

MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
DECEMBER 3, 2007

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, December 3, 2007, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE and NAUSER were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of November 5, 2007 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Wade and a second by Mr. Janku.

The minutes of the regular meeting of November 19, 2007 were not completed in time for this meeting. They will be provided for review and approval at the December 17, 2007 Council meeting.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Hoppe asked that B387-07 be moved from the Consent Agenda to Old Business. The agenda, including the Consent Agenda and the moving of B387-07 to Old Business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Hoppe and a second by Mr. Wade.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Monta Welch - Climate Change Related Issues.

Monta Welch stated she was the Director of the Columbia Climate Change Coalition (CCCC) and was speaking on their behalf and on the behalf of others supportive of action being taken on the issue of climate change. With the help of a number of organizations and individuals, they were presenting a second delivery of petitions from people who supported City action on climate change. She noted the first delivery of petitions, with just under 900 signatures, was made in June and the current delivery included 1,041 signatures for a total of about 2,000 signatures. Ms. Welch read the statement on the petition and commented that they were requesting a timetable for implementation of the goals of the Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement, the establishment of a commission of interested stakeholders to plan, promote and oversee implementation with staff assistance and a biannual report to be published and disseminated to the public with regard to implementation. She stated they appreciated the fact the City had the Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement and had already taken some steps towards its implementation. She commented that the members of the CCCC were suggesting an alternative proposal to Solar One and noted this was an example of how a commission of interested stakeholders might be beneficial to the City. She offered the rough draft of the proposal to Council. She believed the City should be investing in conservation and discussing

different options for addressing net metering and solar opportunities for not only businesses, but also individuals. She thought they could also discuss different rates the City might consider subsidizing and the selling of green credits to cover those costs. She stated she was also submitting an article on how Berkeley, California was creatively trying to help fund citizen installation of solar.

Marlon Jordan - Police Oversight Review Board.

Marlon Jordan, 11 E. Ash, thanked the Council for allowing him to address them with regard to the formation of the Police Oversight Committee. He commented that he was happy with its formation as it showed a willingness to acknowledge there was a problem with police misconduct within the City and globally. He stated he was unhappy with the appointment of three members to the Committee because he felt their involvement would only disenfranchise poor people and, in particular, black people. In addition, he felt the denial of all fifty applicants to participate on this Committee and in this political process was a sign of no progress. He had heard the City Manger indicate he did not want a form of diluted government and believed dilution happened when misconduct was allowed to continue. He understood the City often honored Dr. King's principles, which included the idea that any group effort to correct an injustice of abuse of authority must contain those who were directly affected and those who had filed complaints of alleged police misconduct or discrimination. He believed it had to include those who had filed criminal and civil appeals. He was concerned with the effectiveness of the Committee and thought all fifty people should be allowed to participate as it was not a job application. The denial of allowing all of them to fully participate would not correct any of the issues. He believed it was the right of all citizens to take part in the decision making process of government. He commented that there were two types of cultures within the black community. One was the black professional culture and the other was the black semi-culture. He felt the black professionals purported to offer protection and uplift the minority brethren, but only extended it to those who followed the development and design they followed, which was the assimilation into white society. Those with criminal backgrounds or those who had failed to obtain an education were left to this hostile environment and subculture of racism that kept disenfranchised people down. He asked the Council to consider involving the fifty applicants wishing to participate in this form of government.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B383-07 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to light industrial and live/work units in District C-P and C-1 uses in District M-R.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was an amendment requested by Council to allow the zoning ordinance to facilitate the establishment of high-tech based industry in mixed-use environments. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of theses zoning changes.

Mr. Teddy commented that during the public hearing period, they received correspondence with regard to how the City would handle data centers. Staff felt those were already permitted in an O-1 office district under a different name, so data centers could be allowed by association in a C-P district or some other planned zoning district.

Mr. Janku noted language regarding harmful discharge into the sanitary sewer system and asked if they allowed certain items within limits to enter the system as long as they could be treated by the Plant. Mr. Glascock replied it had to meet certain limits.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Bob Wagner, 1907 Kingsbridge Drive, stated he served as Vice Chairman of REDI and was in support of the proposed changes to the zoning ordinance in Chapter 29 to support high-tech industry. These changes gave high-tech companies alternative locations and more options, which were important factors as they tried to attract high paying jobs to Columbia and support those that would grow out of the technology incubator. He thanked Mayor Hindman and Councilperson Skala for spending an entire day at Purdue Research Park in Indiana looking at high tech development to see what could be done locally. They saw first hand how high-tech companies could operate in a mixed-use or research park setting. He also thanked the entire Council for their proactive efforts on this issue, which would help economic development. He also thanked City staff for their technical help in drafting the proposed changes. He commented that they appreciated the Council's previous support of the Discovery Ridge infrastructure and technology incubator. This should allow them to attract high paying and growing technology companies in Columbia. The REDI Board supported these changes as these efforts positioned them to be more successful in attracting and creating high paying jobs in the community.

Tina Bernskoetter, Columbia Chamber of Commerce, 300 S. Providence Road, thanked the Council for their support of this bill as it was an opportunity for Columbia to showcase itself as a creative and flexible community to attract and retain business.

Thad Simmons, 5002 Orchard Lane, wondered how successful they would be at attracting high paying jobs to a City with an upward spiraling violent crime rate. He asked what they planned on doing to ensure the City was welcoming to new business.

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

Mayor Hindman stated he thought this was a great idea. He believed the City needed this kind of improvement and noted it went along with the idea of more mixed-use activity.

Mr. Wade stated he thought this was an important first step, but believed they needed to realize it was only a first step in bringing Columbia into the 21st century due to changes that had taken place in economic activity from sweat work to smart work areas. He noted there were about half a dozen locations around the Country that were 10-15 years ahead of Columbia and this would begin putting in place the foundation needed for the kind of economic activities they wanted. He was pleased to support this.

Mr. Skala commented that he appreciated being able to participate in looking at one of the premier business incubators and research parks in the Country at Purdue. He thought this was something the Council needed to support as it was in the best interest of the community. With regard to the comment made by Mr. Simmons, he noted the conversation about crime and police was paramount and they would likely be discussing it later in the meeting. He agreed it did have a connection with attracting businesses and in the vitality of the community. He pointed out they were taking it very seriously.

Ms. Crayton stated she was not disregarding Mr. Simmons' comments, but noted the people committing the crimes were at the lowest income level in the community and although that did not excuse them from being mean and ugly, she thought they needed to bring them up as well. She felt people who lived in desperate situations did desperate things and agreed that

was wrong. She thought they needed to get those who would continue to commit crimes off of the streets, but believed they should offer a different life to those that wanted a different life. If they did not do that, the cycle would be repeated.

B383-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

(A) Construction of street improvements on Hunt Avenue, from Worley Street to I-70 Drive Southwest.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted this item had been continued several times as the Council was wrestling with the idea of a twenty-eight foot wide street versus a twenty-four foot wide street. Staff was recommending the twenty-eight foot wide street as they believed it was the best for the community as a whole. He pointed out this was a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funded street and a requirement of HUD was to get the money spent. Staff needed direction from Council regarding how to proceed. He stated staff would support a twenty-four foot wide street if that was what Council decided, although their recommendation was a twenty-eight foot street. He noted the cost was not much of an issue if they cut the street by four feet.

Mr. Glascock pointed out a copy of the street standards for an access street along with definitions had been provided in the packet. He showed the typical sections on the overhead for a twenty-four foot street with and without a sidewalk. He also showed a depiction of the twenty-eight foot street.

Chief Markgraf noted he was concerned with narrow streets and showed photographs of a ladder truck on streets of various widths with and without parking on the overhead. The width of the ladder truck with its outriggers extended was 19 feet and 3 inches. He understood the recommended width was twenty-eight feet and stated it had an effect on trying to get the ladder truck up to rescue someone from an upper story.

Mayor Hindman asked how many two story houses were on Hunt. Chief Markgraf replied he was not aware of any. Mr. Glascock pointed out that although there were none today, the street would outlast the houses.

Mr. Janku thought it was interesting that the narrower street would cost more money. Mr. Glascock noted they were looking to have innovation with storm water by using a trench with drainage through porous pavement, which was less costly than laying a pipe in a grade. With a twenty-four foot street, they would be putting in inlets and pipe.

Mr. Janku understood the resolution estimate was \$521,000. Mr. Glascock noted that included all design, right-of-way acquisition, etc. Mr. Janku asked if they went with a narrower street if they would have to provide the difference between \$521,000 and the current estimate. Mr. Glascock replied it would basically cost the same no matter what they did. He explained they removed the design and right-of-way costs. He thought it would take the same easements to build the twenty-four foot street as it did to build the twenty-eight foot street.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Nancy Pike, 506 Hunt Avenue, stated she was in favor of the street being constructed, but did not see the need for a sidewalk. She commented that they had lived on Hunt since August of 1983 and no kids were in the neighborhood and no one ever walked on the street.

With regard to a fire truck having trouble getting down the street, she noted fire trucks had been to her home several times for emergency situations without any problems. In addition, there were no two story homes on the street. She stated her home was sixty years old and she did not plan on tearing it down or making it bigger.

Ms. Hoppe asked if Ms. Pike wanted a twenty-four foot or twenty-eight foot wide street. Ms. Pike replied the size did not matter to them. They just did not see a need for a sidewalk when no one walked on that street.

John Pike, 506 Hunt Avenue, stated he did not care whether they went with a twenty-four foot or twenty-eight foot street. He agreed there were no two story houses and noted he did not care about the trees because half of them on the west side of the street were dying anyway. He explained fire trucks were able to go up and down the street now with it only being twenty-one feet wide. He noted he did have a problem with where they put the outriggers to slow traffic down. The only person that drove fast down that street was the Domino's Pizza driver. In addition, there was no walking traffic because it did not go anywhere except to the outer road where no one walked.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he was a candidate of the First Ward and noted he had attended the interested parties meeting last August. He commented that he had been disturbed because there was no street tree plan proposed by the City, which he thought was normal for HUD funded projects in North Central and Ridgeway. He also noted Hunt was a long street, so if something happened at one end, emergency vehicles would not be able to get in. He was disappointed the access issue had not been addressed. He thought the plan in general was good and was interested in the idea of using porous rock, but wondered how they got to the point of having to use the money or lose it. He thought it was a lack of staffing as the City did not have enough people to effectively administer plans.

