present zoning, but it would have to be an all indoor operation and meet the definition of light industrial.

Mr. Colbert noted the subject area was northeast of the existing Bass Pro and Menards shops, east of Highway 63, and west of Vandiver Drive. He explained one of the reasons they were requesting a rezoning was because the existing zoning had not worked. The property had been in the planned zoning designation for many years without any activity. It was in a planned commercial district that had several retail uses within it. He noted four restaurants had closed on the west side of Highway 63 as there was not a demand for that type of land use in the area. He commented that being in a planned district also involved a lot of speculation on the part of a buyer in that it required an investment to come up with a site specific plan prior to being able to do anything with the property because one did not know if that site specific plan would be approved. He stated they believed rezoning to the IG district made sense for this property. It was a seven acre island surrounded by major roadways on the west and east, and the industrial designation would allow the property to be used for a wider range of uses, including light industry, artisan industry, commercial services, storage, and distribution. They felt rezoning would allow for the opportunity to have an employment center whereby neighborhoods to the east could walk or bike to it.

Mayor Treece asked if there was anything there that could not be done with the PD zoning. Mr. Colbert replied in theory they could ask for any possible use under the UDC if this was a new PD. In this instance they had a statement of intent that pre-dated the UDC that indicated only the uses on that statement of intent were allowed. He did not believe the adoption of the UDC removed all of the existing limitations on the statement of intent for this particular property. Mayor Treece agreed he did not believe it did. He only felt industrial was a dramatic departure from the planned district. Mr. Colbert commented that there were several protections that he would get to momentarily that might address some of the concerns.

Mr. Colbert noted another reason they felt rezoning made sense was because a goal of the UDC was to move away from planned districts because they were difficult to administer since ordinances were specific to individual properties and did not apply citywide. He displayed the list of uses allowed under the existing planned district, and stated time had shown those uses were not attractive to the market in this area.

Mr. Skala did not believe that was an exhaustive list. Mr. Colbert stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood each of those items would still have to be approved under a plan. Mr. Colbert stated that was correct. He explained they could no longer have shelved planned districts like this under the UDC. If a property were to be zoned as a planned district today, a site plan would have to accompany it.

Mr. Skala understood the PD designation was a function of going from the old system to

the UDC, and that meant planned districts, whether PUD, C-P, or O-P, fell into the PD category until which time they were rezoned. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He noted the UDC explicitly said if it was an approved planned district prior to its adoption, it fell within the rules in effect with that planned district. In this case, there was an ordinance passed in 2008 that currently applied to the property. Mr. Skala understood if they wanted to change the uses, they would have to go through the planning process.

Mr. Skala asked if a brand new piece of property could be zoned PD. Mr. Teddy replied yes.

Mr. Colbert commented that prior to this hearing he had been provided a bright yellow flier that had been distributed to draw attention to the rezoning request, and there were a list of uses outlined in the flier. Those uses included adult retail and indoor adult entertainment so folks were raising the possibility that a sexually oriented business could be located at this site. As an attorney, that was categorically not true. State law had a 1,000 foot setback from any residential property, church building, or park, and a 1,000 foot radius from this site included church office buildings and a single family residence on the west side of Highway 63. Of the eight uses listed, two were prohibited by state law, and some of the other uses listed, such as junkyard, vehicle wrecking, heavy industry, bar, and nightclub, would require a conditional use permit. As a result, they were prohibited unless the Council approved that use on this site. He pointed out light industry had its own design standards. It required certain enclosures and screenings that were different than what was required for other uses. He noted one of the features of the UDC was the adoption of these use specific standards. He stated he felt replatting would reduce the scale of development because they were taking a seven acre lot and breaking it up into three small 2-3 acre lots. It would prevent the type and scale of development with which some in the area had concerns. He commented that the truck terminals off of Route Z were 10-20 acre lots. Heavy shipping would not be done on 2-3 acre lots. He pointed out Menards was located on a 17 acre site. He felt this platting would build in protections as it would increase screening and landscaping requirements, and would reduce what they could do with the site overall. He understood two of the three no votes at the PZC meeting were due to concerns about whether or not development was permitted on property that was within the floodplain overlay. He noted the UDC allowed building in the floodplain under certain conditions. He referred to Section 29-1.6 of the Columbia Code of Ordinances, which indicated the regulations of the overlay district controlled any property that was in an overlay district, so he felt they should have the opportunity to develop in the floodplain subject to the regulations in the floodplain overlay.

Nick Borgmeyer, 2801 Woodard Drive, explained he was a project manager with Simon Oswald Architecture and that their offices were just across Highway 63 to the west of the subject property. He noted the concept of the site plan was to break the lot into three smaller lots with buildings that agreed with one another in a business park approach and had fronts that faced both Highway 63 and Vandiver Drive. The site plan developed thus far would consist of pervious surfaces of 55 percent, and would conform to setback, landscaping, and building requirements. The buildings would be approximately 20,000 square feet each. Employee parking would be on the Highway 63 side, and loading, service, or access parking would be on the Vandiver Drive side. He noted they were currently looking at tilt up concrete construction for the wall structure. He displayed diagrams showing how the buildings might look with the required landscaping.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the owner planned to do this regardless of whether they had tenants if it was approved. Mr. Borgmeyer replied they were currently planning to build the northernmost building.

Mr. Skala understood the applicant had petitioned for a rezoning to avoid additional site plan costs and for changes in the uses, and that nothing would prevent the applicant from building exactly what had been shown with the current zoning of a PD district. Mr. Borgmeyer agreed the building form could be the same, but noted it would be less marketable. Ms. Peters asked why it would be less marketable. Mr. Borgmeyer replied

it was due to the amount of work that would be required for the party moving into the building as had been mentioned by Mr. Colbert.

Benjamin Ross stated he was with Engineering Surveys and Services and they had been retained to help Last Enterprises prepare the engineering work for the project. He explained the site was in the middle of a major highway and previously improved roads, like Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road. He noted shoulders would soon be constructed on Ballenger Lane, and the subject site would be less than a two mile drive from the East Neighborhood Strategic Plan Area to this employment center site. He displayed a diagram, which showed the arterial roads, and explained they were designed for large vehicles and traffic volumes. He noted the site would allow businesses to access Highway 63 and I-70 to the south so it was a great spot for light industrial or warehouse type buildings. He pointed out the roundabout on Vandiver Drive was designed to be expanded in the future to two lanes, and had truck aprons to handle large semi-trucks that had 53-foot trailers. In addition, bike ramps and pedestrian facilities were already in place. Based on light industrial and warehouse uses, they were estimating about 60 vehicles during peak hours to and from the site for all three buildings. This was much less traffic than a sit down restaurant would generate. He stated they thought about 85 percent of the traffic would drive south on Vandiver Drive to access Highway 63 and did not think trucks would utilize Mexico Gravel Road, which was a major arterial with 6,000 vehicles per day now. He commented that when the City had constructed Vandiver Drive, they had included storm sewer infrastructure, so there were two existing bioretention basins that treated stormwater runoff from the street. He noted this development would have to follow all current City standards in terms of water quality and stormwater detention, and runoff would not flow directly into the Hinkson Creek. He explained there was some floodplain fringe on the site, and pointed out if they had a 100-year rain event in the Hinkson Creek watershed, there would be about a foot of water over Vandiver Drive at the south end of the site near the flood fringe. He displayed a schematic from the Boone County Flood Insurance Study as it showed the difference between the floodway and the floodplain fringe. The middle part was referred to as the floodway and included the actual stream channel and the area that needed to be protected from development. He explained the federal government allowed development in the floodplain fringe, which was on the very edges of the site, and pointed out the City actually built in it when it constructed Vandiver Drive. He described the location where they might want to put fill in the floodplain fringe, and noted it was permitted by the floodplain overlay district and the federal standards. He commented that a 100-year event was equivalent to 7.3 inches of rain in 24 hours in the Hinkson Creek watershed, and at least two inches of rain would be required in fifteen minutes. If that were to occur, there would be street flooding all over town.