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

Mr. Janku explained he brought up Hunt for the CDBG process as they were evaluating future streets a long time ago. He stated he would be willing to go with a narrower street due to the physical constraints of the existing houses in how close they were to the street, but believed the sidewalk was needed. Too often, after the fact, they heard from people who were upset that there were no sidewalks. He thought this was an opportunity to provide one. He believed, over time, people with children would move into these houses as this might be a neighborhood for young families looking for starter homes. He thought they would appreciate having the sidewalk so their children could get to the junior high and elementary schools nearby. He commented that he drove the outer road quite a bit and there were a number of people who walked along that street. He understood they were primarily the people who worked in the restaurants and motels there and who had relatively modest or low incomes without adequate transportation. They were walking at bad times of the day and night. He thought they would appreciate a sidewalk connection into the neighborhoods where they lived and hoped some day they could address the sidewalk issues elsewhere. He reiterated he would be willing to support a twenty-four foot street with a sidewalk in order to minimize the impact on the existing residential structures in the neighborhood. He understood parking might have to be restricted in the future.

Mr. Skala stated he concurred with Mr. Janku as this was a reasonable compromise. He understood from testimony, the people on the street wanted to maintain as much of their yards as possible, so he did not believe a twenty-four foot exception was out of line since it was

approximately the same price. Although he understood the problems described by the Fire Chief, he thought they might have to start considering smaller vehicles to fight fires, etc. in the future as they looked at alleys, etc. He commented that they had to balance issues of traffic speed, road size, fire protection, etc. He stated he was willing to support the twenty-four foot street.

Mr. Janku noted Council would have to take into account the street was built for single family homes when reviewing future requests for rezoning.

Mr. Wade stated he believed staff's recommendation of a twenty-eight foot street with a sidewalk was the best in the long run as it would provide far better amenities, but if Council wanted the twenty-four foot street with a sidewalk, he could go along with it.

Ms. Nauser stated she concurred with Mr. Wade. They required this of other subdivisions. She commented that she was not sure of the philosophy of fixing roads in CDBG areas because if the philosophy was to bring it up to the standard, it should be brought up to the standard. She noted this project started in 2006 and did not think they should be making these types of changes after interested parties meetings, etc.

Ms. Crayton made a motion directing staff to proceed with a twenty-four foot street with a sidewalk on one side. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Mr. Janku stated since there was strong and consistent neighborhood concern and because it was an existing street, he was agreeable. If it had been a new street, he would feel differently. He thought they might agree to this with other neighborhoods such as in the Old Southwest and wanted to be consistent.

Mr. Skala recalled from serving on the Street Standards Committee, the beauty of the document was that there was the flexibility in setting standards while providing for alternatives. He thought part of the conversation regarding alternatives was based on streets in the Stewart Road neighborhood since those streets were narrow. He agreed the Council had to consider a broader view to include fire protection, the future, etc., but if they determined this was a relatively stable neighborhood and would be able to adjust if something were to happen, he thought the proper thing to do was to give the people who lived there what they wanted.

Ms. Crayton noted she met with the neighbors and was pleased with the twenty-four foot street.

Ms. Hoppe stated she concurred with Mr. Skala and noted she was also on the Street Standards Committee. She recalled raising the issue of the street standards not being appropriate for older neighborhoods. She thought it was clear the standards were prospective. She thought they had to look at what already existed and adjust the standard accordingly.

Mayor Hindman congratulated staff for their work and innovative thinking with respect to the drainage and stated he hoped they would continue to do that.

Ms. Nauser noted they were making these changes at the end of the process. She thought it would have been helpful to have these alternatives at the beginning of the process and to have a public hearing on those options. This would allow a decision to be made with neighborhood involvement. Mr. Janku pointed out most of the people who attended the initial interested parties meeting were supportive, so staff continued on. The first public hearing was when they received additional input causing them to look at other alternatives. Ms. Nauser noted that meant a large contingency of people were in favor of it as it was in the beginning.

The motion made by Ms. Crayton and seconded by Mr. Janku was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting no.

(B) Construction of the Maguire Extension Project (replacing the LeMone Industrial Boulevard Extension Project).

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was unique because Council considered and elected to proceed with this project earlier last year. Since that time, a lot of analyses had been done on the project to determine if it could be improved to eliminate some of the traffic issues discussed at the previous public hearing. He pointed out the issue tonight did not involve the entire project. It involved whether the project should connect to Lemone Boulevard or Maguire to get out to AC. He explained the Concord Office and Industrial Plaza was platted and approved by Council in 1979. In 1984, Lemone Industrial Boulevard was added to the Major Thoroughfare Plan, which was a component of the City's Comprehensive Plan. At that point, the City's Comprehensive Plan was composed of a series of land use plans and infrastructure plans. In 1993, Lemone Industrial Boulevard was placed in the City's budget under the Street Capital Improvement Plan. In 1997, 42 people from the area south of New Haven Road petitioned the City to extend Lemone Industrial Boulevard. In 2001, Lemone Industrial Boulevard was adopted as part of the CATSO 2025 Transportation Plan, which Council adopted in 2002. Also in 2001, the Larkin Group was contracted to study alignments for the northward extension of Lemone Industrial Boulevard and in November of 2002, they presented four alternatives. In 2005, the City approved the extension of the quarter cent transportation sales tax and an increase in the development charge to fund street improvements. There were a number of public hearings as well as work sessions with regard to the streets to be included in the ballot issue. There were also a number of public hearings after the ballot issue was voted on to pare down the list of street projects to be completed. The citizens voted in favor of two of the three City transportation funding initiatives to fund \$80 million of the \$105 million ten year priority needs Council adopted and approved. Lemone Industrial Boulevard was one of the streets presented for improvement by R276-05. As part of the campaign for the ballot issue, they distributed a description of each of the projects included on the list and it clearly stated the extension of Lemone Boulevard and two bridges. It also noted it was a public/private partnership and that although the budget for the project was \$8.9 million, they would not proceed until they had the private partnership piece. In 2006, a developer received commercial zoning for property from the northern terminus of Lemone Industrial Boulevard to north of Stadium Boulevard and agreed to participate in the cost of extending Lemone Industrial Boulevard. He commented that his point was that this project had a long history of public discussion and several public hearings. They were continuing to try to solve the traffic and safety problems occurring in the Lemone Industrial area. He noted about 2,000 people went to work there on a daily basis with only one way out, which was not a good situation.

Mr. Glascock provided a map on the overhead which showed all of the alternatives determined by the professional staff. The traffic engineer reviewed the alignments and the City worked with MoDOT. He described the original route and the alternative of going to Maguire and out to Warren. The cost was about the same, but the piece out to Maguire would cost more and could be done in another phase. He noted the property owner in the area was willing to

make the alignment shift. The alignment, whether Lemone or Maguire, was part of the 740 EIS and that study assumed this would be built at some point in the future. If the City did not build it, there would be an issue with the 740 environmental study. The bridges they were designing would be the same for either route. It would be a major collector with a thirty-six foot pavement, as designed. As of November, 2006, there were 18,000 vehicles per day at the intersection with 3,500 at Lemone and he thought the numbers might have grown since then.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the 18,000 cars per day at the intersection would change with the right only designated turn lane and other changes planned and approved after they voted on the Lemone issue. Mr. Glascock thought there would be an adjustment with the right turn lane, but noted the traffic still came through at the same point. Ms. Hoppe understood it would be handled differently. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Janku asked what the impact of moving this to the east was as opposed to keeping it so it came out on Lemone. Mr. Glascock replied they would be bringing Maguire through and out to Warren. He understood the Lenoir property might be redeveloped and wanted to work with the City to install a four way stop or signal in the future. He noted Mr. Watkins had talked to the University as well.

Mr. Skala asked what the thirty-six foot wide pavement included. Mr. Glascock replied it would be a two lane road with a six foot shoulder on each side, which could be striped for bike lanes. It gave them the ability to have safety built into the street. Mr. Skala asked if that was for the entire length, including the width of the bridges. Mr. Glascock replied the south bridge might have to be a little wider due to some turning movements at Stadium. He did not know if it would involve the entire bridge or just the northern tip of the bridge.

Mr. Skala asked if the Council decided to go with this alignment, if the Warren and New Haven Road intersection would be a signalized intersection. Mr. Glascock replied it would at some point in the future. Mr. Skala understood it was not part of this. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not on the Council when this was previously approved, but understood the Council approved proceeding with the planning of the alignment of the road. Mr. Watkins recalled Larkin preparing a plan, which was discussed with the Corp of Engineers who indicated which of the four alignments they preferred and the City adopted that alignment. Staff was of the opinion that Council had directed them to prepare plans and specifications. They felt this alignment would help resolve some of the traffic concerns brought up during the initial public hearing and instead of designing something and suggesting changes then, they decided to suggest those changes now. If Council decided to proceed, they anticipated bidding the project in 2009. The issue being discussed involved the connection of the bridges to Lemone or Maguire. They would need to come back to Council with Phase II, which would involve the Maguire extension to New Haven. They were not ready to provide cost estimates or establish an alignment tonight, but had spoken with the property owners and the University. He noted Warren was a dirt road for the most part and was not a long road. He reiterated they were requesting Council direction on whether they should proceed with Lemone or go to Maguire knowing they would be bringing back a Phase II in the future.

Mr. Skala understood a street list was published several times in connection with the 2005 ballot issue, but that language was not on the ballot when people voted. Mr. Watkins agreed the streets were not listed on the ballot. The City's long time modus operandi was to be

general. The ballot issues of the 1980's and early 1990's listed streets, but invariably changes in priorities occurred or dollars projected changed causing a need to add and subtract streets. He explained they wanted to make sure they were not doing something that was contrary to the expectations of the voters.

Mr. Skala commented that there was a need to adjust the list and displace and advance some road projects due to the one ballot issue failing and asked about the rationale of those decisions. Mr. Janku replied they all recognized the fact that all of the projects on the list were important. Some of it was decided due to timing. He noted projects were dropped or delayed from all parts of the City for various reasons.