Mary Jo Kopp stated her and her husband, Jeff, lived northeast of Mexico Gravel Road, and noted they had been told about this development less than two weeks ago. She understood semi-trucks would utilize the roundabouts about six times per hour, and believed that would create a problem. She also understood Paris Road was industrial, and did not feel this area would lend itself to that type of activity. She believed traffic would be an issue and that it would be harmful to the residents on the north and east side. She stated they were opposed to this request, and hoped the Council would consider the north side to be very attractive in spots. She suggested this activity be located in a place that would not affect so many other things.

Jerry Blair explained he was a physician with offices off of Amron Court, which was off of Woodard Drive, on the west side of Highway 63, across from the proposed site. He noted they owned the lot on which the office was located and the adjacent lot, and had become concerned when they had learned about the potential for a change in zoning of property that currently seemed to be zoned appropriately for the area and was zoned the same as their property. He commented that certain types of industrial businesses could potentially negatively affect their property values and create major risks to the elderly

population they served in terms of traffic flow. He stated the proposal by the architect seemed to be very well adapted to the current zoning. He did not see any reason to change the zoning to industrial, and although the applicant had not expressed any intent for industrial uses on the property, it could be used for it if rezoned.

Robin Stover, 3850 Wellington Drive, commented that she had lived at this site for 20 years and had seen the area develop quite a bit. Although there was some commercial zoning, it was still very much a residential area. She and her daughter picked up trash up and down the road every 6-8 weeks, and could not imagine how much more trash there would be if the proposed site was rezoned. She asked the Council to think about those that lived out there. She noted the Battle area was growing, and felt this area could become more residential. She commented that she wanted it to remain an area where people could walk up and down the roads and enjoy the nature that was out there.

Lucinda Dunn stated her and her husband owned 5.5 acres of land approximately 3,000 feet east of the subject site, and they had resided there for 21 years. She believed rezoning this property to industrial would have a negative and significant impact on the future direction of development in this part of the community because it would introduce industrial zoning to a previously industrial-free area. It would set a precedent and encourage future industrial rezoning for nearby properties. She noted there were several large undeveloped lots next to subject site, which, if rezoned, could develop into an industrial barrier cutting off neighborhoods in the northeast sector from the rest of Columbia. She did not feel there was any need to rezone this property. The current PD zoning allowed for a number of uses that were acceptable and productive. The same plan could be developed without the rezoning. The other side of Highway 63 had the same PD zoning and had developed beautifully over the last ten years with office buildings that had improved the northeast sector. She believed that would spread to the subject site if the zoning remained the same because the west side of Highway 63 was now saturated. She commented that she felt the residents were being forced to convince the Council to leave the zoning the same, and thought the Council instead should be thoroughly convinced there was a need to change the zoning. She did not believe the need was there, and hoped the Council would look to the future in making this decision as she felt it was the first step in a process that could lead to industrial zoning to the north and south, and potentially to the east. She stated she believed the current owner would not construct something that looked terrible, but pointed out the rezoning stayed with the land, so that could change years from now, and it was a very visible location. She felt it was in the best interest of Columbia for the Council to vote against the rezoning.

Margie Leaton commented that she had moved into the Wellington Villas in 2015 and loved it. It was a nice neighborhood with upscale homes. Most of the people out there were retirees or close to that age. There were only a couple of young families. She was worried about her property value going down if the subject site was rezoned to industrial. She asked the Council to keep in mind that this was conceptual and nothing was permanent. If that concept did not work out, it could change. If the subject site was zoned industrial, she believed it could encourage other industrial developments. She pointed out that most of the people that came to see her came from Highway 63 and took Vandiver Drive to Mexico Gravel Road. She could see problems with infrastructure and runoff, and felt the semi-trucks traveling on those roads would damage them. She commented that she was proud of her home, and did not want to move again at the age of 78.

Nile Kemble, 3000 E. Henley Drive, stated he lived to the west of the subject site, and had been there for 26 years. He thanked Mr. Land and his associates for getting together with the Neighborhood Association and the other neighbors in the area to discuss their plan. He understood some restaurants in the area had not made it. He felt one had not made it because it had been built before the infrastructure was there for people to visit it, and the other had closed due to management at a higher level. He believed there would be a need for restaurants in the area and the subject tract would be ideal for it. He noted

the neighborhood did not have any problem with the replatting of the lot from one to three lots, and was actually very much in favor of it. He stated he had recently driven by the Blue Ridge Industrial area, and agreed with the comments of Ms. Dunn in that when the development was first constructed, a nice fancy building would be constructed, but as time went on it would become an eyesore. He also pointed out there was a lot of land for industrial purposes of off Route B and Waco Road so he did not understand the need for more industrial land on the subject site, especially since what they wanted to put on it could be done under the current zoning. He understood the staff report had indicated this was ideal and that they did not feel there would be a domino effect from this rezoning because it was surrounded by roads and the area to the south was not, but the tract of land to the south of Vandiver Drive was for sale again. In addition, the roundabout on Vandiver Drive had an undeveloped exit on the southeast corner. He believed the original plan was for a road to go from that intersection to the dead end road by Home Depot. He stated the Neighborhood Association was asking the Council to take all of that into consideration and to vote against the rezoning.

John Holley, 4211 Mexico Gravel Road, commented that he strongly disagreed with this or any other rezoning request for that site. He wanted it to remain a pretty site and undeveloped. He believed it was a beautiful location because it was a part of the road between two roundabouts, and noted it was a gateway to the east part of Columbia. He felt a development with three large buildings would create more traffic on those area streets, and block everything from Highway 63 to the east. He urged the Council to vote against the rezoning.

Bennett Magnino, 4403 Mexico Gravel Road, stated there had been discussion at the PZC meeting about the CATSO Plan with regard to building a connector road from Vandiver Drive to Clark Lane, and understood there was not any concrete plan to make that connection. In addition, if this property was rezoned to industrial, he did not believe it would be rezoned again, and as the land opened up to the south, even if it was 20 years from now, a precedent would be set to add more industrial zoning. He understood Mexico Gravel Road had seen some significant work about ten years ago, and stated he had been told by the neighbors that the development and increased local activity that had come with it had changed the tenor of the neighborhood. He worried that inviting industry to encroach on the neighborhood would change the current feeling, making it more like other parts of Columbia. That was not necessarily a bad thing as he liked Columbia, but he felt there should be some diversity in the residential spaces within the community.

Tyler Dunn explained he had lived less than a mile from this property for over fifteen years. He understood the applicant, Mr. Land, was asking the Council to make a material change to land use in this part of Columbia based purely on speculation. He noted Mr. Land had met with some of the concerned residents on January 24, 2018, and had represented to them that he had a vision for the property, which involved three distribution warehouses, but could not guarantee what would happen there as he did not have any tenants lined up to utilize those warehouses or buyers for the parcels if the plat was subdivided. He stated Mr. Land had also acknowledged he would not have control over how the property was ultimately used if he sold it. He understood the plan was to possibly break ground on one of the warehouses on the north side, and afterwards, Mr. Land would only move forward as required. Mr. Dunn commented that he felt the Council should require something more than hopeful speculation when making this type of material and indefinite change to the use of property in this area of the community. He understood there had been discussion as to the allowable uses of the property, and listed all of the allowable uses per the statement of intent as he felt that was an expansive list. He noted the applicant was asking for this to be changed to an even broader and more expansive list as industrial was the most expansive zoning classification they had, and did not feel this should be done solely based on his vision for the property. In addition, he felt the diagrams and reports regarding traffic, stormwater runoff, and environment impact were immaterial since there were not any definitive plans for the property. He noted there

was a pedway trail along the creek, which he wanted to see preserved. He also asked the Council to consider the Hinkson Creek and any environmental concerns there might be in having a creek in such close proximity to industrial zoning. He commented that there would be a greater need for services in this part of the community, especially with a 304 unit residential apartment complex that would be constructed nearby, and believed this parcel, as it was presently zoned, was perfectly situated to satisfy some of those needs. He understood there had been a proposal for sports complex at the Fairgrounds, and although it was ambitious, if done, it could draw people to the region and by the subject property. He wondered what it might look like 10-15 years from now if zoned industrial. He did not feel they wanted that to be the face of Columbia. He asked for those in opposition to this rezoning request to stand, and approximately sixteen people stood.

Lee Caldwell stated she lived in the Wellington subdivision and noted it was disturbing and frustrating to her that a businessman could purchase a small greenspace parcel of land in a residential area and decide how he could make the most money developing it with total disregard to the private citizens residing in the area and the impact to their quality of life and property values. She commented that the parcel of greenspace was a huge factor in her deciding to purchase a home out there. She asked the Council to vote against the requested rezoning.

Tiffany Zane explained she lived on Timber Lane, which was 1-2 miles to the east of the subject site, and the speed limit was 45 mph between the two roundabouts. She was concerned it would create the potential for lots of casualties if there were wrecks because she had four children, and there were two elementary schools, a couple of churches and three daycares nearby. She noted she had lived in Columbia all of her life and had lost classmates in high school to wrecks with semi-trucks, and did not want to see this happen in that area. She commented that Wellington Estates was similar to the south side of Columbia as it was a very nice neighborhood. She understood a representative of the applicant had indicated the site would create sixty extra vehicles per hour, and that was essentially one extra vehicle per minute on an already busy street. She had heard someone else indicate six semi-trucks per hour, which was an extra semi-truck every ten minutes, and noted this traffic would tear up the road. She did not feel the roundabouts handled the current traffic well. The one on the south side was treated as a speedway, and semi-trucks had difficulty maneuvering the one on the north.

Mark Farnen, 103 E. Brandon Road, stated he was present on behalf of the applicant, Last Enterprises, and commented that both sides suffered from the same dilemma of speculation. The complaints were based upon what might happen and what the site might look like in 30 years, and it was assumed it would be worse than it was today. He understood one of the concerns stated was with regard to traffic as it was estimated there would be an increase of sixty trips per hour at the site, all of which would go on to Vandiver Drive with 85 percent then traveling to Highway 63 through the Vandiver Drive roundabout. If the property was zoned commercial or they stayed with the allowed uses in the statement of intent, 10-11 times more traffic would be generated by those commercial and retail uses. It would be the cause of the most traffic and the most deterioration of the roadways. He commented that none of the traffic at the current time would have direct access to Mexico Gravel Road, and virtually all of the truck traffic would go south unless someone needed to go to Paris Road. He stated what they wanted to do on the site would be better in terms of traffic, as it would be less intense, and marketability. He understood it fit the land well per conversations with City staff and PZC members, and might be the best use of the land, which was what the decision of Council should be based upon. The decision should not be based upon the domino effect with regard to what someone might do on adjoining property in the future. He commented that he felt the UDC had asked them to go away from planned zoning and to find a category that would work. He stated they had not rushed this to judgement as the land had been purchased over two years ago, and they had waited to move forward due to the UDC. He

noted this application had been submitted under every new rule that had been written without a request for a variance or design modification, and asked the Council to approve both the replatting and the rezoning, which was an appropriate zoning category.

Mayor Treece asked if the applicant had been aware of the rezoning when the property was purchased. Mr. Farnen replied yes. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Farnen if he had advocated for all existing uses to be grandfathered into the UDC. Mr. Farnen asked for clarification. Mayor Treece understood he had asked for the existing zoning to be protected under the UDC, and was now asking for a change because they had somehow been impacted by the UDC. Mr. Farnen explained they had waited to advocate for any particular use on the property and had not made overt actions to include them in any other part of the UDC until they had learned what would be specified for the different categories. He commented that they had not advocated for all of the uses in the statement of intent.

Mr. Skala understood if one took a virgin piece of property right now and zoned it as PD, it could have a more expansive list of uses. This particular property, which had been C-P and had defaulted to PD, was subject to the original C-P uses that had been established. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. If the applicant wanted to submit an application under the current code for a planned district, they could ask for any combination of uses and restrictions, but there would have to be a site plan with it.

Paul Land stated he was the General Manager of Last Enterprises, the applicant, and had not meant for this to be controversial. He felt a great place for industrial zoning was between two highways and completely away from everyone. He noted the complaints were from people seven-tenths of a mile to a mile and one-half away, and he had not anticipated this kind of response. He believed the decision tonight was about land use and whether or not this was an appropriate spot for that land use given the design characteristics of the site. It would have sounded a lot less threatening if the UDC had included a technology or employment center zoning, but those zoning classifications were not options. He commented that the UDC had another zoning district known as the M-BP district, and industrial was within the definition of that district, but light industrial required a conditional use permit. He felt there were nuances in the UDC with which he was trying to conform, and pointed out that aesthetic assurances were not guaranteed under a planned district either. He hoped his commitment within the Columbia community over the past 35 years in working with only office, industrial, and business properties would stand for something, and that they understood he would build the highest integrity of property. He stated he did not like the fact the Council had to choose one over the other, and would respect their decision. He commented that he did not feel there would be damage to the roads as those roads were not built to be damaged by the type of traffic this development would generate.

Mr. Trapp asked for the vacancy rate for industrial property in Columbia. Mr. Land replied 6.6 percent, which was historically low, and nationwide it was 12 percent. It was part of the reason for the size and look of buildings he was proposing. He wanted to create something different. They tended to see the backs of industrial buildings driving along Highway 63 and I-70, and he wanted his buildings to face those roads as he had seen in other communities. He stated inventory did not exist for the size of buildings he had proposed, and the intent was to have them occupied by a single user or not more than two users per building. He noted he would hold out for the highest and best users.