Mr. Wade asked if they were running a risk of creating a bottleneck by having two lanes instead of four lanes on the bridges, if this alignment of a Maguire extension to Stadium with two lane bridges and wide shoulders was approved. Mr. Glascock replied he did not think it would and noted bottlenecks generally occurred at intersections. He believed the two lane road with wide shoulders would function for many years. Mr. Wade asked for the level of access. Mr. Glascock replied every building on Maguire had access to it. Mr. Wade understood once one got past the Lemone Industrial Complex, there was very little access. Mr. Glascock agreed. Mr. Wade understood traffic would move rapidly with high volumes past that point. Mr. Glascock stated he thought the streets within Lemone were thirty-eight foot wide, so it was comparable.

Ms. Hoppe asked how much traffic would be placed on Maguire or Lemone due to the commercial Stadium 63 district once it hooked together. Mr. Glascock replied he did not think it would be much because nothing was driving it to go south. The people going north were coming out of Lemone to get onto Highway 63 going north. He did not think there would be a lot of traffic from the commercial development south through Lemone to get to University Farms. He thought some of the Lenoir people might use it to get back to their homes rather than getting onto Highway 63, especially once Lenoir redeveloped and they had a way in at that signal.

Ms. Nauser asked if the majority of traffic heading south would be tractor trailer traffic getting off at Stadium to go south rather than making a tight turn at the AC exit. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe asked if there had been any studies with regard to traffic flow. Mr. Glascock replied City staff and MoDOT staff had studied it. Ms. Hoppe asked if he had figures. Mr. Glascock replied there were 3,000 vehicles and they were assuming over half would go north. Ms. Hoppe asked if those figures included Stadium being extended to I-70. Mr. Glascock replied yes and explained it was part of the EIS and they would look at turning movements at that point. Ms. Hoppe noted when she was at the EIS, she specifically asked the engineers if they had looked at the different options with regard to how much traffic would be thrown onto Lenoir and they indicated those studies had not been done yet. Mr. Glascock agreed they were not to that detail yet, but noted they would look at it.

Mayor Hindman understood if they agreed to the new alignment, a lot of the traffic would come off of 740 going to this area as currently the destinations were primarily on Lemone. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He explained a tractor trailer would get off at 740 and make a right to get in, which was an easier movement than coming up the interchange at AC and making two lefts. Mayor Hindman asked what would happen once he got there. He did not think he could go down Maguire because the turn was too steep. Mr. Glascock pointed to the location of an intersection and described the movement using the overhead. Mayor Hindman

asked if the dedicated right turn lane off of Lemone onto 63 would come at about the same time. Mr. Glascock replied it would not be in conjunction with this project. They were working with MoDOT on that issue.

Mayor Hindman asked for the classification of this part of the road. Mr. Glascock replied it would be a major collector. Mayor Hindman asked if it was being built to collector standards. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Ms. Nauser understood they would be voting to extend it all of the way to New Haven via the existing Warren, but would only begin design plans and phases for Stadium. Mr. Watkins replied that was correct as that was what Council had approved to date. They needed Council authorization for the change. He noted the budget for this project was over \$8 million, but with the private partnership, the City's share would be about half of that amount, which gave them additional money to do other improvements or other pieces of this project that had not been funded. He pointed out the developer was following City policy with the developer providing the street and the City building the bridges.

Mr. Skala asked if a new Lemone was built today if at least two access points would be required for a development of this type. Mr. Watkins replied yes. Mr. Skala asked if a plan could be approved today with the two accesses shown off of Warren and Lemone. Mr. Glascock replied he did not think it would be acceptable because they would be coming back to the same access point. Mr. Skala asked if they should consider improving New Haven. Mr. Glascock replied he believed it was on the list.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Linda Yaeger, Executive Director of OATS Transportation, 2501 Maguire Boulevard, stated they needed a second means of egress from that property. When she purchased the property, part of the decision was based on a letter in 1990 from Ray Beck indicating there would be an extension of Lemone across and over to Stadium. She commented that OATS did not have a strong opinion about it being on Maguire, although it went in front of their building. She noted she did not think anyone would be racing in and out of the streets because of the truck traffic. She and OATS were supportive of a method of egress other than Lemone Industrial to New Haven. She pointed out a friend indicated it took him 25 minutes to leave that location at 4:00 p.m.

Harold Virgen, 18 Springer Drive of the Lenoir Woods Retirement Community, stated this location had a tremendous traffic jam. He noted he went to breakfast this morning and took a back road across a narrow one lane bridge and went around a circle in order to get out because if he had gone to Lenoir Street, he would have spent 25-30 minutes trying to get out. Except for the people in assisted living or the care center, most of the people who resided at Lenoir had one or two cars. Regardless of the route decided on, he urged the Council to improve the widths of those roads and access for the people at Lenoir because it was a serious problem. When the big trucks arrived at 8:00 a.m., it was a solid traffic jam for about an hour. At noon the traffic problem was a little less than an hour and in the evening it was another hour with parents picking up kids and people going home. He understood the Lutheran Senior Services Specialist and CEO had been talking with the City for some possible solutions and urged them not to delay as it was only getting worse and more dangerous.

Tina Bernskoetter, Columbia Chamber of Commerce, 300 S. Providence Road, stated this area was a major tool for gaining and retaining business in Columbia as its location was

excellent. She noted this extension would positively impact the many users of the land. Not only would the major industry and business located there benefit, but the school children and residents would benefit as well. She understood it was also a part of the Metro 2020 Plan. She stated this project was vital to the success and managed growth of the business community and thanked the Council for their vote of support on behalf of the over 1,200 business members of the Chamber of Commerce.

Gay Bumgarner, 1315 Rustic Road, did not think the Council should pass any extension project that spanned Grindstone Creek because no one voted in favor of it. She commented that two projects were listed and they voted against one. She did not believe they voted for the Lemone bridge. She stated this was a poor idea 25 years ago and had not improved with age. The cost in tax dollars had risen to an unacceptable level and the environment had become more sacred and scarce. She believed this was a solution with no problem and no public benefit. Only two astute businessmen benefited with the City giving them a \$10 million gift and years of maintenance costs to assist their private project. She believed both investors would be able to make their investments thrive without City funds. In addition, the City had more pressing needs. She commented that no traffic study had been conducted with new data regarding the uses from the Stadium 63 Properties or the added traffic from Lemone. She noted traffic moved in both directions, so anything that went in on Stadium could come out on New Haven. Stadium 63 with fast food restaurants, etc would for the first time invite the University of Missouri students onto the Stadium/63 intersection. They would also come down Grindstone via the bridge. She believed traffic would become much worse. She suggested improving Warren Road with a completely new plan. She thought Maguire Road should be paved at the same width extending to Warren Road onto New Haven to a four way traffic light with a right turn lane. This was the junction of New Haven east and west with Warren from the north and the University of Missouri South Farm Road on the south. She thought Lenoir could connect into that same road. Warren would also have access roads to Woodstock Trailer Park and the New Haven School. With this one extension, they could give Lemone, Woodstock and New Haven School a second access road. She stated they did not need the bridge. They only needed the Warren Road extension.

Cynthia Schreen, Sales Director of the Zimmer Radio Group, 3215 Lemone Industrial Boulevard, stated they had been on Lemone since the early 1990's. Since that time, the traffic in front of their building had doubled. Traffic backed up twice a day from New Haven Road to as far as she could see which was beyond the Perry Legend Collision Repair Center. Staff had difficulty getting in and out of the parking lot due to backed up traffic and their on-air guests and listeners were delayed due to traffic. She noted the Zimmer Radio Group supported the extension of Lemone Industrial Boulevard.

Ken Midkiff, 1005 Belleview Court, stated he was speaking on behalf of the Osage Group of the Sierra Club. He commented that the industrial facilities located on the Lemone and Maguire Industrial Drives were all allowed by past actions of the Council. These industries all knew there was only one outlet. He understood Ray Beck assured people that Lemone Drive would be extended, but did not have that power. Only the City Council could grant it. He noted these facilities had been present for 10-20 years and the need for quicker and easier ingress and egress had been known for that length of time. He stated they disagreed with Mr. Watkins' timeline and summary. They did not understand the apparent haste in providing an extension of

Maguire Drive and necessitating the construction of at least two bridges over the north and south forks of Grindstone Creek and the connection of Maguire Drive to Warren Drive. They hoped a traffic study had been conducted because without it, the need for providing the extension was purely speculative and he did not believe taxpayer money should be spent on speculation, anecdotes or perceptions. He wondered if the bridges had received an external and objective environmental impact study. They did not consider any study conducted by MoDOT, road building contractors or the City's Public Works Department to provide the type of information needed to make an informed decision because those entities tended to support what they intended to do. They believed the impacts of the two proposed bridges over the south and north forks of the Grindstone would have significant affects on wildlife habitat, water quality and other natural resources, but acknowledged an external and objective environmental impact study might relieve their concerns. He noted they did not have an objection to Warren Drive and thought it was probably a good idea, but thought New Haven Road needed to be widened and an additional lane needed to be added to U.S. 63 because most of the traffic going north got off at Stadium Boulevard. They believed there were many other ways that had not been examined and recommended the decision to extend Maguire be postponed until the effects of the Warren Drive project were known.

Thad Simmons, 5002 Orchard Lane, understood there were twenty years of history in trying to get this road built, but did not feel that made it a priority today. He noted the police training budget had been eliminated and the City could not hire new police officers to protect the streets. He commented that citizens were living in fear and workers in convenience stores and hotels were concerned with being able to get home after their shift due to thugs on the streets. He did not understand how Council could consider spending \$10 million on twenty-five year old bad idea as he thought there were better ways to use the money. He felt it was unconscionable that no one wanted to talk about a murder that happened less than a week ago. He thought they needed to stop thinking about the 2,000 people that went to work at Lemone and start thinking about the other 88,000 people who were living in the City in fear.