Mr. Skala commented that he had lived on the northeast side of Columbia for almost 40 years and noted he intended to vote against the rezoning request. He agreed this was conceptual in nature on both sides. There was fear of the domino effect, impacts to property values, etc. He stated he felt zoning was not an entitlement, and did not see any reason to rezone it to an industrial category as what had been proposed could be accomplished in the same way with existing zoning except that there might be some additional costs due to the need for the site plan or a the need to change some of the allowed uses. He also agreed some of the residences were a half-mile to a mile away,

but reiterated he could not see any compelling reason to change the zoning.

Mr. Trapp commented that he agreed it was fair to say the Council should be thoroughly convinced to grant the zoning change, and noted he believed that had been met. He did not feel the uses that were allowed under the PD plan were additive. They were all service uses that would serve those who lived in the area and did not add any dollars to the economy. An employment center with light industrial uses would generate wealth, value, employment, and jobs, and this was currently not a strong sector in Columbia as the strong sectors were education and insurance. He felt they needed to get beyond those sectors if they wanted to meet the employment needs of citizens, which was why he thought they should consider this. Columbia had really low industrial vacancies. The City had lost economic deals and had lost start-up companies to other communities because they were not able to find facilities. In order to bring living wage jobs to the community, they needed places to put them, which involved land that was zoned appropriately and buildings. In this situation, they had the intent to build at least one building. He believed they would have to bring in more industrial buildings if they were going to have manufacturing and warehousing jobs that paid a living wage and did not require a college education, which could ameliorate poverty and reduce the African-American employment rate. He noted job centers that were somewhat close to residential areas increased the chance people that would walk and bike to work. This was an isolated site that adjoined Highway 63 and Vandiver Drive, and was seven-tenths of a mile from residential uses. He felt it was appropriate and stated there was a desire to break up the site into three sites regardless of zoning, which would offer some protection. He thought the rezoning and replatting were warranted and planned to support both.

Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Skala had indicated the exact same uses the applicant wanted to place on this property could be done under the existing zoning with the only downside being additional work in preparing plans. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Teddy if it was accurate that the plans that had been presented by the applicant for the three warehouse buildings could be built on the property with more plan preparation and submission under the existing PD zoning. Mr. Teddy replied he believed that was true. He explained they had not done a review of that exhibit as it had not been a part of the application. Mr. Skala understood it would require some expense and a change in the uses. Mr. Teddy stated there was a fairly restrictive list of uses in the statement of intent. At the time the property had been rezoned to C-P, light industrial had been an authorized use under C-P, but it had not actually been stated in that specific planned district that it was a use they wanted. Mr. Thomas asked what it would take to add light industrial. Mr. Teddy replied an amendment of the C-P, which would go through the process like a rezoning.

Mr. Thomas stated he was interested to hear what everyone else had to say as this was a difficult decision. He thought it was a very suitable piece of property for light industrial, small scale warehousing as it was completely surrounded by very busy highways and conveniently located on the highway to move goods in and out, but there had also been very compelling testimony from a large number of nearby residents who felt this would be damaging to their quality of life.

Mayor Treece noted he was opposed to the rezoning because he thought it was a significant downward departure from what everything around there was zoned. For those that had spoken tonight, the roundabout to Vandiver Drive was the means of egress and ingress to their neighborhood, and they would have to drive right by this site every day. He believed this was a major gateway from the north coming down Highway 63 to the Fairgrounds and Columbia. He applauded Mr. Land for the renderings presented, but understood all of that along with the uses contemplated were allowable under the PD zoning, and this had been known when the applicant had purchased the property two years ago. It was not as though he had purchased it 20 years ago and had inherited the zoning restriction. He stated he was reluctant to put that neighborhood at risk because

of some unknown plan in the future.
Mr. Pitzer stated he viewed the site differently as it was surrounded by major roads, and agreed it was a difficult decision. He commented that it sounded like those opposed were encouraging the applicant to wind up in the same position after jumping through more hoops.
Mayor Treece noted the PD zoning gave the neighbors the protections they needed and deserved as they had been there longer and had made their investment. He did not feel they should undermine that with a speculative project such as this.
Mr. Thomas commented that he had heard that the designs that had been presented were reasonably acceptable, but the fear was with what the rezoning would allow if the current plans did not pan out in the future.
Mr. Skala pointed out PD zoning would have another step if there was a use change. He understood the idea of the UDC was generally to give more certainty and less negotiation, which he believed would be appropriate if they were zoning a piece of property to a new designation. This had a history of some planning, and some of the residents in the area were counting on that history in at least the review process in terms of any additional uses that might be added to what could already be done. If it was changed to an open industrial area, there would not be any review process, and any use allowed under IG could proceed. In addition, if Mr. Land were to sell the property to someone else, the new owner might have different plans or intentions.

B20-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP. VOTING NO: RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. Bill declared defeated.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought the preliminary plat offered protections to the neighbors by shrinking the size of the site. Mayor Treece stated he agreed.

The vote on R9-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B21-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B31-18 Authorizing a solar project power purchase agreement with Truman Solar, LLC.

Discussion shown with B32-18.

B32-18 Authorizing a small generator interconnection agreement with Truman Solar, LLC.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.
David Bunge explained he was the Vice President of Strategic Development for Cypress Creek Renewables and noted they were excited to be working on the Truman Solar project with the City. He stated they had raised $2.8 billion over the last three years for corporate development and the execution of these types of projects, and had a very large development pipeline across the country in twelve states. In addition, they had executed on projects in nine states and had over a gigawatt of operational assets like this in their portfolio. He commented that one of the things that made them unique was that they were a fully integrated business with the ability to manage these types of projects from inception through development, construction, and beyond. He displayed slides showing their portfolio of projects. He explained this project would generate about 1.9 percent the

City's total energy needs, and in its first year, he anticipated 22,000 MWh. He pointed out the rate would be fixed for the 30-year life of the project giving residents a hedge against the volatility of other fuel sources. He stated the project would be located on the east side of town near I-70, and displayed the current design drawing, which showed the usable area of the project along with some of the wetland features they would work around in order to optimize the system. He noted the project would utilize Tier 1 equipment, and displayed a list of the brands with which they worked. He explained they worked with a number of vendors to ensure they were able to accommodate the right solution for each project. He commented that they were proposing a 10 MW AC facility with a single axis tracking mounting system so the panels would follow the sun from east to west during the day, and system was projected to involve almost 44,000 panels. Upon approval of the power purchase agreement and the interconnection agreement, he stated his company was ready to move forward to bring the project to fruition as they had obtained site control and had started on their development deliverables, which included the environmental assessment. He noted they had participated in discussions with the Community Development Department and had a clear path forward for the zoning and permits associated with the project, and had communicated with the Utilities Department in terms of the development of a plan for the interconnection of the facility and the associated upgrades.

Mr. Johnsen continued with the staff report, and pointed out that upon approval of the agreement, they would have to go through the public improvement process and the appropriation process at a later date to make the distribution system improvements.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been a big jump in the percentage of renewable energy last year due to the wind agreements. Mr. Johnsen stated at the end of 2017, they were at 15.7 percent.

Mr. Thomas noted the documentation had indicated the energy would be generated behind the meter, and asked for clarification. Mr. Johnsen replied, when generating to the distribution system, they were offsetting load before it hit the interconnection flow gates on the transmission system. It was energy that did not necessarily go through the transmission meters that went through the realm of MISO. Mr. Thomas understood those were meters on the transmission system as they stepped down to the lower voltages. Mr. Johnsen explained, as a transmission customer, they were serving load before it went to the transmission meters. Mr. Thomas stated he had been thinking about the meter and solar panels at his house, which were behind the meter, and his explanation made sense. Mr. Johnsen commented that it was a similar philosophy except Mr. Thomas was doing it at a home level, and they were doing it at utility level.