Ms. Hoppe asked if he attended the work session that was held before the Council meeting. Mr. Simmons replied no. Ms. Hoppe explained that work session was centered on crime statistics. Mr. Simmons stated he was here now and wanted to know what they had to say now. Ms. Hoppe pointed out they had to follow the agenda at this time. Mr. Simmons stated he did not understand why they were talking about roads, sidewalks, increased growth, etc. when they could not protect the citizens they had. He thought it was an obvious issue when police officers were telling people to move out of their neighborhoods because they could not be protected. He did not think Lemone Industrial Boulevard was important.

Dave Gaughan, 2811 S. Warren Drive, stated Warren Drive was a residential, gravel street. It was not a dirt street. He understood they would be funneling a lot of the 2,000 people down his residential street. He noted he lived at the end of Warren Drive and had convinced the University to put up the gate where the County road ended to stop people from going down there and littering. He commented that his granddaughter went to New Haven, so they had to deal with the congestion when they picked her up and dropped her off. In addition, she walked to Lenoir for daycare. He agreed that there was a lot of traffic there, but did not see what the Warren Drive connection would do other than take both lines of traffic and put it out on New Haven in half of the time. He did not see the benefit of taking a residential street and turning it

into an industrial street. He commented that he was sympathetic with the concerns regarding the bridges, but did not want the traffic funneled on his residential street.

Mayor Hindman asked Mr. Gaughan's where his house was located. Mr. Gaughan pointed to it on the overhead map. He commented that they were at the end of the County, so it was similar to a cul-de-sac. He noted the semi-trucks learned that after coming down the street. Mr. Janku asked why they came down his dead end street. Mr. Gaughan replied he did not know. Mr. Janku asked if they were trying to find an outlet to the north. Mr. Gaughan replied they were trying to get into Lemone. Mr. Janku understood Mr. Gaughan's house was north of the proposed connection, so traffic would not be pulled past his house. Mr. Gaughan agreed the traffic would not be coming past him, but he would have to deal with the traffic going to and from his home. He noted he was concerned with the indication that they would get to some things later because turning onto Warren at night involved a blind spot. He did not think they would want to have a left turn lane there without a light.

Don Stamper, 2604 N. Stadium Boulevard, stated he was representing the Central Missouri Development Council (CMDC) and noted in deference to Mr. Simmons and without neglecting from his issue, he did not believe these two things could be separated because what helped pay for the things they loved and held so dear was a thriving economy. A thriving economy required investment and opportunity. If they only addressed Warren Road, they would only increase the size of the waiting area. They would be doing nothing to relieve the wait and move the cars. He felt the challenge was to recognize the twenty-five year process that had gone on and the events occurring in the area which would make this improvement more important than ever. They not only needed to look at Lemone Industrial Boulevard, but also the extension of Stadium Boulevard and what would happen once New Haven, University Farm and the Bristol Lake properties developed. He noted the entire area was undergoing a rapid master planning process. This infrastructure was a part of what it would take to accommodate quality growth and an opportunity to expand the employment base. This was one place within the community where they had the opportunity to create jobs. He encouraged the Council to endorse the realignment of Maguire and move the project forward as quickly as possible because it dealt with the future of the community.

Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street, stated this discussion reminded her of the high school issue with a solution being put forward as the only solution with an attempt to push it through. After the public asked for alternatives, they ended up with a better solution. She noted they wanted to support the industries that created jobs, but did not want to spend a lot of public money if it could be done in a more efficient way. She did not feel there had been a comprehensive plan on how they could take care of needs in this area. She thought they were trying to do a comprehensive plan with assumptions without looking at other ways of getting it done. She suggested they go through another process. She commented that State Farm was allowing people to choose to come to work at different times with approval from their managers. She thought this was a creative solution to potential problems. She stated she also thought the City needed to review its policy of building bridges for people.

Catherine Parke, 413 Thilly Avenue, stated she believed this was a crucial issue as a metonymy for the City and the way they thought about things. She suggested they create a genuine and thoughtful master plan and take a step toward it by voting against this project and committing to collect all of the data available before making a decision. It did not work to collect

the data afterwards. She thought they should be collecting solid, hard, substantive, disinterested data before any kind of development and then aiming for as low impact development as possible.

Chris Knudsen, Director of Infrastructure Services at Carfax, stated he thought this was about Lemone versus Maguire until he saw Mr. Skala's presentation and asked if they were truly trying to get rid of this whole project and start over. He noted Carfax thought their employees would have two access points in and out of Lemone and pointed out they were attracting high-tech individuals into the area, which would help the City. He explained there was a fire at Gates about three months ago and one person was put in jail because he ran over fire a hose when trying to leave as that was his only way out. He noted Carfax had about 120 employees and was expanding. There were only 70 employees five years ago. He was concerned the Council was considering doing away with this project. They needed an alternate route to get out of there. He noted he had seen traffic backed up past Maguire and near the University. Everything, to include Lemone and New Haven was shut down three years ago during a police chase on Highway 63. He commented that he did not understand why this was a debate. He noted this started in 1979 and wondered when "in the future" would be to attract high-tech individuals. He was concerned that if there was a change, it would another twenty years before anything was done. He wondered why Carfax needed to be there and stated he would consider moving to a location where they could get technicians in and out. He requested something be done to provide two points out of there. He thought the way originally suggested would work.

Mr. Skala explained he distributed his opinion. He agreed there needed to be two access points as traffic there was bad. He was not suggesting they did not need traffic relief. He was suggesting the connection across the Grindstone Creek was not necessary. Mr. Knudsen commented that it appeared to him Mr. Skala was totally opposed to it and noted he could provide reasons indicating why they needed to get across Grindstone. Mr. Skala pointed out the first bullet in his summary stated "the Warren/New Haven signalized access will improve Lemone area traffic flow and emergency service" and he believed it was absolutely necessary. Mayor Hindman noted the project was not at issue tonight as the Council had already voted to go forward with the planning of the project. At some point, there would be another hearing on whether or not to actually accomplish the project, but the issue tonight had to do with whether it would be wise to have it go into Maguire versus Lemone with regard to planning. Mr. Knudsen stated they did not want the change. They preferred it come out of Lemone as that was what they thought would happen when they moved in there.

Robert Lemone, 6280 Arrowhead Lake Drive, stated he bought this farm with a partner in 1973 and around 1978-1979, they started working on it. The City talked him into building the industrial park. An industrial development authority was created and the first \$500,000 borrowed to build the first building was from that authority. He explained the City hooked him up with a development company out of Kansas City that planned the whole park with the road going across the creek. He noted it was the City's idea for Lemone to go straight through with one long bridge, but was never done.

John McCormick, 3414 S. Rangeline Road, stated some people he respected had great concerns about building the bridges and extending Lemone north. He respected their opinions, but did not have an opinion himself. He suggested the Council involve a process that included community members, so they received buy-in for the ultimate solution arrived at. He noted it

was clear there was a critical need to come to a solution for better traffic flow. He felt the high school site process was a great model for government and staff in bringing the community into the process, so the community embraced the result. He reiterated he was suggesting the Council develop a process that included the whole community when considering whether the project should really move forward.

Roger Schwartz stated he was representing MoDOT and they were urging the Council to move forward with this project. He commented that he would yield to City staff on whether they hooked to Lemone or Maguire. They did not have a concern regarding that, but agreed there needed to be another access out of there. He did not believe the access of bringing Warren Road back to New Haven as another southern access would solve the problem because it would just bring the people back to the Highway 63 and New Haven interchange where there was already a traffic problem. He noted that was the bottleneck that was keeping people from being able to get out of that area. Traffic was backing up on the ramps at Route AC at Highway 63. He commented that a lot of work was going on to the north at Highways 740 and 63 by a developer, which would add a lot of capacity improvement to the 740 interchange at Highway 63. He understood signals and turn lanes would be added. This would address traffic generated by the development at the 740 extension along with any traffic that would come north out of the Lemone Industrial Park. He thought it was important to get the project completed because it would provide a frontage road along Highway 63 would give people options to come north to 740 or go south. Giving people options was a great safety benefit. They agreed with the staff report in that half of the traffic in the Lemone Industrial Park would come to the north to Highway 740 if that option was available. Others who wanted to go to the western portions of Columbia or to the south would continue to use Route AC. He urged the Council to continue moving forward and noted a lot of planning had been done on this. He pointed out CATSO spent a lot of time putting together the 2025 Plan, which included streets in the Columbia region, and it involved a lot of input as well.

Brett Burri, 3400 Whitney Court, commented that he believed second to Scott Boulevard, this situation needed the Council's attention now. Lemone Industrial Park was built with a vision that had not been fully realized due to the continual traffic congestion. He was visiting customers and clients in the area regularly and faced many traffic delays. He thought the current situation was an impediment to other companies that would want to relocate and help with the improvement of the community. He believed this was an opportunity to complete a development with existing infrastructure and create jobs and tax revenue the community needed to support current services and future projects. He asked the Council to move forward as he thought the plan in front of them would relieve congestion.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, encouraged the Council to vote no on this particular issue and to direct staff to come back with a different proposal to do the Maguire project to New Haven without constructing the bridges at this time. He also suggested they work with MoDOT in doing the planning Dee Dokken and Catherine Parke recommended for a slightly larger area than just Warren Road. He agreed the interchange at 63 was a problem, but that was not the only problem. He did not believe the City had a plan for anything 2-3 miles down New Haven making it impossible to make any kind of decision. He thought they had the opportunity, with the money from the bond issue, to get a second access onto New Haven and expand and rebuild New Haven. He agreed with Mr. Skala in that one solution might be to partner with

MoDOT and add a lane going north. He reiterated he was suggesting they vote no on the issue tonight, proceed with traffic studies and obtain cost estimates, and if fixing New Haven, Maguire and Warren did not work, they could then build the bridges. He commented that after the last election, he attended the work sessions and did not feel there was a meaningful planning process on what to do with the money. He thought they could have gotten rid of Lemone and done other things. Council just approved staff's suggestions. He believed Mr. Beck was in the habit of making policy for the City without Council approval and did not think this was the time to honor Mr. Beck's promises. The intent of the industrial development needed to be honored, but did not necessarily include the bridges across the creeks. With regard to the policy of the City constructing the bridges, he thought it made sense in some situations, but did not believe it should be honored for a \$3-\$5 million project. He thought that policy needed to be further developed.

Hank Ottinger, 511 Westwood, stated he would prefer not to see the bridges built. He wanted, as suggested by Dee Dokken, for the people involved to get together to come up with a solution. If the bridges were to be built, he hoped they would be done in the greenest manner possible. He commented that Mr. Stamper indicated they needed to be concerned with those things they held dear, which he felt included the environment. He noted there were ways of making bridges greener than traditional bridges. He understood extra funds were available to devote to the design, construction and post-construction phases of these bridges. Ideally, a single span spanning both of the creeks would be wonderful to protect the riparian environment. He also suggested dedicated space for a trail through the area to be hooked up to Grindstone Park for people on the east side of town to access the trail system. He offered to assist the City in any phase and would be willing to try to pull people together to look at ways of designing the bridges in the most environmentally responsible way.

Eric Yern, 21 Fleming at Lenoir, stated he did not know how this was built twenty years ago with only one exit. He pointed out the City had a problem if there was ever a disaster in that area in the morning, around noon or in the evening. Fire trucks and ambulances would not be able to get through because it was a one lane road up to Lemone with cars backed up. He noted the school was right down the street and if a boiler blew up at the school, he wondered how they would get emergency vehicles past the intersection. He believed there needed to be another exit. The situation was getting worse and he did not know why there was not a simpler solution. He felt the City was not under fire, which was why nothing was happening.

Ron Shy, 5600 S. Highway KK, stated he worked with Allstate Consultants, which was located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Lemone Industrial Boulevard and New Haven Road. He was appalled at the testimony indicating there was no public good for a northward extension. Those who stated it had not been looked at or studied were wrong. He concurred with Mr. Schwartz in that going to Warren out to New Haven would do nothing but make it impossible for the people at Lenoir to get out. In addition, those in Lemone would not be able to get out either. He thought it was mistake to do that first. He believed the Maguire extension to Warren Road was better in the long run and that this would take most of the trucks off of New Haven as most of the heavy truck traffic was on the north end of the Park. In addition, he believed the people leaving Lemone who took the right onto 63 going north would also take that route, so that would only leave the traffic going south. He felt this would solve the problem for a long time to come. When they moved there in 1991, they had 28 people, but now

had 45 and were growing. He explained a lot of the traffic on New Haven to get into Lemone would cut through their parking lot, which was shared by New Haven School, the Dialysis Clinic and them, causing a dangerous situation. He urged the Council to move forward with the route along Maguire.

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

Mr. Wade stated his first public involvement with this issue was when he was Chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission through a memo dated June 8, 2006 in which the Commission recommended they oppose the extension. The purpose of the extension was to meet the transportation needs of the Lemone Industrial Complex and to provide a north/south connector street east of Highway 63. He opposed that proposal because he felt it inadequately addressed the transportation needs of the companies located in the complex, ran closely parallel to Highway 63 making no contribution to the long term City street infrastructure east of Highway 63 and causing the problem of the intersection at New Haven and Lemone Industrial Boulevard to be continued, if not exasperated, did nothing to reduce the ingress/egress problems for Lenoir, and impacted the environment due to the twin bridges. As he analyzed the other routes, he realized those had as much, if not more, environmental impact than the current proposal of the twin bridges, so the issue came down to a couple questions. One involved the route the road would take once it got to Lemone Industrial Boulevard and another involved whether they could adequately meet needs without it being a connection all of the way to Stadium. He stated he would support the proposal before them, which included the shift to the Maguire/Warren route and the route from New Haven over the twin bridges to Stadium. He believed the proposal addressed three of the four reasons he opposed the Lemone Boulevard extension. It did a much better job meeting the transportation needs of the companies located in the Lemone Industrial Complex by providing two new ingresses and egresses. He noted there were several locations of economic-based employment in Columbia and did not believe economic-based employment was commercial. There were several individual locations in Columbia that were important, such as Shelter Insurance, State Farm Insurance, Missouri Book Store, Boone County Hospital, Stephens College and Columbia College, but there were four concentrations of where employment existed, which was the University of Missouri, the medical complex on Keene, the complex of industries on Route B and the Lemone Industrial Complex. Contrary to comments made, he believed there were substantial public benefits and that the City had some responsibility. In addition, he now felt the partnership was a fair one with the City paying for the costs of the bridges and the development paying for the costs of the road. He commented that he believed development projects paid too little for off-site impact on infrastructure with the public's share being too much and was one of the reasons the City was continuing to get farther behind in meeting infrastructure needs, but also felt that was a separate policy issue that needed to be addressed and that the cost sharing on this road was appropriate. He thought the contribution to the long term City collector arterial infrastructure needed to be dealt with and understood a lot of statements had been made with regard to growth management planning. When looking at infrastructure south of WW and east of Highway 63, there were very few options for north/south collector or arterial streets. Due to the amount of traffic there, he felt it was essential to have a north/south collector at that location. This project would allow them to begin to putting the road infrastructure in place. In addition, this proposal would drastically reduce the congestion and improve the safety at Lemone Industrial Boulevard

and Highway 63. By connecting to Stadium, this would become the main truck access and would provide significant relief to residential and car traffic on New Haven. The road would be two lanes, but due to its design and limited access, it would be able to handle high levels of traffic safely. It would also allow the possibility of a reconfiguration of the road system for Lenoir at a future date. He reiterated that this proposal met three of the four criteria he wanted met. The fourth involved the environmental impact of the bridges. He thought they needed to recognize the impact had been slightly moderated by MoDOT's requirement that the bridges be moved further upstream from the original location. It also provided an opportunity to better mediate the impact. He commented that one of the benefits of the public critique for this project was that they had a heightened attention to the environmental concerns and mediation for these types of projects. He expected this to continue on all City road projects and hoped MoDOT would do the same. The notion of green bridges was important. He thought they needed to make the environmental impact concerns a part of the design for the beginning versus it being an afterthought. He understood the proposal before them was not an optimal solution, but believed it was the best of the possible options and that it was time to move the project forward.

Ms. Hoppe stated she voted against the Lenoir extension the first time because she thought there were other options that were less expensive and had less of an environmental impact on the convergence of the Grindstone forks. She agreed there was a traffic problem and thought this was an excellent example of not planning for the long term. She felt this was the result of bad planning and back door promises, which was not democracy. She thought the Council and the public needed to decide what went where and when versus the City Manager or other parties. She agreed a second exit was needed, but thought they should look at all of the options. Her preference was to do Warren Drive with the traffic light to see how it worked. She noted that after the Council voted on Lemone, they approved a revision to the AC interchange for a right designated only lane, which would improve traffic. The East Columbia transportation study was still not done and there were no studies showing the amount of traffic that would be thrown onto or removed from Lemone or Maguire. She felt there were a lot of unknowns. She wanted to proceed with the second exit of Maguire and Warren to see how it worked, as it had the least cost, before proceeding with the bridges. She thought they should also be looking at this issue as a whole. She felt this was a done deal before it started without any studies. She noted she thought the Maguire connection was better than Lemone as it was further east of 63. She echoed some of the statements made by Mr. Wade in terms of that connection. If this was approved, she thought they needed a citizen group and a study to ensure they were the most environmentally responsive bridges. She commented that she did not vote for the bridges the last time and would not change her mind this time.

Ms. Nauser stated she took offense to the insinuation that Lemone was pushed through because it made the assumption that those on the Council at that time did not have the information to make an informed decision. She thought the issue was discussed extensively through many work sessions. Ms. Hoppe stated she did not feel that way and noted she was on the Council then. Ms. Nauser pointed out she was not on the Council when Lemone was put on. She commented that they talked about economic development and the attempt to attract new industries to the community, but failed to adequately address the infrastructure needs of current industries. The Lemone Industrial Area was one of the key industrial and economic engines of the community and employed several thousand people. She noted industries in that

area paid over \$500,000 in real estate taxes. For 2007, with data from only a few of those industries, over \$1 million would be paid in personal property taxes. To say they were using public dollars for the benefit of a few people was selfish because this area was putting a lot of money into the public coffers for parks, trails, roads, schools, etc. She felt they had failed as a community by not providing those who worked in this area adequate ingress and egress. Whether this was supposed to have happened twenty years ago or now was not the point as there was a need for it today. She thought they needed to move forward and liked the new Maguire extension. Her only concern with this plan was putting off the connection from Warren to New Haven to a later date. She understood it was in the plan, but it would be phased in. She hoped they would apply the savings from doing only the bridges for the Warren Road extension to New Haven to get it finished. She commented that she cared about the environment as well, but thought not building the bridges could be short sighted. If they had this philosophy years ago, they would not have had Scott Boulevard, Forum, Stadium, etc. because they all crossed creeks. She believed they needed an outer road to stop people from using the highway as a City road. Highways were not City roads and they needed an outer road to service the entire corridor to include the Gans Road area, which would be another key economic engine to the community. She thought they had to give people adequate infrastructure to get about. If they failed to do that, companies would find communities willing to invest in infrastructure and would leave. She noted those companies would also be very difficult to replace.