Mr. Thomas asked if the $44.81 per MWh included the construction cost. Mr. Johnsen replied the power purchase agreement was the cost to the utility, and the only construction cost they had to roll into it was the cost to extend the distribution system to get to it. They had estimated $1.4 million, but it would have to be brought back once the details were finalized in terms of connection, routing, etc. Mr. Thomas understood the installation of the panels was the responsibility of the company and the City would pay $44.81 per MWh for 30 years. Mr. Johnsen stated the company would own everything on the site, and would only charge the utility per MWh. Mr. Thomas understood $1.4 million was to connect the field to the distribution system.

Mr. Thomas commented that they had discussed the lack of capacity in south Columbia, and wondered why they had not found a location there. Mr. Johnsen replied Cypress Creek Renewables had found a site that would work for them, and the City did not really have much control in terms of the location except that they would connect to them if the site was within reason for the connection.

Ms. Peters left the meeting.

Mr. Skala understood the City had been on schedule in achieving its renewable energy goals in 2017. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. Mr. Skala understood this was to help get them on their way to the 25 percent goal by 2023. Mr. Johnsen stated that was

correct. He pointed out they had anticipated a load increase over time, which in turn would decrease the percentage by a bit, so they would always have to add renewable energy sources to keep up with load percentages.

Mr. Thomas stated he was happy to see this moving forward as part of the planning to meet their annual incremental goals for renewable energy. He noted it appeared to be a good contract. Mr. Skala understood it had been recommended by the Water and Light Advisory Board. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

B31-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSTAINING: PITZER. ABSENT: PETERS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B32-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSTAINING: PITZER. ABSENT: PETERS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B25-18 Approving the Final Plat of Branham - Renfro Subdivision - Plat 2 located on the northwest corner of the West Boulevard and Stadium Boulevard intersection (1028 and 1100 Westwinds Drive); authorizing a performance contract; granting design adjustments relating to sidewalk construction along West Boulevard and Stadium Boulevard (Case No. 17-64).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Thomas understood that if someone wanted to construct a building on a vacant lot on a street that did not have a sidewalk, the City would normally require the construction of that sidewalk, and the owner would sometimes ask for a design adjustment to not have to construct it. He also understood if a building that already existed was expanded, a sidewalk would be required to be constructed. He noted neither of those situations had occurred here, and asked for the reason the sidewalk construction was required. Mr. Teddy replied it was a requirement of subdivision, and in this situation, there was a single lot that was being divided into two lots. He stated it was resubdivision, and they were reconfiguring what was already real estate in an existing developed residential area. Mr. Thomas asked if the sidewalk was required even if there was not a plan at this time for a building to be located on it. Mr. Teddy replied yes. He explained the idea was for there to be an obligation to build the sidewalk even if it was not built immediately. Mr. Thomas asked if it would be required to be installed at the time a building was constructed. Mr. Teddy replied it would typically be done when the building was completed, and noted this owner wanted the Council to waive the requirement, so they would not require it in the future regardless of the intention for the second lot. Mr. Thomas understood this would be a permanent waiver. Mr. Teddy pointed out the only clarification to permanent was that the Council could use means, such as tax billing, to install sidewalks, but noted that was not typical.

Mr. Thomas understood the two circumstances under which they normally required a sidewalk to be built on a street that did not have one was subdivision of a lot and a building permit. Mr. Teddy commented that in the case of a residential subdivision, it was a requirement, but in practice the sidewalks were constructed as building occurred on the lots for up to a three year period.

Mr. Thomas noted they were providing a waiver in this case because it involved the backsides of an unusual lot. Mr. Teddy agreed there was not good access from the residential lot to the sidewalk due to grade differences, etc. The usual theory of incremental residential subdivisions providing sidewalks was that the resident and the general public would get some use out of the sidewalk. Mr. Thomas understood the owner would still build a sidewalk on Westwinds Drive at the time of development as it

was the front of the lot. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.
Tim Reed stated Mr. Branham and his family had owned this land for 80 years, and it had been cut in half by Stadium Boulevard. They had swapped some land on the south side with the City, which allowed them to have frontage on Westwinds Drive. He noted Mr. Branham was happy to construct the sidewalk along Westwinds Drive whenever he requested the building permit, but a sidewalk along Stadium Boulevard and West Boulevard did not make sense, which was the reason for the design adjustment.

B25-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: PETERS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B29-18 Authorizing construction of the Sinclair Road at Mill Creek Culvert Replacement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Pitzer understood the culvert associated with this project had collapsed in 2016 and there had been an emergency road closure for 7-10 days. He also understood it had been said the goal would be to work with CPS since this was near Mill Creek Elementary with the hope it would be completed before the school year, and asked if that was still feasible. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. If they received approval tonight, they would bid the project through the Purchasing Division. It took approximately 3-4 months to obtain the precast structure, and about five weeks to install it, so he felt it could be completed before school started in August. If the schedule was delayed, they would either have to wait until next summer or do it during the school year. Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Sorrell if he would recommend waiting or doing the work during the school year if there was a delay. Mr. Sorrell replied he would likely recommend waiting.

B29-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: PETERS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B33-18 Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Information Technology Department - Geospatial Information Services Division; amending the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan by closing a classification and adding a classification.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Pitzer noted an amendment was needed to show that a half time position would be converted to a full time position. Mr. Thomas asked if that had been a typographical error. Ms. Thompson replied yes.
Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend B33-18 per the amendment sheet handed out that evening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.
Mr. Pitzer understood the cost of making the change would be offset by budget reductions in FY 2019. Mr. Chapdelaine stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked if those had already been identified. Mr. Chapdelaine replied most of it had been identified and the rest would be addressed when they reviewed all of the positions. He stated they would be able to make it cost neutral. Mr. Pitzer understood the target reductions were specifically for this position and that Mr. Chapdelaine did not have a larger set of budget reductions. Mr. Chapdelaine stated it was just for this particular item.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B33-18 per

the amendment sheet handed out that evening was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B33-18, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: PETERS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

B22-18 Approving a PD Plan Major Amendment for The Villas at Old Hawthorne located east and west of Old Hawthorne Drive West (Case No. 18-5).

B23-18 Approving the Red Oak Marketplace PD Plan located on the southwest corner of the Grindstone Parkway and Norfleet Drive intersection (Case No. 18-20).

B24-18 Approving the Final Plat of The Gates, Plat No. 4, a major Replat of Lot C1, The Gates Plat No. 2 & 3 and a tract located in the Southeast Quarter of Section 9 and the Southwest Quarter of Section 10, Township 47 North, Range 13 West, located south of Old Plank Road and at the current east terminus of Rivington Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-33).

B26-18 Approving the Final Plat of Tuscany Ridge Plat No. 2 located on the east side of Brown Station Road and south of Napoli Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-235).

B30-18 Authorizing the acquisition of certain interests in real property for construction of the Bingham Road and Ridgeley Road PCCE #16 sanitary sewer improvement project.

R10-18 Setting a public hearing: proposed upgrade of the water distribution infrastructure along Bryant Street between Ash Street and Switzler Street, and along Switzler Street between Garth Avenue and Lasalle Place.

R11-18 Expressing support for renovation of the Columbia Housing Authority's Providence Walkway Apartments and associated application to the Missouri Housing Development Commission for low-income housing tax credits.

R12-18 Authorizing application for federal assistance from the Recreational Trails

Program for construction of the Hinkson Creek Trail - Stephens Lake Park to Clark Lane project.

R13-18 Authorizing application for a Land and Water Conservation Fund grant from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources relating to the purchase of property on Sinclair Road to be used for park purposes.

R14-18 Authorizing an agreement for professional services with Weather or Not for weather condition monitoring services.

R15-18 Authorizing an extension of the temporary closure of a portion of the sidewalk and three (3) parking spaces on the north side of Walnut Street, between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, to facilitate the construction of an office building at 807 E. Walnut Street.

R16-18 Transferring funds from the Office of Cultural Affairs to the Community Foundation of Central Missouri - Columbia Arts Fund for sustainable art and arts programming.

R17-18 Authorizing a special event agreement with Ragtag Film Society for the 2018 True False Film Festival.

R18-18 Authorizing an agreement with Virtual Academy and Missouri Police Chiefs Association for Peace Officer Standards and Training Program (POST) approved online training for City of Columbia police officers.

R19-18 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with TREKK Design Group, LLC for an Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) study of the Flat Branch-C and Flat Branch-I basin areas.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: PETERS. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R20-18 Accepting the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program 2017 Year End Report Summary; authorizing staff to complete the public improvement process for the proposed installlation of traffic calming devices on Sexton Road and Rollins Road; authorizing staff to pursue traffic calming projects on William Street, Primrose Drive and Rain Forest Parkway.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Stone provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had received some complaints from cyclists regarding the Stewart Road project in that one had to make a decision as cyclist while approaching the bumps whether to go through a very narrow strip of level pavement between the end of the speed hump and the end of the pavement going into the gutter pan or to pull out in front of traffic and go over the hump like a vehicle. He asked for that situation to be avoided in the future if possible by either taking the hump all of the way to curb or allowing a wider passage for cyclists to pass to the right of the hump. Mr. Stone stated it would likely be dependent on the width of the road. He described how it had been handled on College Park Drive and noted that situation could still be created on Stewart Road. It was narrower so they would have to make a decision as to whether it was a shared lane facility or not, and since it was a 25 mph road, he felt it was appropriate to make it shared lane facility.

Mr. Thomas stated he was a big fan of the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program and the data driven approach to priorities and projects. The only problem was that there was not enough money for it, and he hoped they could do something about that as soon as possible because he felt the list was getting longer even though they were completing 3-4 projects every year. Mr. Stone pointed out the street standards that had been adopted in 2004 had essentially eliminated newer roads being added to the list. Those constructed after 2004 were 76 and 79 on the list. He noted they had one at 21, but it mostly due to the lack of connectivity. Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Stone was saying they would eventually run out of roads constructed before 2004 that needed traffic calming and that there should not be many more of the more recently constructed roads added to the list. Mr. Stone stated that was the hope.

Mr. Skala understood that suggested the 2004 street standards were working well. Mr. Stone stated that was correct.

Mr. Stone commented that Walnut Street near College Avenue did not really fit into the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program, and they were working with Stephens College for some calming along that road. He pointed out that project might come to the Council later this year outside of this program.

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased to see Primrose Drive and Rain Forest Parkway on this list. With regard to traffic calming on Primrose Drive, they had accepted a fee in lieu for the sidewalk around the big Sycamore tree, and asked if the concept of a curve or bulb-out would be vetted with those in the neighborhood when the interested parties meeting was held. Mr. Stone replied it would be a part of the discussion during the public improvement process. Mr. Trapp understood it might require additional funding to do something different than the speed humps, which was the approach neighbors almost universally took. Mr. Stone stated they were effective. He commented that they looked at other options, and noted they were looking at a choker option on Rollins Road. Mr. Trapp pointed out Rain Forest Parkway already had a speed hump, and he did not feel they should be timid when approaching these issues because they would otherwise not come off of the list.

The vote on R20-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: PETERS. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

B34-18 Adopting the Rules of Procedure for the City of Columbia Board of Adjustment.

B35-18 Approving the Final Plat of The Villas at Old Hawthorne Plat 9B, a Replat of a portion of Lot 5 of Old Hawthorne Plat 1, located east and west of Old Hawthorne Drive West; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-3).

B36-18 Approving the Final Plat of CGS Subdivision Plat 2 located on the south side of Broadway and west of Rothwell Drive (4006 W. Broadway); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-22).

B37-18 Approving the Minor Plat of Bryant Walkway Apartments I - McBaine, a Replat of a part of Lot 23 of Garth's Subdivision of Garth's Addition to the City of Columbia, located on the east side of McBaine Avenue and approximately 600 feet north of Ash Street (304 McBaine Avenue); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-36).

B38-18 Authorizing construction of a six-foot wide sidewalk along the west side of Oakland Gravel Road, between Blue Ridge Road and Edris Drive; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B39-18 Authorizing the acquisition of certain interests in real property for construction of a six-foot wide sidewalk along the west side of Oakland Gravel Road, between Blue Ridge Road and Edris Drive.

B40-18 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement for professional architectural services with Architects Design Group / ADG, Inc. for design services relating to the construction of the Police Precinct/Municipal Service Center North facility in the Auburn Hills Subdivision.

B41-18 Authorizing the upgrade of the water distribution infrastructure along Bryant Street between Ash Street and Switzler Street, and along Switzler Street between Garth Avenue and Lasalle Place; determining that the work shall be done by City employees or authorizing the Purchasing Division to issue a contract for the project.

B42-18 Authorizing a pole attachment license agreement with ExteNet Systems, Inc. for the installation and maintenance of communications facilities, distributed antenna systems and associated wireless equipment on City distribution poles.

B43-18 Authorizing Amendment 8 to the general cooperative agreement with the Boone County Regional Sewer District relating to sewer service to property

located on State Highway HH.

B44-18 Authorizing a grant of easement for sewer purposes with Boone County Regional Sewer District to change the connection point of a new force main sewer line located adjacent to Creasy Springs Road.

B45-18 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for an aeronautical obstruction survey of Runway 2-20 at the Columbia Regional Airport.

B46-18 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for the design of isolated pavement repairs to Runway 2-20 at the Columbia Regional Airport; appropriating funds.

X. REPORTS

REP7-18 Resolution declaring the City Council's support for Community-Oriented Policing.

Discussion shown with REP8-18.

REP8-18 Feedback from the Vehicle Stops and Listening Tour Summary.

Mr. Thomas commented that at the last meeting they had considered a draft resolution declaring the support of Council for community-oriented policing, defining the parameters of community-oriented policing, and directing the City Manager to design a community-oriented policing program for Columbia in partnership with City staff, especially the Police Department. He had received a number of suggestions and had heard some at the prior meeting, and this was a revised version of the resolution. He understood the plan was to allow for comments for another week, and to then bring it forward as a resolution under the new business section of the agenda as a resolution.

Mayor Treece suggested allowing comments until Monday, February 12.

Dale Roberts, 1301 Vandiver Drive, explained he was present on behalf of the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA). He understood someone had said calls for service were reduced with community-oriented policing, and stated that was not entirely true. Calls had been reduced in areas where the community outreach unit was located, but those calls tended to move to other areas. Calls were not necessarily reduced. He commented that the officers supported community-oriented policing, and many of the more experienced officers had indicated they had done it in the 1980s and 1990s. It might have ended when the Department had reached the tipping point in terms of sufficient manpower to engage in something this labor intensive. He stated one of the questions of the CPOA was what the Council meant by community-oriented policing as it had not been identified in the document and was open to interpretation. If they agreed 2.5 officers per 1,000 residents were needed for a community the size of Columbia, they should have 301 officers, and were short by about 127-128 officers. As a result, they were short-staffed in taking on a project of this type. He commented that the resolution directed the City Manager to design the program, and they did not feel Mr. Matthes had the expertise in law enforcement to do the work asked of him. Based on what he had

seen from other community-oriented policing projects, he did not believe the community should tell the department how to do its job. He felt the community should tell them the goal and ask that they make that goal happen. This resolution indicated the community would work with the Columbia Police Department (CPD) on its policies and with regard to how it should do its job. He did not feel that was workable. He explained officers tended to work the entire shift going from call to call to call. Community-oriented policing was labor intensive and had an expectation for officers to be out on the street talking to people, and it was difficult to build relationships when going from call to call. He reiterated that they did not reject this concept by any means. They only feared they did not have the staffing to do it. He pointed out the morale survey had indicated 58 percent of officers were looking for jobs elsewhere, 66 percent were unhappy with working conditions, and 96 percent felt morale was getting worse. When asked who they primarily held responsible for the current state of morale, 65 percent had pointed to the City Council as they did not feel the Council supported or understood what they did. He noted there had been a great resurgence of that feeling with this resolution as the officers understood it as they would ask the officers to perform even more duties than they already had. He asked the Council to come up with significant improvements to the resolution and to meet with CPD and the CPOA to make it a more viable opportunity.

Mr. Thomas understood calls for service had gone down substantially across Columbia in 2016 versus 2015, but they had gone down much more in the three community outreach unit targeted areas. They had now added a fourth area. In terms of what community-oriented policing meant, he thought the definition was likely best summarized in the third whereas statement, which he read. He noted it was not finalized as they would continue to work on it, but they were trying to balance broad parameters without micromanaging it. He pointed out the Council directing the City Manager was a code requirement, and it was implicit that Mr. Matthes would confer with Chief Burton and other members of staff in the process. He noted Section 3 had identified all of the groups that should be involved in the process. He commented that he was concerned to hear the discussion of this resolution had depressed the morale of the officers further because that had not been the intent. He understood the officers that worked in the community outreach program had a higher than average morale, and he thought the goal was to create a police program whereby all officers had a high morale. He noted it was his belief that a community-oriented policing approach would lead to it. He understood it was very likely that the current CPD budget would not be able to achieve the goals, and that they would have to find ways to add officers.

Mayor Treece commented that if Mr. Roberts had any other suggestions with regard to the resolution, he should share those with the Council by Monday.

Mr. Skala felt there were two paths. One was the need for more personnel if there were additional responsibilities with community policing because it would be time intensive. He thought it was also true to suggest the community policing model would provide a boost to the morale of officers as the community outreach unit experience in Columbia had been beneficial and had provided a boost to the morale of those officers. He understood that was based upon the capacity to do it.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Roberts if he would have more confidence if the City Manager were to pull a police officer out of the CPD to help draft this plan, assuming it was the right person. Mr. Roberts replied yes.

Peggy Placier explained she was representing Race Matters, Friends, and noted they applauded the revisions in the resolution, but continued to have questions about implementation and the leadership capacity within the City do that kind of planning and implementation. Some recent events and reports gave them reasons to have concerns. She noted at recent candidate forum and at the last council meeting, there had been evidence that problems in the CPD did not bode well for the community-oriented policing resolution. In addition, the morale issue was festering. She commented that she had not been at the candidate forum, but it had been reported that there were some deep

concerns that might prevent them from moving ahead. Also, the Missouri Quality Award report for the City had shown a lack of responsiveness to employees and the public, and that did not bode well for an atmosphere for implementation of community-oriented policing. She noted the Listening Tour report had been a 600 page compendium of unanalyzed statements and could not provide a guide for community-oriented policing without much more work. She felt its release in that form had been detrimental for the public understanding the results of all of the hours people had spent at meetings and providing feedback. She stated the comments made at the Columbia Values Diversity Celebration had been problematic and had caused them to wonder about Mr. Matthes' ability to understand what needed to happen with the racial biases he was trying to explain as his comments represented a deep response to the first set of pictures when people were not in their occupational clothing, especially when indicating comfort for seeing the same people in their occupational clothing. She felt that was a problem, and that everyone should be comfortable with the people in the first set of pictures or needed to analyze the fears the first set of pictures seemed to present to some people. She suggested Mr. Matthes take the next step because that was what they would ask of the officers. They did not want officers to have that automatic knee-jerk response as it was racial profiling. Everyone needed to learn to be comfortable with respecting and valuing all people even when they were not in their professional outfits. She commented that she believed that was one of the values of community-oriented policing they wanted to see.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Placier if she would feel more comfortable if the City Manager pulled a police officer out of the CPD to develop that plan or vision, assuming it was the right person. Mr. Placier replied yes, and explained her goal was for people to get past the initial reaction and to have a basic respect for the person regardless of how they appear.

Paul Love, 100 Sandra Avenue, commented that from what he had heard, the City was short about 100 officers, which meant they had to find about $10 million in revenue somewhere. He noted he had attended a Vision Zero meeting in the Second Ward recently and the people from the PedNet Coalition had asked about support for a tax for additional officers. He felt if those that walked and biked around town were concerned for their safety, there was more to the issue than just crime. He believed they needed to start with the underlying structural issues prior to looking at hiring 100 new officers as morale was low. He understood more than 30 percent of the officers had less than two years of experience. If they were looking to send officers into the community as part of the community policing program, and most had been there less than two years or would likely not be there more than another year or so, he thought it would be pointless to build relationships. He suggested they address the morale and retention issues as there was tremendous expense in hiring new people. He understood the City Manager was well qualified, and recommended these be performance goals assigned to him.

Mr. Pitzer asked Chief Burton if he agreed with the statement that they used to have community policing, and if so, if there was anyone that was still around that might be helpful to this process. Chief Burton replied they had engaged in community policing since he had been here in different forms. He provided the downtown unit and the assignment of two officers to Douglass Park as examples. He stated they had done what they could based on the number of officers they had. He noted they had ended up with the six community outreach officers due to the strategic plan and the request of the City Manager for an officer in each of those areas. For officer safety reasons, they decided upon two for each area. He reiterated they had engaged in community policing to the extent possible since 2009. It was very manpower intensive and they did not have the resources. He explained about a third of an officer's time should be spent on calls for service, while another third should be for the administrative duties related to those calls, and the final third for discretionary purposes. They could then engage in the things needed for community-oriented policing. It would very difficult until they got to those numbers. He pointed out they had shortages throughout CPD. It was not just in patrol.

He stated he did not believe Mr. Roberts was too far off when he had indicated about 100 additional officers were needed to do this.

Mr. Pitzer asked when the geographic-oriented policing for patrol had been instituted. Chief Burton replied 2010, and explained that was only at the command level. He would have done it all of the way down to the officer level, but they had not had enough officers. Mr. Pitzer asked how patrol had been oriented before 2010. Chief Burton replied it was just patrol prior to his arrival. They had officers in patrol that worked different beats. They were not assigned to the same areas.

Mr. Pitzer understood the resolution mentioned an evaluation strategy that would ensure accountability, and assumed that was for the actual program itself and not the planning process that would lead to it. Mr. Thomas felt the planning process should create an evaluation strategy.

Mr. Pitzer noted a phrase reading "residents who have experienced racial disproportions in traffic stops and searches" had been inserted in Section 3, and asked if they would be self-identified individuals. Mr. Thomas stated he was not sure and explained he thought it was an important group a number of people had requested be a part of the planning process. He commented that there were people in the community that had testified they had been racially profiled, and some had spoken at the NAACP meetings that had been held in the fall. He thought they should do what they could to identify those people and ensure they were included in the design of the plan.

Mr. Pitzer commented that one of the proposals of the vehicle stops summary was to adopt a bias-free policing policy, and wondered if that should be included within community-oriented policing, or if that was a separate matter. Mr. Thomas thought the seventh whereas statement had discussed facilitating public discussion of the racial disproportions in traffic stops and searches so a shared understanding might emerge for the factors contributing to the disproportions. He felt that was related, but noted he was happy to include bias-free policing as a part of the definition of community-oriented policing. He pointed out they all had biases and many of them were not aware of their own biases, and to call for bias-free policing was not to impugn anyone or create a sense of guilt or shame. They all needed to understand their biases and be able to overcome them. He suggested adding it to the third whereas statement.

Mr. Matthes explained everything related to the vehicle stops listening tour process had been intentionally presented, and they had then analyzed and condensed it to what they felt were actionable items, which was presented in the thirteen pages provided tonight. He commented that they intended to move forward with the items in that memo. In defense of the CPD, he noted many of the items requested were already done, such as post-certified training on bias-free policing. He pointed out they also already did community policing as well, and both he and Chief Burton were very familiar with many models of community policing. If the Council chose to pass the resolution on community-oriented policing, he intended to ask a member of the CPD to assist with it.

Mr. Thomas stated he appreciated all of those comments and noted he liked the path they were taking.

Mr. Pitzer clarified there had been a sentence in the report indicating Chief Burton had committed to working with Empower Missouri and other interested stakeholders to adopt a policy on bias-free policing, which seemed to indicated they were willing to adopt a more formal policy. Chief Burton stated he had sent Empower Missouri a draft last week. Mr. Matthes noted it was based largely on the work of Lorie Fridell, who had done some great work in that realm.

Chief Burton commented that one of the things he was hearing that was driving some of the morale issues was related to pay. The CPD starting salary was less than that of the Boone County Sheriff's Department. St. Louis County had recently provided their officers 30-40 percent raises across the board. He understood Columbia had not had the money for raises for quite a few years, and suggested pay issues be included in the community policing agreement as it was a factor. He felt officers should be paid fairly and that they

be cognizant of what other cities nearby were doing. Mr. Thomas commented that he believed that likely drove the number standing vacancies they had.

REP9-18 Correspondence from the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council relating to the Public Inconvenience Fee.

Mayor Treece understood the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council had made two recommendations. One was for the City to follow its own rules, which he thought they had clearly established. The other was for some of the revenue to be used to help businesses affected by the street closure. He noted he was not sure how he felt about that as his philosophy was that the fund was to compensate taxpayers that had paid for it and were losing their right to use it.

Mr. Skala commented that signage and notification were key and that helped the public as well. Mayor Treece agreed.

REP10-18 Citizens Police Review Board 2017 Annual Report.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

REP11-18 Missouri Quality Award (MQA) Feedback Report.

Mr. Trapp commented that it was an impressive endeavor to take on the Missouri Quality Award. He noted a lot of the departments were certified, but this involved the entire City having a very high level certification process. He thought the scores looked pretty good for an initial application, and they were on the path to excellence. He stated this was a great process as it had pointed out a lot of strengths and some areas of improvement. He felt it had been a bold move to apply, and understood there were only three governmental bodies with this certification. He suggested they further discuss this at a work session. He commented that the Council fundamentally served as the Board of Directors for the City of Columbia, and some of their primary duties were to manage risk and strategically plan, so he felt it was better to discuss this when they had more time.

Mr. Skala agreed it should be discussed at a future work session so they had the time to dig into it for a better product in the future.

Mr. Matthes stated they would bring this forward at a pre-council meeting or work session.

REP12-18 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mayor Treece thanked everyone that had submitted names, and listed the names of those he was appointing to the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning as Ryan Kaufmann, Jay Hasheider, Rob Wolverton, Quinn Cunningham, Brionna Emerson, Kim Wade, Mark Alexiou, Dale Tidemann, Carolyn Amparan, Annette Triplett, Raghu Raghavan, Aimee Davenport, Chris McLeland, David Reed, Mason Brobeck, and Alex Antal.

Mayor Treece noted he would announce the appointees to the Mayor's Task Force on Bicentennial Celebration Planning at an event on Thursday, February 8 at 5:30 p.m. in the Lobby of the Historic Daniel Boone Building/City Hall, and encouraged everyone to attend.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Amin to distribute the list of those appointed to the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning to the Council.

Mr. Skala commented that while he had been out of town a Missourian reporter had interviewed and quoted him when he had not spoken to any reporter.

Mr. Thomas asked what it had been regarding. Mr. Skala replied it had to do with Uber. He noted he did not disagree with some of the comments made on his behalf, but he had not made them.

Mr. Skala stated he had attended the New Partners in Smart Growth Conference in California and would share the information he had obtained at a later date. He noted he had also been appointed as the Columbia representative to the Racial Equity in Leadership (REAL) group, and would provide information from it as well.

Mr. Trapp asked for a report regarding the progress made in addressing Fourth of July fireworks. He understood they had tried to address the issue with pure police power and a community policing attitude, and it had been ineffective. He thought they needed more support for community activities and alternative events, such as block parties that might limit the transportation routes for those involved with drive-by fireworks. He commented that it had been a stressful event in some neighborhoods, especially when police presence moved to adjoining neighborhoods.

Mr. Trapp stated, in response to the comments of Paul Love, he did not have a conflict. He had never taken anything of value for any vote. He noted he was proud of the work he did with the homeless, and it was not an unreasonable rate as it had been 30 percent lower than the competing bid and what they had paid for a similar service previously. He explained the work was more than interviewing the homeless as he also coached them and provided them referrals for resources. He commented that he had shortened the wait for people in terms of social security, had established them with Medicaid, and had obtained housing vouchers. He stated it had been bid in an open process with full disclosure, and pointed out he appropriately recused himself from votes whenever there was an appearance of a conflict. He commented that he would leave it at that as he felt one should gain support and work hard at electioneering to win elections, and these kinds of baseless accusations reduced the creditability of government.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that he was still trying to get to the bottom of the trash issue. Mr. Trapp stated he had answers to Mr. Elkin's questions and would discuss them with him after the meeting.

Paul Love, 100 Sondra Avenue, stated he found it to be unethical to run campaign defense ads on the City Channel.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 2:03 a.m.