Mr. Skala stated he did not think the bridges were a good idea, although he might be able to be convinced otherwise if the facts were there. He agreed with the suggestion of looking at the traffic flow due to the northern extension before building the bridges versus after building the bridges. With regard to the alignment, he was leaning toward the Maguire alignment because it opened up the possibility of the connection with New Haven. He noted the Council asked the Planning and Zoning Commission to review the CIP Plan and the Commission made the unanimous recommendation to remove the Lemone Industrial Boulevard extension to Stadium from the Plan because they felt alternatives, such as the enhancement of Lemone Boulevard, New Haven Road, Highway 63, etc. interconnections, should be considered. The Commission's reasons included the high cost relative to distance, the relatively narrow distribution of public benefits, the other much higher impact projects that could be done and the extensive negative environmental impacts. He stated he agreed it was an awful traffic area, but so was Ballenger/Clark Lane. He commented that some of the people who worked on Lemone Industrial lived on Ballenger Lane and St. Charles Road, which were two of the projects removed from the list in 2005 when the one ballot measure did not pass. He admitted he helped to defeat the ballot measure and did that because the City never asked anyone to come to the table to talk about priorities with regard to the roads chosen, the cost, how it would be financed, etc. It was not because he thought the City did not need money for infrastructure. His problem with this had to do with process in how it was given to the public, what was voted on and how some of the road projects were eliminated or moved up in priority. He noted the Ballenger Lane overpass across I-70 and the improvement from St. Charles Road to Keene Street were on the 2-3 year track in the CIP Plan before the 2005 ballot issue, while Lemone was on the 7-10 year track. After the ballot issue failed, those two projects were removed from the CIP Plan priority and the Lemone project was expedited. He did not know if the bridges were necessary and felt the reasonable and prudent approach would be to make the improvements within the Lemone

Industrial Park, allow another access point and improve New Haven Road to see how that worked. He agreed they needed a north/south connector, but thought they needed it further to the east. He stated Rolling Hills Road would be the next north/south road and a total extension of Warren was cost prohibitive. He commented that \$5 million was for the two bridges and the road in between and another \$4 million would come from private contributions, which was not private because they would be funded with a TDD, so they would ultimately spend approximately \$10 million for this improvement. He did not think they knew whether it was worth \$10 million or if they had to have this improvement yet. He suggested they get some people together for a work session to solve some of these problems before having people come to a City Council meeting. He thought part of the problem was that some of the information had been misrepresented. If it came to a vote on this specific issue, he felt Maguire opened up the opportunity for another access point so that was what he would favor. He pointed out, as this moved forward down the road, he would vote against the extension of the bridges until it was demonstrated it was absolutely essential to solve the problem they had without first trying some alternatives.

Mr. Janku stated he supported the original decision to design the bridges as he believed they had a significant public benefit. He also thought they needed to move forward expeditiously. He noted the gentlemen from Carfax made some clear points with regard to the frustration employers were feeling in that if they could not recruit good talent, they would consider relocating. He pointed out he did not think the vote tonight would slow things down. It would keep things moving forward at the same pace. He also thought the final connection from Warren would be completed by the time the bridges were completed. He understood things, such as different work shifts, were being tried to address peak demand times. He commented that in the previous public hearing, Mayor Hindman stated he wanted the bridges to be designed in the most environmentally sensitive manner, even if it was not the most inexpensive way, so he thought that was part of the current planning process. If they did not build the bridges, he believed the trucks would go further east to Rolling Hills, so they would be pushing heavy truck traffic in that direction. As Mr. Watkins had indicated, there was a long history of this being on the CATSO Plan and the City's CIP Plan, although it was not funded, and he thought it was appropriate for staff to tell people it was part of the City's long range plan to build this road.

Ms. Crayton stated she had previously worked near New Haven and at Lenoir and did not feel the traffic was getting any better. She also thought it would get worse if apartments were located where the trailer courts were currently. She noted there were 2,000 people, school buses and tractor trailers on that road causing traffic to back up. She wondered what needed to happen before they decided to take charge of that road and believed they needed to do something to relieve the traffic.

Mayor Hindman stated he intended to vote in favor of the Maguire extension and pointed out he favored the bridges. He commented that one of the things they were trying to do was encourage industrial development and the building of industrial parks in Columbia. The best economic development strategy was to take care of what they had. He believed this Park had good industry and that the industry was telling them the traffic situation there was unacceptable. He believed the City needed to put in the proper infrastructure to support it. He wondered who else would build an industrial park if they saw the City was not supportive. He felt if they tried to solve the problem with Warren Road going to New Haven and everyone turning right to go to

Highway 63, it would just make the intersection worse. He noted he was concerned with the environmental issues. He agreed it was a sensitive place with two streams coming together. He thought they should be looking at green bridge building techniques and was sure it would be reviewed. He understood staff would let them know what they were doing along that line.

Mayor Hindman made the motion to replace the Lemone Industrial Boulevard extension with the Maguire extension.

Mr. Janku asked if they could also proceed with planning the connection from Warren Road, so it would be in place when this project was completed.

Mr. Skala stated he saw this area to include Lemone, Warren and New Haven Road, which was why he would support the change to Maguire, and pointed out in the future he would oppose the bridges unless he had data to show it was the only reasonable alternative.

Mayor Hindman stated he would include Mr. Janku's suggestion in his motion and noted his motion was to replace the Lemone Industrial Boulevard extension with the Maguire extension and to direct staff to proceed with plans for the connection from Warren Road. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(C) Construction of the Brandon Road Phase I storm water management project.

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated the goal of this project was to reduce the incidents of house and street flooding at the southeast end of Brandon Road. The improvements included realigning the end of Brandon Road, adding a swale on the side of the road, building a retaining wall and flood wall and improving a swale along Stadium Boulevard to help reduce the frequency of the flooding of houses along the street. A sanitary sewer pipe and manhole would also need to be moved. The estimated cost of the project was \$170,000 and would be paid for by a combination of storm water utility and sanitary sewer utility funds. He noted there had been a number of meetings with the neighbors in regard to this project and believed it was something most people were comfortable with.

Mr. Glascock showed a drawing of the project on the overhead and explained the project had been on books for a number of years, but they had issues with reaching a consensus, so they decided to split it into two phases. This would not solve all of the flooding problems, but would relieve a lot of it. They would be building swales and taking the overflow to a different route. In order to do this, they needed to move the sanitary sewer. This did not cost as much as if they would have had to replace the culvert.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Teresa Maledy, 4501 E. Bonne Femme Church Road, stated she would be moving to 215 Brandon Road on December 7, which was why she had an interest in this. She commented that they had attended one public meeting and noted they appreciated the City's willingness to gain input from the neighbors. The last plan they received indicated they could potentially lose 8-10 feet off of the front yard. She understood they were tilting the street to encourage the runoff to go down the street and were in favor of that. She noted they discussed wanting to save two large trees in the front yard and City staff was able to make some accommodations to reduce the amount of yard they would be losing. She asked that as the plans were refined, the City continue to try to find ways to protect the trees and as much of the front yards of the houses as possible.

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

Ms. Nauser apologized for not being able to attend some of the public meetings on this issue and stated she was glad to see the project was moving forward.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with Phase I of the Brandon Road storm water management project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

R281-07 Certifying local organizations as community housing development organizations; amending the 2007 Action Plan.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this dealt with the HOME allocation and explained a HUD requirement was that they reserve 15 percent for Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO's). The Community Development Commission was recommending two proposals be funded from the 15 percent set aside. They were suggesting \$55,960 for Habitat and \$35,000 for Job Point. In order to reserve the funds for Habitat and Job Point, the Council needed to formally certify them as qualified CHDO's and amend the Action Plan.

Mr. Teddy explained the term Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO's) was a Housing and Urban Development (HUD) term that referred to not-for-profit organizations that met certain federal criteria, such as having the development of affordable housing as part of their purpose and a certain amount of representation on their governing board that represented low income neighborhoods. The three organizations that competed for the annual set aside all met the criteria described by HUD. The 15 percent set aside equaled \$90,960 and the total requested was \$202,367. Staff and the Community Development Commission agreed on the recommendation to provide \$55,960 to the Show Me Central Chapter of Habitat for Humanity to help build six affordable houses and \$35,000 to Job Point to help build an affordable house and provide job training services to disadvantaged youth.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Crayton noted many organizations did not do what they indicated they would, but thought these entities actually helped the community and wished they could provide them more funding. The people with Job Point were being trained to build houses and she thought that was good because they would have to rebuild their own neighborhoods. In addition, some would be getting those homes.

Mr. Janku stated he was supportive of this as well. He noted he had supported Habitat's projects on Norbury Hill and Haden Drive. He understood they still had to build a sidewalk along Oakland Gravel for the Norbury Hill project and wanted to ensure it was completed in a timely manner because the City would be building the other part connecting to it. Mr. Watkins thought they had their part essentially done.

Mr. Skala thought it was good to encourage affordable housing in the community and like Ms. Crayton wished there were more funds available.

The vote on R281-07 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B382-07 Establishing a sidewalk maintenance and construction policy.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would amend the current sidewalk funding policy with regard to maintenance. Staff was proposing to amend the policy by providing 50 percent of repair costs for downtown sidewalks and 100 percent of the reconstruction/replacement costs of sidewalks in some older neighborhoods. He noted this was all subject to funding availability. With regard to the replacement of sidewalks, staff was considering doing some of the work themselves and hiring youth from the neighborhoods for summer employment as it would benefit the property owners in the area as well.

Ms. Hoppe noted the Council memo discussed sidewalks shown on the Master Plan and sidewalks not shown on the Master Plan. In addition, Section 7 of the ordinance dealt with sidewalks on the Master Plan. She wondered where the sidewalks not on the Master Plan were addressed in the ordinance. Mr. Glascock replied it was not specifically in the ordinance and his interpretation was that if they were not on the Plan, they would be included in whatever was left. Ms. Hoppe asked if they needed to include something in the ordinance to address those not included on the Master Plan.

Mr. Janku commented that this ordinance dealt with the reconstruction of sidewalks, but wondered how minor repairs would be handled. He asked if this would allow that to be done at the City's expense. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mr. Janku noted the ordinance did not address that issue either, but it was understood. Mr. Glascock explained the ordinance addressed major repairs where they were taking out large sections of sidewalk. The grinding was done by staff.

Mr. Wade asked what sidewalks were not included in the Master Sidewalk Plan. Mr. Janku replied many. Mr. Glascock stated all of the residential sidewalks were not included. Mr. Wade noted Section 8 of the ordinance addressed sections of sidewalks in single family areas.

Mr. Boeckmann referred to the last paragraph on the first page of the Council memo and noted Section 8 of the ordinance addressed it. Ms. Hoppe understood the single family areas were not on the Master Sidewalk Plan. Mr. Glascock explained they previously indicated they would provide 50 percent in any R-1 or PUD area and they revised it in order to include affordable housing areas per Ms. Nausser's request. Ms. Nausser commented that she was concerned because it originally indicated they would only pay if it was owner occupied, so if it was a rental, the landlord would have to pay and would essentially force the tenant to pay for it. Mr. Watkins stated their goal was for the City to take on the repair of all sidewalks in the Master Plan, which included the major sidewalk area and was covered by Section 7. With Section 8, they were saying they would address a residential sidewalk that needed to be repaired or replaced subject to funding availability whether it was in the Master Plan or not. That left commercial sidewalks and other sidewalks not in the Master Plan. Downtown sidewalks were included in the ordinance and they were suggesting a 50/50 split in costs.

Ms. Nausser noted Section 7 indicated this was subject to the availability of funds and asked if there would be criteria. Mr. Watkins stated he anticipated Council setting a level of funding and staff providing a plan to spend that money subject to adjustments by Council.

B382-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B387-07 Authorizing an amendment to performance contract for Bluff Creek Estates, Plat 7 with B & E Investment, Inc.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated per current policy, Bluff Creek Estates was responsible for building a road and the City was supposed to build a bridge over the Grindstone Creek on the other side of Highway 63, but the City had never taken on the responsibility for that bridge because of the lack of funding and the opposition from the neighbors on both sides of the bridge. In addition, staff was not proposing to bring the bridge up for Council consideration in the foreseeable future. The developer was requesting they amend the agreement with the plat to specifically say he was not responsible for the bridge. He noted the road was designed to have a bridge, but bridge was not built so the road just ended.

Ms. Hoppe stated the residents were concerned with regard to what would happen in the area. A lot of construction debris and concrete was dumped on both sides and on the north side it was about eight feet high. In addition, there was erosion. She wanted to know how the road would be completed. Mr. Glascock explained from the City's standpoint, it would be completed when the bridge was in because there was nothing saying the bridge would never be built. They would leave it open to be built. Ms. Hoppe asked what would be done with the end of the road in the meantime because the concrete street ended abruptly and without warning and the road dropped off into what had become a construction debris site per a resident of the area. The resident also indicated that over the years, contractors had used the site to dump concrete sludge left over from the building sites through the subdivision. Top soil had been removed from the area surrounding the end of the creek and hauled off to other construction sites. What was left was a disturbed, uneven, unsightly erosion-prone perpetual construction debris site that was unsafe and appeared to be unregulated. Mr. Glascock stated they looked at it and were considering putting up signs at the end of the pavement to make it safer. They were still trying to determine what they could do with regard to the erosion.

Mr. Janku noted a barrier was put up at the end of Smiley and asked if that could be done. Mr. Glascock replied it was called a type five diamond and was red. Mr. Janku asked if that was what they were proposing to put up. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe asked for the ordinance that spoke to how the roads were completed. Mr. Glascock replied they were just a dead end. It could dead end into a property or could have a cul-de-sac on them. It depended on how it was planned on the plat. Ms. Hoppe asked if the City had any standards or requirements. Mr. Glascock replied it just could not drop off abruptly and there should be signs at the end of them.

Mayor Hindman understood the plat showed a bridge, but the neighbors were objecting to the bridge being built. Ms. Hoppe pointed out they did not raise the issue of the bridge. They were concerned about it being an eyesore and were concerned with the erosion. Mr. Janku stated they could address the signage, but wondered what could be done about the erosion. Mr. Glascock explained it was similar to what they had on Providence at one time. He noted

this was a rocky area, so it would not take seed and mulch well. They would have to come up with some mixture that would look nice.

Mr. Wade understood the bridge was in the plat and as long as it was in the plat, the road had to be such that it allowed a bridge to be built. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct. Mr. Wade thought they had some options. They could put up a sign or take the bridge off of the plat and create a cul-de-sac to have a descent end to the street. If they only put up signs, they would never have a decent end to the street. Mr. Watkins thought they needed to determine if they would ever build a bridge and if they were going to build it, they needed to proceed. If they decided they did not want a bridge, he agreed they needed to amend the plat with the developer's assistance to remove the bridge and provide a plan for ending the roads. Mr. Wade stated in order to do it right, they needed descent data about whether there should ever be a bridge there and input from the neighbors and developer. He wondered if there was even a reason for the bridge.

Mr. Janku thought there was a reason for the bridge, but the reality was that the neighbors did not want it on either side even though the community would benefit from it. In addition, there was no funding for it at this time. He thought they needed to determine if they could satisfy the neighbors' immediate concerns without a long, involved costly process and thought they could. With the appropriate signage and a report indicating how they could deal with the other issues, he thought they could solve the problem without a public hearing on whether the bridge would be built or not. Mr. Wade commented that there would be no public hearing with the plat. Mr. Janku agreed, but noted this would involve some public discussion and costs due to the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Skala thought the critical question was whether they could do a proper job without taking the bridge off of the plat and they would need to defer to staff on that issue. Mr. Glascock stated the road had been like this for many years. They did not get to the end of it to check it enough. He thought they could do a proper job and did not believe the bridge should be removed from the plat because they did not know what might be needed in the future. Mayor Hindman suggested a pedestrian bicycle bridge over it.

Mr. Wade asked about the issues of erosion and illegal dumping. Mr. Glascock replied he would either need cameras or would have to send someone down there to catch them. Mr. Janku asked about placing a barricade there to make it more difficult for the trucks to reach that point. Mr. Glascock replied they could do something to create a barrier.

Mr. Janku recalled the developer having to put more money into the project in order to prepare the road for the bridge. He suggested a report be requested at the end of the meeting to address the concerns.

B387-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B388-07 Accepting certain streets for ownership and maintenance from the Missouri Department of Transportation.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this would authorize the City Manager to take over twelve streets that were currently maintained by MoDOT. He pointed out they were not taking over Stadium,

Providence or College. A lot of these streets were in areas most people did not realize were MoDOT responsibility. He commented that the one that was of particular concern to staff was the outer road of Route K, which was the entrance to Rockbridge High School and the Career Center. With these being a MoDOT responsibility, they were the lowest priority for maintenance, snow removal, etc. By bringing them into the City system, the City would be in a better position to address the needs of snow removal and maintenance.

B388-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B389-07 Authorizing acquisition of property for storm water control and for construction of Brown School Road, from approximately 300 feet west of Highway 763/Rangeline Street westward to Providence Road.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was in addition to an ordinance the Council approved in October authorizing staff to acquire the appropriate easements for the improvement of Brown School Road, which was a 2005 ballot issue street. They needed an easement they had not previously requested in order to deal with some storm water issues.

Mr. Glascock described the properties using the overhead and stated they wanted to purchase both properties owned by the same person for a storm water feature for the upper Cow Branch to assist with water quality in the area.

Mr. Janku asked if it could potentially be part of the trail network or used for recreation. Mr. Glascock replied it could.

Mayor Hindman asked if there would be a lot of tree clearing. Mr. Glascock replied there would not be a lot in that area. There would be some along Brown School Road. He explained they would back water up into this property.

Mr. Janku asked if it would be a retention pond. Mr. Glascock replied it would be a retention/detention type area. Mr. Janku asked if it would be similar to what was at Again Park. Mr. Glascock replied it would be dry most of the time. Mr. Watkins noted it currently flooded.

Ms. Nauser asked about the cost. Mr. Glascock replied he failed to include it, but noted they would go through an appraiser if they had to condemn it. Ms. Nauser asked where the money would come from. Mr. Glascock replied it would come from storm water and project funds. The one to the north would be paid for with storm water funds because it was strictly for storm water.

B389-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B393-07 Appropriating funds from The Missouri Foundation for Health grant relating to Local Health Department Infrastructure Enhancement.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was an ordinance that would appropriate funds from a grant the Health Department had received.

Ms. Browning explained the previous Council agenda included the approval of this grant and this was the fifth grant received from The Missouri Foundation for Health, which was

created by the Blue Cross/Blue Shield when they went from a not-for-profit to for-profit status. They had an 82 county service area to include Boone County. This particular grant came from them seeing health departments struggling and not having excess money for infrastructure improvements, so they decided to set aside \$50,000 for each of the 82 counties plus \$2 per capita. This amounted to about \$350,985 over a three year period. Its uses were limited in that it could not be used for personnel costs or continued expenses, such as health services. It could be used to make improvements, such as sound improvements in their heavily used training areas, improvements to Animal Control, the replacement of some vehicles, communications enhancements, improvements to emergency communications Ham radio system, etc. They had the opportunity to consider some projects they would not have been able to ask for under normal budget circumstances.

Ms. Hoppe understood during the first year, the money would be used to improve the Animal Control Division workspace and asked if that went with the furniture. Ms. Browning replied some of it was linked with the furniture. The miscellaneous contractual would be for contracting to have the acoustics done in the Health Department. Some of the other furniture arrangements would address some space flow issues in the clinic area and training rooms.

B393-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B384-07 Approving the Final Plat of Vintage Falls Plat 2; authorizing a performance contract.**
- B385-07 Approving the Final Plat of Westchester Village Plat 1-A, a Replat of Lot 67 Westchester Village Planned Unit Development, located on the southwest side of South Village Circle, west of Bethel Street.**
- B386-07 Vacating electric, utility and water easements within First Tier Plat 1 Subdivision.**
- B390-07 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to establish an all-way stop at the intersection of Silvey Street and Worley Street.**
- B391-07 Authorizing a right of use permit with Mill Creek Manor, Inc. for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of landscaping, including an irrigation system, lighting, electrical conduits and water service lines, within Thornbrook Terrace and Abbingdon Terrace rights-of-way.**
- B392-07 Amending Chapter 10 of the City Code as it relates to placement, screening and relocation of video service provider facilities.**
- B394-07 Appropriating funds from The Missouri Foundation for Health grant relating to the 2007 Healthy and Active Communities Project.**
- B395-07 Appropriating donated funds for supplies for the D.A.R.E. program.**
- B396-07 Authorizing an amendment to the Cooperative Agreement with Boone County and Boone Electric Cooperative relating to establishment and operation of a Geographic Information System (GIS).**
- B397-07 Adopting the City of Columbia, Missouri, Money Purchase Plan; authorizing the Director of Finance to administer the plan.**

- R271-07 Setting a public hearing: construction of Clark Lane from Route PP to St. Charles Road.
- R272-07 Authorizing an agreement with the PedNet Coalition, Inc. for the Mayor's Challenge: Bike, Walk & Wheel Week event.
- R273-07 Authorizing agreements with local organizations to fund human rights education programs.
- R274-07 Authorizing agreements with various home health care agencies for homemaker/personal care and respite care services.
- R275-07 Authorizing agreements with various social service agencies.
- R276-07 Authorizing various emergency vaccine/medication dispensing agreements and alternate site mass medical treatment agreements.
- R277-07 Authorizing a Contract of Obligation with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for financial assurance for proper closure and post-closure activities at Columbia's landfill.
- R278-07 Authorizing a joint funding agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring in the vicinity of the wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.
- R279-07 Authorizing an Assignment of Fire Hydrant Service Contract (Blue Acres) with Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

R280-07 Adopting a five year (2008-2012) active and retiree premium rate structure strategy for the City of Columbia.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was an extension of the discussion from the last meeting with regard to the health insurance rates for active and retired employees to meet the new GASB policies. This resolution laid out how they planned on meeting all of the requirements for the next five years.

Ms. Buckler explained this was needed so the City had a plan that could be provided to auditors and bonding companies.

Mr. Janku asked if any other communities had done anything similar to what they did with regard to Medicare retirees, etc. Ms. Buckler replied there were no comparisons for a City this size. Mr. Janku stated he asked because he thought it was a great idea.

The vote on R280-07 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B398-07 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to the Historic Preservation Commission.
- B399-07 Approving the Final Plat of Paris Road Plaza Plat 1 located on the east side of Paris Road (State Route B), north of East Brown Station Road.
- B400-07 Vacating a sanitary sewer easement located on Lot 4 within Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 1.
- B401-07 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to long-term lease of off-street parking spaces.
- B402-07 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code, as it relates to the 2006 Edition of the International Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings.
- B403-07 Accepting conveyances for street, utility and temporary construction purposes.
- B404-07 Confirming the contract with Emery Sapp & Sons, Inc. for relocation of 8-inch and 12-inch water mains along U.S. Highway 763, between Big Bear Boulevard and Summerfield Street.
- B405-07 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B406-07 Approving a petition requesting the formation of the Keene Medical District Community Improvement District consisting primarily of property located along Keene Street from Broadway to I-70 Drive Southeast.
- B407-07 Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia School District for a playground improvement project at Field Elementary School.
- B408-07 Appropriating donated funds for the Flat Branch Park Phase II development project and the Stephens Lake Park development project.
- B409-07 Authorizing a right of use permit with The Curators of the University of Missouri for installation of an emergency outdoor warning siren on the Sinclair Farm property.
- B410-07 Appropriating federal forfeiture funds for the purchase of video surveillance equipment for the Police Department.
- B411-07 Authorizing a lease agreement with the Carolyn J. Adams Revocable Living Trust for property located at 2311 East Walnut Street.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

(A) Intra-departmental Transfer of Funds.

Report accepted.

(B) Bus Stop on Green Meadows, West of Providence.

Mr. Watkins explained Council had asked staff to determine whether the bus stop at Green Meadows and Providence needed to be moved. Staff was recommending it not be moved at this time.

Mr. Glascock stated it was one of the City's most utilized bus stops. In addition, they would stop there anyways because it was at a corner. He explained if people stood there, they would stop regardless of whether it was a regular stop or not because it was at a corner.

Ms. Hoppe stated she raised the issue because she had seen traffic backed up to the outer drive. She was okay with it if it was fine with staff.

(C) Street Snow Removal Recommendations.

Mr. Watkins stated this report reflected discussions from the last work session with regard to snow removal operations and policies for the upcoming snow season. Staff wanted Council's concurrence.

Mr. Glascock noted a statement was added to the report indicating they would treat residential streets during normal working hours as needed even if it was less than four inches in case there was a need to treat a particular problem.

Mr. Wade asked if that would affect the money available for street maintenance. Mr. Glascock clarified that he did not mean they would treat them. He thought something could come up and did not think it was good policy for them to say they would not do it if that was the case. He gave the example of a water line breaking causing an icy area. Mr. Wade asked where the money was charged if it was during regular business hours. Mr. Glascock replied it would come from the operating budget. Mr. Janku thought it could be moved to street maintenance if it was not spent. Mr. Wade understood it did not reduce that budget because staff was on the payroll already. Mr. Glascock pointed out if they did all of the residential streets during regular hours, it would reduce that budget because they would be burning fuel and using salt. He reiterated this was only for problems they did not anticipate.

Mr. Janku understood this was policy, so adjustments could be made in terms of priorities. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Watkins noted it was his intention to bring this to Council every year to determine if any adjustments needed to be made.

Mr. Janku made the motion to approve the new policy for snow removal. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(D) Street Closure Request - Earth Day 2008.

Mayor Hindman made a motion to approve the street closure as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Janku stated there was a car business along Rangeline that stored a lot of used tires near the roadway and a concern was raised regarding mosquitoes. It was also unsightly and a nuisance. In addition, the business had historically stored vehicles behind the building, which was adjacent to Bear Creek. The City recently adopted regulations dealing with property usage near creeks. He wondered if there was any existing ordinance that could be enforced and if not, he wanted a report with suggestions on how to address this issue.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to review existing ordinances to determine if any of those could be enforced and if there were none, to provide a report with suggestions on how to address the issues of the tires near the roadway and the vehicles adjacent to Bear Creek. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Crayton stated she saw people following the trucks delivering trash bags to residents and taking those bags. She thought the public needed to be aware of this. She noted they were even using children and believed this was a constant problem. Mayor Hindman asked if they were taking the blue bags. Ms. Crayton replied they were taking black and blue bags. She wondered if there was anything that could be done. Mr. Watkins pointed out that was why staff had suggested a coupon system. Mayor Hindman understood they would be trying the coupon system in one part of town. Mr. Janku asked where they were trying it. Mr. Watkins replied they had not developed the proposal yet, but were working on it.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted staff to come up with a plan and time table for taking care of the erosion problems and the dumping of concrete problem on Bluff Creek Drive near the Grindstone Creek in order to make it a more attractive area.

Mr. Janku asked if she wanted to include both sides. Ms. Hoppe replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report which included a plan and time table for taking care of the erosion problems and the dumping of concrete problem for Bluff Creek Drive on both sides of the Grindstone. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser stated they had all been thinking and talking about the City's crime problems and wanted to reassure the public that this was a high priority for the Council as they had talked about it several times. She noted she attended two workshops on crime and gang violence at the National League of Cities (NLC) Conference and received a lot of valuable information. In addition, she had been doing a lot of reading on successful community programs to help prevent crime. She did not want them to be overly focused on the policing end of the problem because that involved reacting to the situation. She thought it needed to be a community approach. She understood Chief Boehm was in the process of gathering statistics they requested at a previous work session and wanted other information to be provided as well. She wanted to know if there was any data with regard to the ages of adult offenders, the highest grade completed, zip codes and their last known addresses in order to pin point where the illegal activity might be coming from so they could focus resources in that area. In conducting her own research, one interesting statistic she found was that over 1,000 children in the community had dropped out of high school since 2003. She thought that was alarming as it indicated many children had no hope for the future other than crime. She commented that they had received information on how many active police officers the City had, but also wanted a comparison of active police officers per population from other comparable communities so they had baseline data. In addition, she wanted to know the cost of hiring two new beat officers and one traffic officer and the cost of some new vehicles, so they had that information if they needed to make some serious budget decisions. She also wanted a report with information from the Police Department, the Social Services Division and the Parks and Recreation Department that identified the proactive measures and/or programs currently in place to prevent children from getting involved in crime, such as mentoring programs. She wondered if there were any collaborative efforts between the City and the School District to reduce dropout rates and truancy and if there were any collaborative efforts in place between the City and other community organizations, such as faith based organizations, youth based organizations,

charitable organizations, etc. She noted a program called 1-800-Speak-Up was discussed at a workshop at the NLC Conference. It was a program where children could call and report illegal gun ownership without a fear of retaliation since they would be calling a central location elsewhere. Those calls would then be redirected to the Police Department. She had not had the chance to look into that, but thought it might be valuable. Mr. Skala stated he collected some notes and would make that available to staff.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to provide reports on all of the items she mentioned. The motion was seconded by Ms. Crayton and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala noted one of his neighbors went to the School Board when there was a rash of burglaries to determine which of the youth in the area had not been attending school or had dropped out. Those were the kids involved in the break-ins per the Police Department. He noted these were crimes of opportunity for at-risk kids with nothing else to do.

Ms. Nauser commented that she failed to formally ask for information regarding the shortage of police officers and what they would not be able to fill. She pointed out she mentioned it during the pre-Council meeting. Mayor Hindman stated he assumed that would be included with the previous requests.

Mr. Wade stated there had been discussion about different issues in terms of amending the Charter and he wanted a report on the different ways the Charter could be amended along with advantages and disadvantages.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to provide a report on the different ways the Charter could be amended to include the advantages and disadvantages of each. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade stated he had received several complaints from people who had bad experiences with others who were not keeping their dogs on a leash and under control. He commented that he had a specific incident he would forward to Ms. Rhodes, so the Parks and Recreation Department would have at least one specific complaint. After reviewing the Parks and Recreation Department report for the month, he noticed there were about a dozen notations about dogs not on a leash, but all were given warnings.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to provide a report on how they could ensure the leash requirement was enforced so the dogs did not interfere and intrude into the activities of others. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade noted he had previously asked for information from the Water and Light Advisory Board about the economics of fuel cells and the possibility of having one fuel cell for experimentation. He believed fuel cells were cheaper than solar panels and wanted to know the status of his request.

Mr. Skala stated he recently spoke to a constituent that lived in the Benton-Stephens area and whose father was Paul Albert. He was asking about the controversy surrounding the naming or renaming of Albert Oakland Park. He wanted a report on whether that was being considered, how it was being considered, etc. He just wanted the details. Mr. Janku noted they

had received a report in the past. Mayor Hindman suggested staff provide that report to Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala noted during the break, he spoke with Mr. Lemone who pointed out he might have been misinformed with regard to his contribution and whether he would be reimbursed, so they agreed to get together to discuss the issue.

Mr. Skala explained he had a constituent who requested information about the Randy Adams Building on East Walnut and asked staff to look into it and to provide the zoning history, etc. and they did a marvelous job in tracking it and providing a response.

The meeting adjourned at 11:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk