

MINUTES
SPECIAL
CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
JULY 22, 2008

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a special session at 6:00 p.m., on Tuesday, July 22, 2008, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE and HINDMAN were present. The City Manager, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

NEW BUSINESS

Determining the priorities for GetAbout infrastructure projects.

Mayor Hindman explained the purpose of tonight's meeting was to make decisions about proposed projects that should be funded and built and noted the Council was anxious to obtain citizen input.

Mr. Watkins asked Mr. Glascock to review the projects that had been identified in previous Council work sessions and by the GetAbout Committee.

Mr. Glascock explained the City had been given a \$22 million federal highway grant for non-motorized transportation in order to try to make a difference in modal shift by getting people out of cars and using other transportation modes such as walking, bicycles and the transit system. He noted they had used about \$2 million in promotion and education. He referred to the overhead and stated the next four lines showed office space and payroll for each of the upcoming years. A report was due to Congress by September, 2010 regarding what had been done. There were also \$1 million in intersections improvements the Council had approved in June and three sidewalk projects approved by the Council in May. They had about \$700,000 for bike shelters, racks, striping and cost share. The next two items, which involved promotion and education and street marking, intersection and wayfinding were being proposed by staff in order to continue what they had started. Approximately \$350,000 involved planning studies for projects not identified for moving forward but needing to be brought to a logical stopping point. They also included a contingency to cover any unforeseen circumstance. Normally, that would be around 5-10 percent, but they tried to keep it to a minimum by using 3.5 percent, so the remaining balance was about \$12 million. He pointed out they had about \$17 million worth of projects on the list provided, so it needed to be narrowed down to about \$13 million.

Mr. Watkins asked Mr. Glascock explain the color coding on the matrix. Mr. Glascock replied items in green required no right-of-way. They felt those could be built very fast with construction starting in spring. Items in yellow involved low right-of-way impacts and staff felt those could potentially be done by mid-summer or fall of next year. The red items had medium impacts and would take a while to get through. They thought those might run into 2010. The blue items involved high right-of-way impacts and would take the longest to get started. The purple items were projects involving other issues.

Mr. Watkins pointed out that because this involved federal money, they had to follow federal procedures in terms of right-of-way acquisition, which took a long time. He commented that it was a fair, but lengthy process, even when there was voluntary donation of right-of-way. Staff was asking the Council to identify projects they felt comfortable moving ahead with even if it was a number less than \$13 million, so they could get started with those. He understood Congress would begin considering the next round of highway funding and felt they needed to show some construction or a modal shift by 2010 or next spring in order to begin the process of asking for additional money in the highway bill. He noted they were anxious to get started on as many projects as Council felt comfortable with.

Mr. Janku stated the Old 63 to Grindstone project was shown to have an estimated cost of \$2.3 million. He wondered how that tied into the pedway along Old 63, which was funded with State enhancement and City money. Mr. Glascock explained they had the portion along the Hinkson Creek to Grindstone Park funded through enhancement grants. This project went south to Bearfield from Grindstone Park and north to Stephens Lake Park from the Hinkson Creek bridge. It would allow one to get all of the way down Old 63.

Mr. Janku understood a 3.5 percent contingency fee was added to the total program and asked if the individual project numbers included contingency fees. Mr. Glascock replied those were planning numbers. They tried to get them as close as they could with some contingency. When going through a project, the scope changed some, so they tried to anticipate those changes with a little contingency.

Mr. Janku understood there were assumed numbers for the width, size and surface when the estimates were done. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Janku thought when they discussed those specifics, it might impact the costs.

Mr. Skala asked if these numbers assumed paved trails. Mr. Glascock replied they were paved pathways. Mr. Skala understood there was no provision for hybrid or unpaved trails at this point and that these numbers reflected the cost of paved pedways with a standard width of approximately ten feet. Mr. Glascock stated the pedways would be eight to ten feet wide.

Ms. Hoppe commented that a lot of people had raised the issue of signage in terms of safety when bike lanes and pedways intersected with streets and asked if that was built into the budget. Mr. Glascock replied it was part of the wayfinding signage budget. Ms. Hoppe stated she was not just talking about how to get from one place to another. She explained she was talking about safety issues. Mr. Glascock stated that was part of the signage.

Mr. Skala understood there was some discussion in terms of the advertising budget as there were two parts to that budget. One part had already been spent and the other part was projected to still be needed for advertising. He thought there was a suggestion to reduce the budget if some of these other options were to be considered. He understood that was not reflected in the numbers they were provided because that projection assumed they were continuing with what was planned initially in terms of advertising. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Skala understood any savings would come out of those budgets. Mr. Glascock stated it could.

Mr. Wade commented that they had a list of eighteen projects, which involved a substantial investment in terms of feasibility, preliminary engineering design, etc. He noted

\$4.8 million in projects would be eliminated and asked what would happen to the projects that were not a part of construction for this phase. Mr. Glascock replied the money given fell under the Federal Highway Commission and required them to follow certain guidelines to include the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process. Those rules included a no build option. He noted the projects had to be studied to ensure their purpose and need, so they were allowed to bring them up to a certain planning level. This was what would be done with the ones that did not proceed. Mr. Wade understood those taken to that planning level would be there to be pulled off of the shelf for a later time if they received more money and had to make additional decisions for additional projects. Mr. Glascock stated that was the intent. Mr. Wade understood the cost of those projects would be less because the preliminary planning would already have been completed. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala noted some of the Council had conducted informational neighborhood meetings and an issue that had come up at one of those meetings involved the discussion of the purpose of the grant, which was a modal shift away from automobiles and to bicycles, pedestrians, bus service, the neighborhood school bus program, etc. He asked if those projects were supposed to be accommodated by the same money. Mr. Glascock replied Columbia was ahead with regard to the transit system because they already had things like bike racks on buses. They did not have some of the infrastructure, so they concentrated mostly on that. Mr. Skala understood the goal was coordination between the two as well. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Janku noted they had money from ballot issues for trails and sidewalks that had passed and wondered if any of that money might be undesignated and available. He commented that he did not need an answer now, but thought it would be useful when they began crunching numbers.

Jay Hasheider, 1403 Windsor, stated he lived in the Benton-Stephens neighborhood, just east of downtown, and asked if the William/Old 63 improvement involved passing over the overpasses on Broadway and College. He stated he was referring to lime green line, just northeast of downtown. He understood an earlier version involved crossing the overpasses through Stephens College, which he recalled had a sign stating “no biking.” He wanted to clarify whether that path was approved by the College. He noted that from his perspective, his neighborhood had a lot of bicycling opportunities and would appreciate a good pathway into downtown. He thought the Walnut corridor was a good one for improvements. He just wanted to ensure everything had been cleared as far as using other people’s property.

Mayor Hindman understood staff had been working with Stephens College and the College had been cooperative and was interested in a route that would go through their property. It was not one of the funded routes at this point. He commented that he did not know if it even needed to be funded because they might be able to use something that was already in place.

Chris Walthall, 1000 Wayne Road, stated she lived in the Grasslands and started walking her son to school seven years ago. She noted they started the Walking School Bus program. She commented that she had three reasons they needed the ADA compliance South Garth extension and introduced Sam, Jack, and Henry. She stated that Oliver had to

go to the restroom, but he was their stroller set. She encouraged the Council get this going because she wanted to see it done before those children left Grant School.

Fred Koenig, 2 E. Ridgeley Road, stated he walked with this group five days a week and often got the size of the group to a dozen or more, which was a safety issue since Providence had very narrow lanes for a four lane, high speed highway in that section. The curb was bumped frequently and the only thing between the sidewalk and the curb was a small patch of grass.

Les Wagner, 1115 Lakeshore Drive, stated he lived beside one of the trail accesses about two-thirds of a mile from the corner of Stewart and Providence. He noted he had been asked by many about his experiences living right beside the trail, as his home was not far from the trail. He stated the benefits of living on the trail were that he and his family could go out the front door and turn right to walk or bike on the trail or walk downtown. Questions he had been asked involve privacy, people coming off of the trail, street people, etc. He commented that they have had very little problems. He noted only a couple of people had come into their yard from trail in the last 10-12 years. One of them had a bad case of diarrhea and was not much of a threat. The other guy seemed a bit disoriented and headed back to the trail when he realized he had gone down the wrong path. There had not been any criminal activity. He stated there were times when people slept in the woods and were drunk. He thought everyone, regardless of where they lived, had run into someone like that. He noted it was not common. He commented that they did have one person who took up residence causing the neighborhood to talk to the City. The City removed the foliage they were using to live in and they had no further problems. With regard to those who were concerned about access to the trail, he stated the down sides were few. He commented that the issue with the vagrant was addressed by the City and noted he believed it was common for persons to live in some of the wooded areas of the community. He stated a benefit to having access through the woods was the City would cut back some of the foliage and remove some of the cover, so they might find fewer problems than before.

Cia Johnson, 1025 Ashland Road, Apt. 201, stated she was a fourth year veterinary student and a seven year resident of Columbia and would have obtained three degrees by next May. She commented that she and her husband chose to not own a car because they liked the health benefits of not having a car. They did all of their errands and shopping on the bike. The only time they used a car was when they were going out of town to visit their parents. They owned a green business where none of the equipment they used was motorized. They transported all of their equipment by bike and trailer and the equipment did not use any gasoline. For their business, they utilized Stadium Boulevard or Broadway, between Ashland Road and Old 63. There was no shoulder because of the bridge on Stadium and Broadway had narrow lanes there. Coming down Broadway and Stadium was not as bad because they could go faster without much momentum, but pulling a loaded trailer with a bicycle up those lanes was difficult. She stated she was in support of the Bluff Dale connector because of issues like this for her family. She also had friends who lived in that area and noted it would make it much easier for the inexperienced cyclist to come from those areas to campus or downtown. She commented that it was very stressful to ride Broadway or Stadium in that area. She stated she would also make use of the South Garth connector

because they rode on Providence through that area with a loaded trailer due to the business. She noted she was adamantly opposed to any sidepath, pedway or bike path in Columbia because of their inherent dangers. She understood the Council had heard a short presentation on that issue last night. She felt they were very inappropriate and led the public to believe they were safe to ride on when they were really not. She encouraged the Council to continue to study those things to ensure they were making the right decisions for the community. She stated she was grateful to the Council for making the very difficult decisions of which paths, trails and sidewalks to institute in the community.

Ms. Hoppe understood Ms. Johnson lived on Ashland Road, south of Stadium. Ms. Johnson stated she was not south of Stadium. She was just past Stadium. If one turned on to Ashland toward Hospital Drive, there were the Tara Apartments and Ashley Ridge. She lived there. Ms. Hoppe asked if she was aware of the bike boulevard that was being planned for Williams Street. Ms. Johnson replied she did not have a good familiarity with that one. Ms. Hoppe explained a bike boulevard would go down Williams Street and a pedway would be on Walnut that connected to Stephens Lake Park and Old 63. Ms. Johnson stated they utilized a lot of that area. She noted she was in favor of trails that did not cross a lot of driveways or streets with a lot of traffic. That was what she meant when she stated she was against pedways in general. The trail that ran through Stephens Lake Park was nice to ride on. Since there were no streets, she used that cut through to go to Wal-Mart to shop. It was very handy because she could skip Broadway by coming in the back way to Wal-Mart.

Mr. Skala asked if she was concerned with the paths that were slightly separated from some of the roadways, but were parallel to the roadways in terms of her criticism of sidepaths or pedways. Ms. Johnson replied yes. Mr. Skala understood she was suggesting it was better to have independent paths that did not necessarily parallel. Ms. Johnson stated if they were going to be a bike path, she felt they should be independent. She noted she was in favor of bike lanes in the actual road or having a shoulder that was available to ride. She commented that she rode on Stadium Boulevard past the point of Providence where there was a nice shoulder. It was very handy and she did not have any problems. The section she spoke of earlier was narrow because of the bridge and there was no shoulder.

Marvin Blakemore, 2507 Barrys Bluff Court, stated there was a neighborhood meeting in February regarding the Bluff Dale Drive project with Ms. Hoppe being the Chair of that meeting. She presented all of the possible trail routes through Bluff Dale and after discussion asked them to vote on which ones they liked. The vote was almost 100 percent for no trail. The people on Bluff Dale Drive were not in favor of a trail down their street. One reason was due to infrastructure. The street was only 25 feet wide and would have a 10 foot wide trail, two lanes of traffic and parking. Other reasons were the loss of privacy, possible flooding due to three low water bridges within a mile downstream of Bluff Dale Drive, which would impede water flow, and parking. There would be no parking at the trailhead, but he did not know how they would keep people from parking on the cul-de-sac. Another concern was that having a trail down the street within a few feet of the front door could devalue their property. He commented that the buyers of the lots paid for the street when they bought the lots. Each successive buyer also paid for the street. The street was maintained by the taxes those people paid. It was an implied ownership of the street even though it was a public street. He

did not believe it was like Williams, College or Broadway. He felt this was a neighborhood street. The people who lived there worked hard to take care of their houses and their thoughts and feelings were important. He noted he could ride on his bike in all directions around Bluff Dale Drive without ever getting on Bluff Dale Drive and questioned whether it was a necessary route.

John Ott, 212 Bingham Road, stated he was one of the Co-Chairs of the GetAbout Advisory Committee and was speaking on behalf of the Committee. He noted he would also speak as President of the Grasslands Neighborhood Association toward the end of his comments. He explained the GetAbout Advisory Committee was asked to review the results of the draft priorities of the Council a couple weeks ago. They were very supportive of the Council priorities, but had three additional comments for consideration if there was a way to achieve it within the budget. One was the Stadium Boulevard bikeway and sidewalk on both sides of Stadium from Providence to College. They felt it was a neglected area and would provide a lot of connectivity for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Another one was the Bear Creek Trail to Blue Ridge with a Python Court connection and they would encourage the Council to continue planning for the I-70 bridge overpass. They understood there was a big cost affiliated with it, but when looking at connecting parts of town, it was an important piece. The Committee was also recommending the inclusion of the Bluff Dale link. He understood there was controversy surrounding it and explained the idea was to connect neighborhoods so they could get from point A to point B as efficiently as possible. The alternate route involved a lot of elevation and made it more difficult. He noted modal shift was the primary goal for all of this money being spent. Anecdotally, it seemed like it was happening already. He thought it might have been happening before the gas prices increased and now, with those increases, they were seeing more bikes. He commented that there were always alternative solutions, but the shortest and flattest opportunity was probably the best, if it could be achieved, for the community as a whole. In regard to his role with the Grasslands Neighborhood Association, he explained they had a meeting about a park with the Parks and Recreation Department a few months ago. The one thing that was important to the neighborhood and had overwhelming support was an ADA concrete path connecting the Grasslands Neighborhood with Garth and the Old Southwest. They wanted something so people could get to Grant School and the Library without negotiating Providence Road with its the bend, speed and closeness to cars. He commented that it was a path that had been forgotten for some time, but had been used historically. He understood there were adults who grew up in the neighborhood that used to walk that path. He provided a list of people who used the path and were in support of it.

Ms. Hoppe understood Mr. Ott indicated the Providence to College/Stadium pedway was important and she agreed. She noted she had suggested they look at a connector from the College and Stadium pedway down Rock Quarry Road to Capen Park. It was listed as priority, but also indicated it was a new project that needed assessment. She asked if he could comment on that connector. Mr. Ott replied he did not believe he could speak on behalf of the group with regard to it because he was not sure how everyone felt. He, personally, felt it made a lot of sense. He thought it might have been that they had a priority

list to which they added three other things and might have added it if they had felt comfortable adding a fourth or fifth item to the list.

Tate Windmoeller, 705 Rockcreek Drive, stated he was ten years old and thought the important thing about the trail to Garth was that it would be a safe way to get to the Library. He commented that his mother made him ride his bike to the Library all of the time and he did not like going up the sidewalk on Stewart after getting off of the trail. He felt a trail to Garth would be a better and safer way.

Michelle Windmoeller, 705 Rockcreek Drive, stated she road her bike around the City a lot and noted she used City streets. She explained she had taken the Confident City Cycling course and noted the programming got her to the point where she felt comfortable and would ride on City streets. Her son had taken Bike Pro, which was an educational program, and was now a much safer rider than before. She explained they both learned a lot about how to ride and how to be safe. It had changed how they were able to get around town. She commented that she was a mother who made her children ride their bikes everywhere. The trail was a good way to move a seven and ten year old through town. As Tate mentioned, they rode to the Library a lot. They came off of the trail connector at Providence and swung up onto the sidewalk on Stewart Road because there was no connection. She did not believe it was safe for children to ride on the sidewalk, but they had to in order to get to the top of Stewart where it curved so they could see if cars were coming on either side before crossing to get on the safe way to get to Garth and the Library. If they were able to come off of Garth and go straight down there, it would be beneficial. She noted her children's piano teacher and friends lived on Bluff Dale. She commented that they rode there and had to go through the intersection of Old 63 and Stadium, but were very safe about it. She stated she had learned the proper way due to the educational programming, but still preferred a less stressful way to get them to that area on their bikes. Ms. Hoppe pointed out 63/Stadium was getting a pedestrian and bike friendly intersection.

Max Overshiner, 1300 Garden Court, stated he was ten years old, had taken the Bike Pro class and rode his bike to school everyday. He commented that he thought it was important to put in the South Garth Trail connector because they had to ride on Stewart to get to the trail.

Gina Overshiner, 1300 Garden Court, stated she was a licensed cycling instructor (LCI) with GetAbout and PedNet. She noted she had chosen to do that after taking the Confident City Cycling class because she saw how important it was to educate people to ride safely, so she wanted to stress the importance of programming. She explained the Confident City Cycling class focused on riding on the roadway safely by following State laws pertaining to bicycles. It taught bicycle laws, bicycles being treated as vehicles and how to ride and maneuver on the road in a safe and predictable manner. She felt teaching people how to ride on roads and having these programs available for the citizens of Columbia helped facilitate the mode shift. She thought it probably helped in a bigger way than adding trails because a trail would not go everywhere someone wanted to go. She felt if they taught people to use their bicycles safely in all types of conditions, they could go anywhere they wanted because roads went wherever people wanted to go. She believed this would ultimately facilitate the mode shift in Columbia. In addition, having more educated cyclists, who followed traffic laws

and common courtesies of the roads, would help to increase good relations between drivers of motor vehicles and bicyclists. She thought they should appreciate the importance of programming and keep funding available for it. She commented that the South Garth connector would be great because a group of parents and students, who called themselves the Lee School Bike Brigade, rode together every morning. She thought it would reduce congestion at the intersection along Stewart and South Garth where they got onto the trail because they could shoot straight up Garth to the trail when coming from the west side of town, near D & H Drug, and going to Lee Elementary School as it was on the opposite side of downtown. She explained they took the trail to Cherry and took Cherry through downtown. She noted it would help facilitate their ability as a group of parents riding with children to get to school safely.

Stacy Turpin, 107 E. Stewart, stated she would read a letter from Stuart Loory, who resided at 2310 Meadow Lark Lane and was unable to attend the meeting, and noted she echoed everything stated in the letter. She commented that she had been a commuter by bike and foot for over ten years and it was the infrastructure and state of mind of the community that made a difference. She read the letter, which stated Mr. Loory was in his twelfth year of teaching at the Missouri School of Journalism and had commuted daily by bicycle to work for all those years. He did it for several reasons to include the enjoyment of bicycling, the ability to exercise and the feeling that he was doing what little he could to make the City and planet a better place to live. He had been biking intensively for 23 years, and for the past 13 years, most of it had been done with his wife on a tandem. They had taken their bike to such places as Singapore, Sylvania, England, France, Italy, Russia, Finland and many places in the United States. He felt biking was an unparalleled way to see the world. He applauded GetAbout Columbia for its effort to make this a more bike friendly City. Last month, they rode from Fisherman's Warf in San Francisco on bike routes, trails and a pedway across the Golden Gate Bridge and back. The route went through a couple of housing developments without any noticeable disturbance and separated cyclists and pedestrians from cars enhancing safety. Plans in Columbia would do the same. He was mentioning that in support of the proposed Bluff Dale Drive/Rollins Street connector because it would make commuting from the east side of Columbia to campus and downtown safer, more attractive and more accessible. It would also serve to interconnect various trails, pedways and routes throughout the City. It would take bicyclists off of Stadium Boulevard and East Broadway where serious accidents were waiting to happen. He understood some residents of Bluff Dale were concerned the pedway would bring vandals, violence, vagrancy and crime to their neighborhood. Bicyclist and pedestrians were generally restrained and concerned about such matters as littering, environmental disturbance and the protection of flora and fauna. As the price of energy continued to increase, he believed the pedway would increase housing values as potentials buyers saw the advantage of easy fuel-free commuting by foot or bike and the privilege of being close to an accessible nature trail. He believed the proposed connector made sense for all pedestrians, bicyclists and residents of east Columbia and urged its inclusion as a top priority.

Scott Walus, 2007 Woodlea Drive, stated he was currently pursuing his doctorate at the University of Missouri in the Communication Department and wanted to address the Bluff

Dale link. He commented that there were two ways to get to campus from a residence on Old 63. They could either go up Broadway or up Stadium Boulevard. With either route, they had to take Old 63. On days it rained, he stated he could not ride his bike as it was a death trap to go down Old 63 on a bike in the rain. He felt this was a community issue versus a bicyclist and pedestrian issue. He referred to a 2008 case study by Hanson and Young involving Arlington, Virginia and how they bettered their community through “active living politics” and he believed the Council was showing an interest in “active living politics” with this grant and by having these meetings. He commented that this generally started in 1973 with the gas spike and felt this was similar in that they were looking for options. Those who lived on Old 63 had no options except to trek up what he called “the 40 degree angle hill of death” or find something like a motorized scooter. Aside from increasing bicycle usage and fighting obesity, he believed this made an important statement to the commitment to non-motorized transportation. It also made commuting and parking easier. He noted there were a few people who would make the classic “not in my back yard” argument and he believed, at some point, they would have to say this was what the community was about and would have to make sacrifices in order to cope with what would be an alternative transportation world.

Ms. Hoppe understood Mr. Wallace indicated he did not want to bike up hills and asked if he was familiar with the steepness of Rollins Road because that was the only way to get to campus from that connection. Mr. Wallace commented another reason he wanted it was because it would be shaded. There was not a single tree on Broadway and on a 94 degree day, it was very hot.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Wallace mentioned it was difficult, if not impossible, to ride on Old 63 because of rain and asked if the purported trail through Bluff Dale was passable across the Hinkson Creek. Mr. Wallace replied from what he understood, it was.

Jim Terry, 508 South Garth, stated he wanted to address two issues with regard to the MKT South Garth extension. He understood \$860,000 had been allocated for the MKT connectors. He suspected most of that would go toward the South Garth connection. There was about 650 feet sloping down more than 50 feet from South Garth to the trail and a densely wooded area. He felt by the time they removed the hundreds of trees, created the retaining walls, created the bridge over the creek and paved that narrow shoot down to the trail, it would be very expensive. He wanted everyone to consider what else could be done with that money to increase non-motorized transportation. He commented that he came from a walking and biking family, so he was certainly in favor of that. He thought they should look at sidewalk improvements, new sidewalks, bike lanes, bike racks and other simple things to encourage people to walk and bike to work and school. He stated the proposed connector went from north to south and connected two residential neighborhoods. Despite what was written, he did not believe it really encouraged college students to get to campus or people to get to work. It was not laid out in a direction that would encourage that. The concerns of the neighborhood involved noise, parking, crime, vandalism and the homeless. He noted they already had a parking problem in the neighborhood because many students parked on their block and walked to school. The trail was primarily a recreational trail and not a commuter trail, so people would bring their bikes on bike racks and park their cars to go for a nice ride. It would create parking congestion in the neighborhood. He stated they were concerned

about their cul-de-sac on Lathrop, which was a very quiet and dark space that has had drug problems in the past. They did not want to encourage that to start up again. In addition, many homeless people had substance abuse problems and were mentally ill. He commented that they had a lot of elderly people and young children in the neighborhood, so they were against any plan that would make access easier for people camping out in the woods by the trail to come into their back yards.

Judy Johnson, 1516 McKee Street, stated she was with the Zaring Neighborhood Association and noted she was interested in the education program discussed. She wondered if they were taking that into the schools. She felt children needed to be educated young and needed to learn which side of the street to walk on and how to dress when walking at night. She commented that this was a real problem in her area as people walked on Clark Lane when trying to get to 63. It did not have shoulders and the people were in dark clothing, so they could not be seen. A few weeks ago, she attended a meeting where some of the plans were shown and thought there were areas in her neighborhood, but did not see those identified on the overhead. She noted there was nothing north of I-70 and in the area of Clark Lane and Ballenger. She thought something had been shown going through The Links and toward the west off of Clark Lane. She stated they were in desperate need for something out there with regard transportation and walking. They had no sidewalks, curbs or shoulders and had a big drop off. She proposed improvements on Rice Road with a bike lane on Hanover and a way to get across the ravine for people to get to work and use the restaurants. She noted she had been tempted to bike to her mother's home in Whitegate as she visited her daily, but had trouble shifting gears when going up hill, so she did not do it. She pointed out they had a person in a wheelchair and a guy with a two-wheeled scooter that traveled Clark Lane, so it was a real problem there.

Mr. Skala pointed out there would be striping along the continuum of Rice Road into that area to connect with some of the trail connectors if they were connected. The problem they had was Hanover to 63 because that piece was not included. Ms. Johnson commented that she did not think Rice Road was improved enough for striping. Mr. Skala understood there would be striping for bicycle paths on that road and along the entire length. Ms. Johnson noted it was barely wide enough for two cars and there were no sides on that street either.

Mr. Janku asked if the reason nothing was shown on the plan north of I-70 was because The Links put in a portion of the trail adjacent to the Hominy from Clark Lane to I-70. Mr. Glascock replied Ms. Johnson was talking about a map produced earlier that showed more infrastructure than this. Mr. Janku asked if the part that had been built with regard to Clark Lane had been factored into the cost estimate. Mr. Glascock replied it was through The Links to Clark Lane. He commented that he was not sure it had been built. Mr. Skala stated most of it was built. Mr. Janku understood it was not part of the cost estimate. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He explained when they built Clark Lane, they would have some type of facility there.

Mr. Skala noted the map dated June 2, 2008 had the other trails, bike routes and shared use paths north of I-70. It was not just shown on the priority projects list.

Mayor Hindman explained there were sidewalk projects and other things that made it a better interconnected system, but it was hard to show all of that on one map, which had been an issue.

Jeff Barrow, 1007 Coats Street, commented that he was a member of the Columbia Area River Paddlers, which was a loose affiliation of Whitewater Paddlers and explained the paddlers had the gear, experience and knowledge to paddle fairly high flood waters competently. He understood part of the trail system would have low water bridges across the Hinkson Creek. He thought there were already two low water bridges across the Hinkson Creek and commented that the term paddlers had for low water bridges was “drowning machines” because when built at a perpendicular angle to the stream, water flowed over them at an extreme velocity creating a very forceful backwater wave on the other side. It looked like nothing, but if a boater got into the wave and could not get out, they would flip and unless there was someone there to rescue them, there was no way for them to get out of the stream, so they would eventually drown, even with the best personal flotation devices. He noted this was a niche concern of a niche group, but felt if they were going to build low water bridges, they should contact the American Canoe Association, American Whitewater Association or American Paddlers to obtain specifications to make them safe for paddlers. He had seen some that were not built 90 degrees to the current so if someone was stuck, they would be thrown out to the low water end. He understood they could also put in slots, so there was a current of water and not a continuous solid wall of water that held people. He thought they should address this issue before they were designed and built. He commented that about five years ago, there was a fatal accident on the low water bridge near the MU soccer fields, just east of Providence from the Reactor.

Sara Gable, 2508 Shepard Boulevard, stated was in support of the Sixth Ward trail and pedway projects. She understood there was controversy surrounding the Bluff Dale connector and while she was somewhat sympathetic to the neighborhood’s concern with the location and particular legs of the proposed trails, she trusted the City to implement these plans in the smartest manner possible. She commented that she had been a resident of Columbia since January of 1994 and had watched several trail and park projects come to fruition. Each project, and in particular, the westward extension of the MKT from Scott to the Katy Trail and Stephens Lake Park had been designed and constructed in a sustainable and pleasing manner that drew people to them. She also viewed the entire trail system as something the community was creating for future generations. She and her husband recently became Boone County foster parents and had a three year old. Her daughter’s weekdays involved attending a childcare program that was located near the Providence and Stewart Road intersection and the children frequently visited Flat Branch Park and took walks in the woods along the MKT. In the evenings and on weekends, they typically biked from home to Stephens Lake Park and hiked in the various parks around the City. She noted this little girl now asked to go and do these types of activities. She felt this was what the project was all about. She wanted to connect kids with nature and expose them to alternative modes of transportation. She asked the Council to accept the current plans for the Sixth Ward trail and pedway projects.

Barbara Reid, 104 W. Lathrop, stated there was a vacant lot between her house and the proposed Garth trail extension. In response to the pink flags all over the neighborhood, she learned more about the process. She stated they had many brilliant people in the neighborhood and thought the City and PedNet should use their talents. She commented that Mr. Wade helped them get together as a neighborhood and about 32 people attended a meeting. She explained they were given an overview of the process and went around the room to obtain everyone's input. For the most part, everyone was behind the priorities of GetAbout Columbia with minimal impact to the environment. They felt Stewart Road needed to be improved because it was not safe, even though it was one of the most used roads they had. She commented that they had a lot of ideas and wanted the Council to consider those.

Charlie Smarr, 1111 Lakeside Drive, stated he was present on behalf of his parents, Robert and Jane Smarr, who lived on a three acre lot at 600 South Garth, which was located at the end of South Garth where it met Lathrop, and understood it would be at the head of the connector at the end of Garth to the Katy Trail. He noted his dad had lived there for nearly 80 years. They were opposed to the proposed Garth Avenue connector primarily because it would disrupt their privacy. The proposed connector would literally go through their back yard. They were also opposed because it would require a great deal of destruction to a natural wooded area. He pointed out his parents were not opposed to trails as they already had a 600 foot easement on the south side of the property. This would be another 600 foot easement on the west side of their property. The opposition to this proposal was simply due to its location. He explained there was strong neighborhood opposition to this proposed connector and all three of the adjoining property owners, his parents, his aunt, and Dr. Wilson Beckett, were 100 percent opposed to this location. Virtually everyone who lived on Thilly Avenue was opposed and many who lived on Garth and Lathrop were opposed. He noted he had a petition with signatures of 56 neighbors who were in opposition to this proposed connector in this location. He explained their neighborhood was already connected to the Katy Trail with two direct access points at Stewart and Providence and Lakeshore Drive. The Grasslands Neighborhood could be connected to the existing Katy Trail from Clarkson with a bridge across the Flat Branch. The Walking School Bus could then walk up the Katy Trail to Stewart and not go near the intersection of Stewart and Providence and avoid Providence entirely as that was not a safe place for children to walk. He commented that according to the City's engineering plans, this proposed connector would require extensive retaining walls and a 100 foot boardwalk bridge due to the rugged terrain. He felt building a 600 foot long, 10 foot wide concrete trail over a sewer line in a drainage ditch through rugged, wooded terrain with a 55 foot drop in elevation was an ill conceived notion and seemed to be more trouble than it was worth. He hoped the Council would consider more viable alternatives. He noted they had a subcommittee looking at alternative options for trails in the neighborhood as suggested by Mr. Wade.

Catey Terry, 508 South Garth, explained her neighbors, Tom Ratermann and Mary Beth Schillinger, were on vacation and could not attend, but had asked her to read a letter on their behalf. It indicated they had learned the City was planning on building a recreational trail from the current terminus of South Garth Avenue to the existing MKT trail and they were 100 percent opposed to the project. It seemed to them the goals and objectives of this

project were poorly defined. They wanted someone from the City to enumerate the goals and objectives of this specific project. If the goal was to increase neighborhood access to the MKT trail, this project was not needed. The neighborhood had excellent access to the MKT by the Lakeshore Drive access, the Providence and Stewart access and the SAE fraternity house. It seemed as though this project was selected by City staff based on the convenience of an existing right-of-way. To the casual observer, it appeared the City's desire was to show an accomplishment with this funding rather than do any real planning as to what was needed for the goals of this program. They felt the City should conduct a comprehensive planning process to determine if and where to spend these federal dollars and if the impetus to spend these tax dollars was not there, a return of those funds to the federal government should be considered. They thought a better use of these federal tax dollars would be to extend commuter trails to developing neighborhoods as they felt infrastructure should be built prior to development. They suggested extending trails in the Hinkson, Hominy, Grindstone, Cow Branch and Bear Creek valleys before these watersheds were fully developed or with the development of these subdivisions so that the trail network could be integral to the neighborhood rather than an afterthought. They felt their neighborhood was an urban neighborhood and the trail planners did not recognize the problems associated with an urban trail were different than problems associated with a suburban trail in a suburban neighborhood or a rural trail associated with a rural area. Urban realities, such as parking and people with mental illness and alcohol addictions, were affecting their emotions regarding this project and would affect their sense of safety in their homes and on their streets. They felt their already limited privacy would be further compromised by the building of this trail. The trail planners were also asserting repair of the private sewer on South Garth would require clearing the existing right-of-way. They felt this argument was disingenuous given the availability of trenchless technologies to repair sanitary sewers. In addition, it was clear from the drawings by the trail planners that sufficient right-of-way was not available for this Garth project. She wondered if the City would take easements from existing property owners if easements could not be negotiated. The stress from land acquisition could elicit a very physical response in property owners and an unneeded burden for elderly property owners. They asked the Council to oppose this project.

On behalf of herself, Ms. Terry commented that she was proud of Columbia for the GetAbout grant and supported PedNet. She walked her children to school and rode a bike. She noted she was opposed to the Garth Avenue trail extension for many of the reasons that were enumerated. It was referred to as a short inexpensive connector, but it was really 651 feet with a 50 foot drop. The City had a 23 foot easement that they took from the Smarrs in 1983 and would need at least 40 feet to make the trail so it was not a skate ramp down to the trail. She felt that would involve a phenomenal amount of money and destruction to the natural habitat of the neighborhood. She thought the money would be better used on making sidewalks and streets safer and having public education for people to wear helmets and obey the rules of the road. She noted they had two entrances to the MKT less than three-fourths of a mile from Garth. The one at Stewart and Providence was recently improved and she believed there was a way for the Grasslands families to walk safely to school. The other was

at Lakeshore Drive and was within her definition of a short and inexpensive trail as it was about 10 feet of gravel. She asked the Council to not approve this project.

Peter Yronwode, 203 Orchard Court, suggested each project be numbered with the numbers being annotated on the map so the map was easier to use since the names of the projects were a tad ambiguous. He stated he had been a bicyclist of the City all of his life. His children rode their bicycles from Benton-Stephens to Oakland Junior and Hickman in the 1980's before any of the improvements on Paris Road had been made. He asked the Council to consider a number of more general issues. He suggested putting connectivity before budgetary concerns. Some of the most important projects with regard to connectivity were categorized in the color violet. He thought they needed to think about the broader objectives rather than strictly budgetary concerns. With regard to the trail or sidewalk proposal up Providence Road, he felt bicycles on sidewalks was a universally a bad idea and should not be encouraged. He commented that he had ridden up Providence to Lemone and it was a drag, but felt it could be done if it was striped and people paid more attention. He thought they should also consider the impact on nature for all of these projects. Many would go through relatively natural areas of town, so it was very important they kept that in mind. It was inevitable for some trees to be cut down and they would have issues of runoff into the creeks due to trails running along the creeks. He thought they should be sensitive to those concerns. He asked the Council to consider community rather than local concerns because issues of "not in my back yard" did not belong in this discussion.

Todd Guess, 2301 Primrose Drive, stated he was a League of American Bicyclists certified cycling instructor and taught bicycle education courses for the PedNet Coalition and GetAbout. He noted quite a few citizens had come through the educational programs and the results had been phenomenal. In a recent survey sent to graduating students of the Confident City Cycling course, the average answer to the question of percentage of car trips that had been replaced with bicycle trips was 35 percent. Since the classes were working, he felt it would be a shame to see any degradation in funding for education. He suggested any project involving pedways or sidepaths be tabled for the moment. They were inherently dangerous. All of the other cities that were known for their bicycle infrastructure were not using these facilities any longer because they encouraged bad behavior by cyclists and were significantly more dangerous. With regard to the east side trail connector, he commented that as a regular bicycle user he ran many errands on his bicycle to include shopping at the complex on Conley. The only convenient way to get there was on Old 63, and despite the fact he was a comfortable cyclist in traffic, Old 63 was not a terribly comfortably road to ride. He felt the connector linking that side of town to help avoid Old 63 would be hugely beneficial, so he was supportive of that project.

Jeff McCulley, 1909 Gordon Street, commented that if the Wabash Walkway was the same thing as the COLT's trail, he was in favor of it, especially with regard to the area north of the Business Loop. He noted there was only a sidewalk on the east side of Paris. If one was going north on Paris/Route B, it was not too bad, but if one was going south on the sidewalk, there were problems because all of the cars turning right out of the driveways only looked to the left as they were turning right to make sure there were no cars coming. They

would not see someone on a bike on the sidewalk because they were not looking. He reiterated his support for the COLT's trail.

Chris Marshall, 500 South Garth, stated she grew up in the neighborhood and moved back when she was an adult. She noted her kids had grown up in the neighborhood as well. She commented that the idea of connectivity was wonderful, but felt the right-of-way that existed currently to extend Garth was in the wrong position for a trail connector as it was very steep and in a draw. It was extremely wet and because it was heavily wooded, it did not dry out easily. She noted they were told the engineers could solve these problems and agreed they could if they were maximally invasive to the area, which the neighborhood did not want to see. She pointed out it was not a path that was used a lot by neighborhood kids because of the problems enumerated. It was in a draw and was steep going downhill from an already existing hill on Garth. They tended to use the SAE trails and trails that existed off of the end of Thilly Avenue in those days. She felt the federal guidelines for this trail connector were dictating a kind of trail that was inappropriate in this location and for this neighborhood. As a result, she wanted more examination of it and for the City to look at the alternatives.

Ellen Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, commented that as a regular bike rider, she could tell them how helpful some of the specific proposed improvements of the non-motorized pilot project would be. She gave the examples of the County House Branch trail to get to the ARC, the Farmer's Market and West Junior High School, the South Garth extension, which would improve her family's regular rides to the Library and various music lessons, and the Bluff Dale connector, which would be very welcomed for the many meetings she attended at her church on Shepherd Boulevard and for her ride home from work. She noted it might be easy to dismiss these points as the wish list of someone who was already a hard core bike commuter and not at all representative of most Columbians and their needs as they started thinking about using non-motorized transportation. While the hard core term might describe her and her family now, seven years ago they were typical. They put over 20,000 miles per year on two vehicles as they managed two careers and shuttled two children around, but they were motivated to try something different. In her case it was due to concerns about declining fitness and the environment. In response to the motivational challenge of the first annual Mayor's Bike, Walk and Wheel Week, she decided to mix in a little non-motorized transportation. At that time she did not have the fitness to contemplate her entire seven mile trip to work and was not comfortable in traffic. She started with things she was comfortable with, such as a few miles on bike trails and the bus, and gradually through increased experience, taking the Confident City Cycling course and infrastructure improvements, she had gotten to where she was today. She noted they still had two careers with two kids with many activities, but the kids were also competent cyclists on lower traffic streets having taken the PedNet Bike Pro class and knew how to use the bus, so they managed easily with only one car. She calculated that if they still drove as much as they did seven years ago, they would be spending an additional \$2,000-\$3,000 per year on gasoline at current prices. These savings were all on local trips as they had not changed their vacation driving patterns and much of the savings had been spent in the local economy. She believed her story showed that with wise use of federal funds for a combination of easily accessed infrastructure projects that served both novice and experienced pedestrians and bicyclists and a strong

promotion in the education program, other families could also experience a transition to a healthier, more fun, lower carbon, and lower cost transportation mix.

Jackie Bell, 1008 Bob-O-Link Drive, stated her residence was just off of Shepard Boulevard and commented that she moved there seven years ago from large cities that were not friendly to pedestrians and bicyclists. She noted she also drove 200 miles per day with a SUV, so she came to Columbia with an automobile mentality and moved into a landlocked neighborhood without thinking about it. She explained most of her friends lived to the west and were trying to be green, so she was trying to get out of her car as well. Last year she got a bike and tried to do the one week challenge. She stated it was awful getting to work at the University. She stated she wanted to be a biker and the idea of improvements in that area would be fantastic. It would make the neighborhood more appealing to have access. She commented that she was trying to teach her daughter to ride and having a safe and comfortable way to get downtown and to the University would be fantastic. She understood the concerns of the people on Bluff Dale and felt it would be fantastic if there were alternatives. She stated she spent hours walking with Ted Curtis searching through yards and creeks trying to find paths and it was hard to find access. She noted she was in support of the improvements in the Sixth Ward and wanted to get out of her car.

Carolyn Oates, 1363 S. Mesa Drive, stated she lived in El Chaparral and would love to bike to work. Since she biked every weekend, people were always asking her why she did not bike to work. She noted she would not be here today if she biked on WW. The community was growing in that direction, so they were close. She stated she could bike from Keene Street to work, but would have to get to Keene Street. She began biking seriously in 1969 when she attended the University because she did not have car at that time. She also biked two years after graduation because she could not afford a car as a teacher, so biking was a very active part of her life. She stated she believed the social value would be tremendous if they made contiguous connections. She thought they needed to start from the center and build from there. She would leave it up to the people with the technical skills and the engineers to figure out which route was best for which neighborhood, but believed they had to be connected. She noted they heard the same arguments of property being devalued due to vagrants, etc. with the Katy Trail, but that did not happen and she did not think it would happen with this either. She commented that people had attested to the fact they had lived near a trail for ten years and had very little problem. She thought it looked like an extension of a long thin park system. If they could connect north, south, east and west, she felt someday they might be able to get the further out community connected as well. She noted they only needed six-tenths of a mile out there.

Ally Gassman, 1700 Princeton Drive, stated they moved to Columbia about eight years ago from Berkeley, California and the City had improved a lot. She thought the Garth and Bluff Dale connectors would be great and noted she would use them a lot. She explained she was a parent educator with Parents as Teachers and did most of her visits by bike. She stated she would love to go out to El Chaparral and PP, but believed any connection that was made would truly be welcomed.

Ms. Gassman read a statement by Kyna Byerly who resided at 623 Bluff Dale Drive. It indicated she had lived on Bluff Dale Drive for thirteen years and had three children, ages 8-12. She wanted a trail connection for her neighborhood. She respected the fact some of her

neighbors had a different opinion and hoped they would respect her opinion. Since her first child was born, she had found it difficult to get around her neighborhood and access any place else without a car. She could not walk with a stroller to a park because it was impossible to safely cross Broadway without crossing lights. It was hard to walk to the school as well because there were sections of Shepard without sidewalks. Getting to Grindstone Park, trails, downtown and campus was difficult as they were surrounded by very busy high traffic roads, which she felt was unsafe for small kids. Access to a network of trails would be such a blessing. She could let her kids go places she could not let them go now. They could all easily and safely walk and ride to places they could not get to now. In addition, they would not have to walk next to an enormous concrete wall with traffic whipping by at 40 mph and could more easily get out to enjoy the trails and parks. The trail access would not only give this immediate neighborhood access. It would allow many more people to get back and forth. It would benefit people in surrounding neighborhoods on both sides of the creek as well. She noted the City had been very willing to listen to concerns and change plans over the years. While having trail access might bring more people into the neighborhood, she was confident the City would help address any issues that might arise. She believed trail access would increase the desirability and value of their homes and neighborhood. It would be a change, but in her opinion, it would be a good change that would benefit many people.

Meg Milanick, 702 W. Rollins Road, stated she was in favor of the Garth Avenue trail extension. She felt it was important to connect the MKT trail to real destinations if they wanted to change people's transportation habits. One habit she wanted to see changed was for everyone with children to allow them to walk or ride their bikes to school instead of driving them to school. She explained she was a Walking School Bus driver and supported this extension for the Walking School Bus from the Grasslands. Grant School and the Library were a real destination. She noted this extension would also serve many people who lived west of the extension. She commented that she did not agree with a statement made indicating the MKT was just an exercise trail. She exercised and commuted on the trail to classes on campus and shopping downtown. Her husband also commuted to work on it. She thought they needed to make the trail convenient if they were going to change habits. She pointed out they made roads convenient, so they needed to make trails convenient as well. She stated she had lived in the neighborhood for twenty years and parking at the Lakeshore access had never been a problem. She thought most of the people that accessed the trail there were on foot or bike. They did not drive their cars there with their bicycle on the car to access the trail.

Clyde Wilson, 1719 University Avenue, stated he was on the City Council from 1971 to 1981 when terms were only two years and when they put in the Katy Trail. He explained the initial plan was to take the Katy Trail all of the way down to McBaine, but due to some burned railroad trestles and other difficulties, they decided to go from Providence and Stewart to Scott Boulevard, which was the City limits at that time. They held public hearings and had heard some of the same concerns. He noted the Katy Trail went into the back yards of people living in the Grasslands. It also went through some of the back yards of people living on Edgewood. Some of those people were as vocal and opinionated as the group here tonight and did not want the trail. They brought up issues of vandalism, noise, theft,

homeless people, trash, etc. because they were really quite concerned. Another interesting factor was that the people who spoke in favor of it were the runners and joggers. He did not recall a single parent coming to talk about its usefulness for their children. The opposition felt they were spending too much money for a few people. He noted one member of the Council suggested they make it into a road as a shortcut from Stadium to Providence. He pointed out none of those things people were concerned about really happened. He thought it was interesting that the people from the Grasslands were all in support as it showed there had been change with regard to the notion of trails and their benefits since that period of time. The houses where the trail passed Forum were advertised as being accessible to the trail, so he doubted there would be any great decrease in the value of property. He suspected, in most cases, the property value would increase. He noted that as soon as the trail was opened, it began to be populated by older people walking along with crutches, walkers, etc. and parents pushing strollers with kids, etc. The joggers and runners left and really never used the trail. He explained one of his colleagues had asked his students do a survey regarding who was on the Katy Trail and it was people with small children, elderly people, families, etc. He noted it was an opportunity to own a place which was safe, smooth and had a country atmosphere with relative ease, so it turned out to be a wonderful thing for the City. He stated he could not take away anyone's anxiety or concerns because they were real, but in the long run, he thought they would be happy with the trail. They would meet neighbors in a different environment and other people that would come along on the trail. He felt it would be a great asset to the community.

Kate Basi, 3606 Jungle Tree Drive, stated she resided in the Vanderveen Subdivision and the part of the trail that was to run behind her house had been pulled from the first list because they had protested. She explained the feeling was that everyone who had bought property along that creek bed did so with the specific understanding it could not be developed at all. This was important because they had made a \$200,000 investment due to the private green space. She commented that she was in attendance in support of her neighbors, who were on the other side of Blue Ridge where the trail was still going to go. Some were afraid to speak out because they were City employees and feared retribution. She stated that safety might not be a major issue, but it was more of an issue when the trail was there. Right now, they had an undisturbed, extremely dense green space that no one would go through. The trail was an access point. She understood there had been a murder and rapes on the MKT trail and felt that needed to be considered. She noted someone earlier had mentioned wanting the simplest and easiest route for connectivity. She pointed out the simplest and easiest route from Vanderveen was to take Blue Ridge or Providence to Garth to the Bear Creek Trail. She stated she thought trails were great and used them when she was in college in Iowa, but noted she did not believe they should be done at the expense of the people who were there. She agreed with the person who stated trails should be built into the subdivisions, so the people who were buying there bought with that understanding. She recognized the City had the legal right to put trails in without their consent and might think it had a duty to plan for the long term at their expense, but also felt the Council had the duty to respect their current citizens. If the City chose to follow this without regard for other things like police needs, street infrastructure, stop lights, etc., they would lose the people living

adjacent to them. She noted she and her husband would never purchase a house in the City again because they did not feel they could trust what they were told.

Jeanine Pagan, 701 Bluff Dale Drive, stated she was President of the Hinkson Creek Valley Neighborhood Association and noted GetAbout Columbia was presenting these trails as though it was something new. This was not new to the Hinkson Creek Neighborhood Association. The Hinkson Creek trail, and specifically Grindstone to Stephens Lake, went back to 1995. It was proposed to go along the Hinkson Creek in the back yards of the homes on Bluff Dale and was called the Greenbelt Trail. At a public hearing in the 1990's, the neighbors came to speak against the trail in their back yards on Bluff Dale, and due to the opposition of the neighbors, the proposed trail was moved. She noted there was no City funding for the proposed trail at that time. In 2002, the Hinkson Creek Trail - Grindstone to Rockhill Park to Stephens Lake appeared in the Parks and Recreation Open Space Master Plan. The Plan was updated in 2005 and the Hinkson Creek trail was listed as the primary acquisition target of property. In 2006, federal grant monies flowed into Columbia and the City had informational meetings. The neighbors turned out in great numbers and wrote their suggestions for alternate trail routes. In January 2007, there was another neighborhood meeting with the Mayor in attendance. He shared his view of the bike trail, but the neighbors did not share his view. In April 2007, the Council held a public hearing for application of MoDOT enhancement funds and the neighbors stated they did not want more monies going to the Hinkson Creek trail as it was presented. The Council voted to not include this particular trail on the enhancement fund application. On January 27, 2008, the Hinkson Creek Valley Neighborhood Association met to discuss the proposed trails and at the City's informational meeting on January 29, 2008, the neighbors told the City they did not want the trail connection to Bluff Dale. On February 23, 2008, the Neighborhood Association met again and voted to not have a Bluff Dale connection to the proposed trail. The Valley View residents, who were also part of the Neighborhood Association, met again on March 1, 2008 and voted not to have a trail connection to Valley View or Bluff Dale Drive. In June and July of 2008, the Sixth Ward had informational meetings on the proposed GetAbout trails and the neighbors attended those meetings. She stated the Hinkson Creek Valley Neighborhood Association had been educated, met repeatedly, voted and filled out countless of GetAbout comment cards. They did not want the Bluff Dale connection to the proposed trails. They wanted their privacy, security and their nature left natural. They did not want to become the thoroughfare for the thousands of travelers that PedNet had promised.

Kathy Gordon, 7 E. Lathrop Road, stated she was speaking about the South Garth connection and noted she had done some measurements. The difference between the current route down Stewart Road to the MKT and the proposed connector route was an average of 689 steps. She rode it at a moderate speed on her bike in 1 minute and 57 seconds. She walked it while pushing her bike in 5 minutes and 32 seconds. She walked it without her bike in 6 minutes and 13 seconds. She thought school kids would probably take a little longer going to school, but less time running home after school. The difference in distance was about one third of a mile. She believed the neighborhoods would still be connected, especially with the Grasslands connector in place. The Grasslands people needed and wanted the connection to the MKT because they did not have one now other

than the low water crossing for service vehicles. The people on the Garth side had two entrances to the trail and used them all of the time. They did not consider it a hardship to go to the corner of Stewart and Providence to get home. She agreed the safety of Stewart Road needed consideration. If it was dangerous, it needed to be brought to safety standards for all users. She felt the connector would solve the safety problems for the Grasslands, but not the larger walking and biking community that used Stewart Road all of the time. She commented that she had a hard time justifying spending the majority of the approximately \$800,000 to build the connection from Garth to the trail, apart from Grasslands to the trail, which was wanted and needed, because it would give her a third entrance to the trail and only save 1 minute and 57 seconds on her bike trips.

John Schulz, 5430 N. Clearview Road, stated he rode his bike 17-18 miles per day round trip to get to and from work and made sure to have his life insurance paid up every month. He explained he went down Clearview Road to Brown School Road. Before the bridge was torn up, he went from Brown School Road all of the way to Oakland Gravel Road, down to Paris Road and turned off on William. Since Brown School Road was torn up, he had to go west down Creasy Springs, which had a steep hill. He understood it was outside City limits, but noted that was the route he had to use to get into town. He commented that Paris and Garth were the only two basic ways for people who lived in the 600 homes out by him, so they had to get to those roads one way or the other. He stated no amount of money would build all of the trails they needed and people would get around town by using roads. He thought they needed to spend some of the money on educating the drivers of automobiles as they killed people. There were 40,000-45,000 people every year in America that were killed by automobiles and that was the problem. He asked where they saw a commercial telling the automobile driver to watch out for bikes. He noted he had been hit twice on his bike in the last three years and once a motorist got out and told him it was his fault because he coasted through a stop sign when no one was there. The motorist followed him for a block and then hit him. She told him if he called the cops, she would tell them he coasted through the stop sign. He hoped that demonstrated they should think about an educational campaign for motorists. When he was a kid, there was a campaign every year when school started reminding motorists to watch out for kids riding their bikes and walking to school. He noted they had created a culture where they had to have parents pretending to be a school bus to take kids to school, which he thought was neat idea, but felt showed how far removed they were from a generation ago, when it was natural and safe for a kid to walk to school without pretending to be a school bus. He hoped they could get people to feel safe on their bikes and make motorists understand it was not their duty to teach the bicyclist a lesson.

Tyler Cook, 3101 Old 63 South, stated he was a student at MU and an avid individual bicycle commuter from the top of the hill on Old 63 to campus and downtown. He noted the area was saturated with students making a daily commute to downtown and campus. He commented that he was not a representative of this area, but had a strong feeling that he was speaking on behalf of a great portion of this population by saying the addition of the Old 63 to Grindstone and Grindstone to Stephens trails would be essential. This claim was under the pretense of safe and accessible bicycling and walking to campus for the student populations in this region. The bicycle byways to campus from the Old 63 communities were very limited

and terrifying. They demanded riding on Stadium, Old 63 or College, which were three heavily trafficked arteries of Columbia during the school year due to students commuting to campus. The intersections at Stadium and Old 63 and Stadium and College were a circus with cars backed up. It was hard to get from one stop light to another within ten minutes on some days. He noted people, ages of 18-22, were not known to be the best drivers, and since most of the traffic was due to the student population, having these pathways as the only means of getting to campus from this area was a definite risk to his and other commuters' safety. He stated he believed having these trails would draw more active commuting. He noted Sustain Mizzou, which was a student organization on the MU campus that promoted a sustainable lifestyle, had conducted a survey regarding off campus students commuting to campus and the most prevalent deterrent for a student to commute, especially with the Old 63 South population, was the lack of safe routes from the Reserve, Bearfield, Grindstone, Campus Lodge, etc. areas to campus. He felt the addition of the Grindstone to Old 63 trail and the Grindstone to Stephens connection were legitimate solutions to the different safety issues for students commuting from this area to campus.

Sutu Forte, 627 Bluff Dale Drive, understood it was mentioned at the beginning of the meeting that they needed to try to save \$5 million and suggested they scrap the Bluff Dale/Hinkson Creek/Rollins connector because that was about \$4 million and improve the sidewalks and bikeways along Old 63. She also suggested putting an additional bridge on Stadium so it was not dangerous to ride a bike and improving the roadway along Walnut so there was access to downtown. She thought they should see the results of that before bulldozing a gorgeous area to put in trails. She felt it was an area Columbia could be proud of and one all residents could use. She noted the neighbors wanted to pool their money to purchase it and turn it into a wildlife sanctuary. She did not think all of the people who were in favor of going through the Hinkson Creek and up the Rollins connector knew how steep it was. She commented that there was steepness that had to be experienced when trying to access campus. She did not think it was that bad along 63. She understood a pedway would be going along Chapel Hill Road, which was a steep hill for a bike road. She explained those who lived on Bluff Dale and had participated in this anti-trail or bikeway stance on their street were now being put in the category of being "wusses" because they did not want all of this traffic in front of their houses. She reminded the Council they had sent all of them petitions indicating the great majority of the neighborhood did not want the trail. She stated the street was narrow with children playing on it and noted they were accustomed to a cul-de-sac and an end to the street. She asked that they not put in a category of being wimps as they were just standing up for their homes and where they lived. In addition, they knew there was a system already in place.

James Dean, 2900 Forum, stated he represented a business and had a safety concern with regard to a bridge on the lower end of Forum Boulevard. He noted he called it the "no elbow bridge" and explained that if someone wanted to run or bike across that bridge, they would need to tuck their elbows and ears. He commented that he had almost been hit many times as he ran across it on a daily basis. He suggested a solution to gain access to the Katy Trail over the Hinkson Creek with an easement on the northwest corner of their property. He understood Ted Curtis had brought it to the Council's attention and that it had

made it out of the top twenty and into the next ten. He thought it was within the trail connection focus. He asked the Council to think of the people trying to cross that bridge. The simple solution was for them to donate land by easement over the Hinkson Creek. It would bring them in behind the office park on the northwest corner of their property and would provide the bicyclists and runners a safe connection to the trail via the southwest community down Forum Boulevard. He noted in 13 days, he had come up with 800 names of people that wanted to see this connector happen. He thought he could get another 1,000 if they gave him another week. He stated that until they could educate the vehicle people so they understood runners and bicyclists had the right to share the road, they could give them their bridge back by having a connector over the trail using their property.

Mayor Hindman asked for clarification on the location of the proposed easement and asked if it was through the Wilson's property. Mr. Dean provided a drawing and stated it was on the Wilson's property. He explained that when passing the new club down Forum Boulevard, it was 35 mph, but just before the bridge, it changed to 45 mph, so before hitting the bridge people were doing 55-65 mph. As a runner or cyclist coming across that bridge, it was scary. In addition, the 15 inches they had to ride or run on the bridge was not in the best condition.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the easement was north or south of the bridge. Mr. Dean thought it was south of the bridge. When coming down the hill on Forum before the bridge, they would take a right on an easement all of the way to the northwest corner. He stated they had spoken to the Lakewood Rail Homeowners Association to let them know this was being proposed to the City and to ask for their support. Thus far they were in support. They wanted to see engineering drawings to understand how it would connect to them.

Karen Cone, 507 South Garth, stated she shared her neighbors' concern about the South Garth extension and felt the plan had been done in haste without proper or careful consideration of all of the options. She urged the Council to reconsider the plans for that particular connector.

Daren Preis, 4803 Chilton Court, stated he was the Treasurer of the PedNet Coalition Board and was supportive of infrastructure priorities that lent themselves to the most comprehensive network of accessible trails and pedways possible. He explained in 1999, when he moved to Columbia, the MKT was one of the most immediately endearing qualities of this community. He commented that he rode recreationally from time to time and felt the trail was an invaluable asset to this City. In 2005, after participating in Bike, Walk and Wheel Week, signing up as a PedNet Coalition member at an Earth Day event, and finding connections between the healthy and active living movement and the educational achievement of Columbia school children, he joined the PedNet Coalition Board. From that group, he learned how vibrant and progressive this community was. Between the expansion of active living and education programs and the enhancement of the City's infrastructure, Columbia was evolving in a way that was increasing the quality of life and creating an environment that had the capacity to weather economic downturns and was ripe for economic activity. When gas prices began to rise dramatically this past year and after considerable prodding from Ian Thomas, the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition, he decided it was time for his own mode shift. He took the Confident City Cycling class offered by GetAbout

Columbia and gained immeasurable confidence in his ability to maneuver through Columbia on a bike. He now he rode his bike to work several days a week, felt better, thought clearer in the morning and was more likely to have money in his wallet at the end of the week. He stated he still rode recreationally with his six year old son who also wanted to save the world. The only limit to his travels, now that he understood the rules of the road, was the infrastructure itself. Now that he had been empowered by community success in this area, he wanted to have access to the entire community on his bike and wanted to enable a similar epiphany in his fellow Columbians. He felt the best way to do that was to expand the trail system in ways that maximized the federal investment they were discussing tonight by focusing on mostly small projects in dense areas close to the central City with lots of destinations and high levels of bike and pedestrian traffic. High value, low cost trail connections were paramount to this success. He noted the PedNet Coalition had passed a resolution expressing strong support for the construction of neighborhood trail connectors and wanted to share why he was personally in support of the Bluff Dale Drive and South Garth connectors. He asked the Council to consider the comprehensive trail system in their deliberations for the future of the City.

Jim Linville, 8309 W. Trails West, stated he was in support of the trail connectors because he used the trails extensively. He noted he and some of his friends put on events using trails and those events drew people into the community and into the trail system. He stated he was one of the people referred to as bad on the trails because he was a recovering alcoholic and drug addict, and was a former smoker. The trail system meant life to him. He commented that he had been clean and sober for thirteen years and had not had a cigarette in four years. He noted he was a runner.

Lania Arrigo, 621 Bluff Dale Drive, stated she had been unsure as to whether to speak or not as she valued her neighborhood and her friendships and felt it was difficult to say something different from what a lot of people in Bluff Dale had said. She commented that she was in favor of Bluff Dale Drive being part of a connector. She explained that when she purchased her home six years ago, her biggest disappointment was that there was no beautiful, easy or pleasant way to get to campus. She had heard stories of a professor that used to live in a nearby house and had built up a little rock bridge to walk up the hill to campus. She wished she could do that because she wanted to get to campus from where she lived. She referred to the student that lived on Old 63 who spoke earlier on behalf of other students wanting to get to campus and felt that was important. She noted this was also difficult to speak about because students lived in many houses in her neighborhood, which were not kept up. She agreed with Ms. Forte in that where the path would be placed was beautiful. She commented that the history of how the land was purchased was pretty awful. She stated she had a huge fear of the process with regard to the Council considering whether Mr. Altis could develop there or not. She noted she was in favor of using Bluff Dale as part of the connector because she wanted to get to campus and realized that was a selfish reason.

Meredith Donaldson, 1001 Pheasant Run, stated much of what she wanted to say had already been said. She was in support of connecting trails and disagreed with the previous speaker because she did not feel it was a selfish interest. She believed connecting trails was the future. It reduced the carbon footprint and made people healthier. She felt it was where

the community needed to go, so she supported the interconnected trails. She stated she was specifically speaking in support of the trails in the Sixth Ward as she thought they were well planned. She agreed the area there was sensitive and noted she liked the idea of the low water crossings and being aware of the hydrology and the sensitive parts of the area. She thought they could plan a trail that would help protect the environment there. She stated she was also speaking on behalf of the Frank Cunningham family as they were on vacation and were in support of this as well. She noted she was also a convert. They had bought bikes and were going everywhere due to PedNet, the course, etc. She hoped this would go forward quickly.

Susan Decker, 2111 Southwood Drive, stated she was a proud resident of the Hinkson Creek Neighborhood and noted she agreed with them on almost everything except for this trail. She explained she belonged to two subgroups in the neighborhood and was a parent of an eleven year old hiking and biking enthusiast who rode in circles around the neighborhood because he could not go anywhere else. She noted she was also handicapped. She stated she favored this trail and felt access to MU would enhance their property values. She believed it would be an access most of the neighbors would use versus people from the outside. She felt people driving would go to Stephens Lake or the Katy Trail. She did not think they would come into the neighborhood by car to use the extension. She urged the Council to consider the access and make it important. She was concerned that as time went by and her back became worse, she would not be able to use the trail. She wondered if they could make the extension up Rollins more accessible to wheelchairs. She thought she might end up in one and wanted to be able to take her child down the trail to potentially enjoy the Grindstone area. If the trail was not handicap accessible, it would exclude some of them, so she asked the Council to consider that as well.

Lorri Kline, 509 Old Highway 63, provided some photographs to the Council and stated she lived in a little white house that sat down in the valley next to the Hinkson Creek, about one quarter of a mile off of Broadway. It could not be seen from the road. The property was 3.75 acres and had been in her daughter's family for over 70 years. She commented that she did not know until five weeks ago that this trail would impact her. It would be in her front yard versus her back yard. The vantage point for most of the pictures was from her front porch. The trail would run along almost the entire length of her front yard and cut out a portion of her driveway, which she learned she did not own even though she had maintained it. It would also cut down trees. In addition, there would be a tunnel outside her front door. She referred to a swing in one of the pictures and noted there would be a tunnel under Old 63 where the swing sat. She explained the reason she bought and stayed there was because of its seclusion, location and aesthetic value. There were deer and all kinds of animals in her yard. She did not want a trail or a tunnel in her front yard. She believed it was a safety issue because the place was secluded. She felt relatively unsafe living there as it stood now, but if the trail came down into the valley and into her front yard, she would truly not feel safe. She stated she learned of this five weeks ago when she was contacted by the City. She understood there was some consideration to try to re-route some of these, but she did not know if that would happen or not. Since she had not been told about this earlier, she did not feel she could trust anyone at the City. She pointed out she would be back if the trail and

tunnel went through her front yard to ask for the property to be rezoned because she would not want to live there.

Ms. Hoppe understood the trail was originally supposed to go under the bridge and around. She believed that was still a strong possibility. Ms. Kline stated she told the City she would not be opposed to granting land above the driveway for access in that direction if that was the consideration. Her concern was it being in her yard as it was a secluded area. She explained having a tunnel, trail or retaining wall in her front yard was not something she had ever anticipated.

David Goldstein, 206 E. Ridgeley Road, stated he lived in the Grasslands for over 30 years and noted he was speaking as a parent and a pediatrician. He noted when he moved to the area, there were only three children in the neighborhood. It was different now and the idea of having a connector to Garth and to the school and Library was fantastic. It would also be good for people coming from the southwest off of the MKT because anything that got one off of Providence Road was wonderful. He commented that he was one of the founders of the Friends of the MKT and many of the arguments he was hearing tonight were the same he had heard when helping to develop the MKT. He agreed those were legitimate concerns, but noted time had shown that with carefully thought out projects, land values went up and adjacent landowners loved it. He thought they needed to look toward history as they thought about the opposition to these projects. He believed with the South Garth connector, they needed to be certain the engineering did make sense. When looking at the community as a whole, the benefits would be tremendous compared to the negative side.

Ian Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, stated he was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition and explained it was about 8½ years ago that a relatively small group formulated an existing vision for Columbia, which had started out as the MKT trail. They wanted to expand that single trail into an entire network throughout the City. They also wanted it to be accessible by all residents at a relatively short distance from their home, business, school, etc., so every journey had the chance to be completed by active modes. He noted it was wonderful to see how that movement had grown and how many people were supportive of that general idea. He thought it was great that people who were on the other side of specific arguments from him were still supportive of the general concept. He believed everyone, except for those who did not own a car, were very aware of the high cost of fuel. It was his opinion, the cost of oil and gas would worsen. He felt the quicker they, as a society, accepted that and started planning for the future, the better. Other closely related issues were climate change and the health crisis of a sedentary lifestyle where children were developing diseases that had never been seen in children before. They were having shorter life spans and a reduced quality of life as a result of a car oriented society. He commented that Columbia was a national leader in a national movement to address these issues. He noted this meeting and the progress of GetAbout Columbia was on the radar of national advocacy groups. He distributed a letter of support he received today from America Walks, the leading national advocacy organization for walking. He felt it was important to do the best they could, which involved combining programming with good infrastructure design and good infrastructure design meant looking at the projects that would benefit the most people and journeys.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the \$1.1 million in promotion and education included programming. Mr. Thomas replied he assumed it did. He noted he only saw these numbers today for the first time. He understood \$2.1 million was the total for marketing, education and encouragement in the first 18 months and \$1.1 million was allocated for the second 18 months. He stated that did not seem like enough as he felt the funding should have continued at a closer level.

Janet Hammen, 1416 Wilson Avenue, stated she was an avid supporter of Columbia's trails and parks and was somewhat torn. She noted she lived in the East Campus neighborhood near Rockhill Park, which was pedestrian only. It was very rugged and hilly. The Rollins/Hinkson/Stadium trail would go through a corner of the Rockhill Park. She stated she had walked it and it was very rugged terrain. She thought someone in a wheelchair would be ill at ease on it even if it were paved. It was pristine urban wilderness and Columbia did not have anything like it left. She explained part of this trail would go from Rockhill Park into University property that was also rugged before continuing on to the Hinkson Creek. She did not like the idea of blasting into that hillside. Although it would be above the existing Rockhill Park pedestrian trail where no bikes were allowed, it would take a fairly large part of the area. She noted she was also concerned with crossing over the Hinkson with a low water bridge into the Altis property. She explained she had not walked that area, but had walked the area where it crossed back again at another low water bridge and onto University property. It was a valley and had been wet this entire year. She asked Mr. Curtis if it was a wetlands or standing water and understood he was checking on that. She did not feel there had been enough surveillance of the area. She wondered if there were other alternatives. She noted she also did not think the grade on Rollins Road met ADA requirements. She wondered what would happen and what the cost implications were with the entire section of Rollins Road going from where it would enter Rockhill Park up to William. She understood Ms. Hoppe had suggested the alternative of Rollins to Ashland to Stadium and asked if it was a viable alternative. The improvements to Stadium and Old 63 included a tunnel below the bridge. She would like the Council to consider the wilderness of this.

Darron Blakemore, 723 Bluff Dale Drive, stated he resided at the end of the street and the trail would basically start in his front yard, go along the side of the house and down the back of his yard. He noted he was a voter and taxpayer and felt maintaining these trails would cost the taxpayer. He commented that this was a personal issue for him because it would affect his privacy. He felt he would no longer have any privacy. He worked in his front yard one afternoon and only one car came by. He thought there were other ideas. He noted there was a spot south of Valley View Road and thought it could be put in between the two houses that met Old 63. He believed the biggest concentration with regard to population was up toward Shepard Boulevard. They would have to go down the hill to Bluff Dale and back up. He noted Bluff Dale meandered and curved. People would come down Woodley and Southwood as it was human nature to take a shortcut. He stated the Crosscreek development was strongly opposed by the neighborhood near Hollywood Theaters and that was at the end of a four lane road. Although they expected it to eventually develop into something, it was held off for a couple years due to neighborhood opposition. In addition, it

made the voters happy. He felt it was the Council's job to express the voters' desires and needs.

Ms. Hoppe understood Mr. Blakemore lived at the end of the cul-de-sac and asked for clarification regarding the one car going by. Mr. Blakemore replied they just drove through and then back out. He noted there were a couple other cars, but only one car that was not from the neighborhood. He stated it was nice, peaceful and beautiful and would hate to see that change.

Steve Pagan, 701 Bluff Dale Drive, stated he had resided there for 23 years and was opposed to the Hinkson Creek trail from Grindstone to Stephens Lake with the Bluff Dale connection. He explained Bluff Dale Drive was an older neighborhood with ranch style homes and single car garages. Most of the cars were parked on the 24 foot wide street. He and his wife purchased the home for its back yard and being able to own part of the Hinkson Creek. The neighborhood had been fighting off the trail since 1995 when the City came to them wanting to put a trail through their back yards. They envisioned a small, gravel trail in the back yard, but the City wanted a concrete trail with a 100 foot buffer on each side of the trail, so all of their back yards would be completely gone. When asked what they would do with the back yards, they were told they would let it grow naturally, so they would see weeds in their back yards. The City then started talking about condemning the property and taking the property, which was when they really got mad. The proposed system had not changed in the last 13 years even though they had provided many other suggestions in the last several years. All had been rejected by the GetAbout Committee, which Mayor Hindman chaired. He commented that since the inception of this trail system, the City had been in the process of building a pedway and dual lane route on Old Highway 63. The pedway would be a 10 foot wide sidewalk. There were two five foot bike lanes as well. As a result, bicycles would have a total width of 20 feet and the cars would only have a total width of 21 feet on Old Highway 63. The 17 foot path they wanted to put on Bluff Dale was wide enough for two semi-tractor trailers. He question why it needed to be that wide and noted a regular trail was not 17 feet wide. He thought between the pedway and bicycle lanes on Old 63, which was a parallel route, they would have 37 feet for bicycles to ride. He did not think they needed that much. He reiterated they had provided suggestions over the years and the responses they had received were that they looked into it and the original proposal was best or the engineering surveys had not been completed so they did not know what would be proposed. They were also told that if one lived by a creek, there would be a trail and there was nothing that could be done about it.

John Glenn, 300 McCaw Drive, noted a speaker from Vanderveen had previously indicated they were in opposition to the trail and pointed out he was not opposed to the trail. An article in the Missourian mentioned the Vanderveen community had been surveyed, but they had not. The people who owned property on Jungle Tree were upset about the trail and he felt they had the right to be upset because they bought there properties without knowing what might happen back there. When coming in from Vanderveen, cyclists only had two choices, which were Rangeline and Garth. He explained he was a novice biker and wanted to see more "park and ride" areas, so he could drive his car to a certain point and then ride his bike in. He noted Wilson's was kind enough to say he could park there and then bike the

rest of the way, but he was concerned with Providence Road and Garth. Garth was narrow and one could lose a bike tire in the grates on the street. In addition, it was too tight when on it with a bus.

Mary Bancroft, 1714 McAlester, stated she was representing her mother, Edith Douglas, who owned to lots next to the street on the west side of a proposed South Garth trail connector. In addition, her aunt and uncle lived at 600 South Garth and their property was on the east side of the proposed connector. They all opposed the connector. She explained her family had enjoyed the private, natural qualities of this area for many years. It was wonderful because they felt it was safe from the encroachment of apartments or commercial rezoning. If the connector, which was to be 10 feet wide, was built, the privacy and natural beauty of the area would be destroyed. In the building of the connector, they felt there would be an extensive tearing out of trees. The neighborhood was a community of families. It was not a pass through area. There were other places nearby to get on the trail, such as Stewart Road and Lakeshore Drive. The City had made a commitment to parks and natural areas and asked that this natural area be given the same respect since other options were available.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, stated she supported the trails and loved to bike, but changed her mind when receiving additional information today. She felt compelled to talk about regional transportation needs, which was in the Visioning Plan and noted as one of the top three issues in needs assessments done by Boone County for 18 years. She stated she commuted over 70 miles to Jefferson City per day and was one of at least 1,400 people. Another 2,400 came from around Boone County. She understood GetAbout involved a mandate to reduce vehicle traffic through non-motorized means. In talking with the Boone County Community Partnership, she was lead to understand the original intent of the federal legislation was slightly different. Instead of the word non-motorized, it used the word alternative. If that was the language, it could include buses. She asked the Council to look into the prior language and consider a pilot project that would coordinate the five major cities of Boone County with Wabash as the median point and a north and south loop. She suggested the south loop go from the Wabash Station to Ashland and Jefferson City. She noted she had spoken with MoDOT and the Community Partnership and understood this pilot project was ready to go within 60 days. It had hybrid buses lined up. It would only take \$108,000 as an annual match to make this go. They had almost \$400,000 in pledged federal monies through the Federal Department of Transportation with its 5311 program. She noted there used to be a City bus to Jefferson City, but it was not needed as much then. There also used to be a private way through the Greyhound as well.

Ann Cowan commented that she moved to Columbia about 35 years ago and had cheered and supported the trails that made Columbia a great place to live, work and play. She explained she also helped to establish the YouZeum, which was a place they could focus the community's efforts in promoting the health of the community. She noted she was a nutrition and health specialist with the University of Missouri Extension. She also led the healthy lifestyle initiative, which was working to increase access to healthy food and physical activity. As a result, she was drawn to PedNet, an organization in support of an integrated network of trails, bike lanes, sidewalks, etc. to bring a health, quality of life and economic and

environmental benefits to Columbia. She noted she served as the Vice President of PedNet. PedNet had two recommendations for Council. During the first 18 months, \$2.1 million was committed to marketing and programming and during the second 18 months, only \$1.1 million was allocated. They believed additional funds needed to be provided due to the importance of promoting the use of the trail. The other recommendation concerned the categorization of the projects. PedNet had analyzed the recommended infrastructure projects according to their potential to create mode shift and cost and provided a handout showing that.

Mr. Skala understood the list she was providing analyzed the project in terms of mode shift potential and cost and asked if one of those took precedent. Ms. Cowan replied the first group of projects included mostly small projects in dense areas close to the central City with lots of destinations and an existing high level of bike and pedestrian traffic. They were high value, low cost trail connections.

Barbara Wills, 3011 Alsup Drive, stated she was present to read a letter from Frank Cunningham, who lived at 1112 Pheasant Run in the Shepard Boulevard area. She noted she shared a lot of his beliefs. Mr. Cunningham's letter indicated he wanted to reiterate his complete support of the work being done by the City's Public Works Department, the Parks and Recreation Department and the GetAbout Columbia Office to establish trails along with connections to all neighborhoods. He supported the Bluff Dale and Garth trail connections. After seeing the arguments made by the opposition, he found them to be fears that could be rebutted. Concrete trails were less expensive to maintain and allowed access for wheelchairs, strollers and roller blades. In addition, concrete was cleaner and did not damage the chains and gears of bicycles. With regard to trash, one could travel any of the trails in Columbia and find the dumping of trash was not a problem. The unfortunate fact was that crime happened everywhere. He did not think the opposition could find any statistic to show trails brought higher crime areas. He understood law enforcement would say intermittent pedestrians would more likely encourage criminals to find a location less traveled. Columbia did have homeless people and he understood they stayed close to their resources of food and shelter. He had seen them at Flat Branch Park, but had not seen them on other parts of the trail. He agreed they used them, but it was not typical. The opposition indicated people would park on the streets with the neighborhood trail connections. There were several neighborhood trail connections along the MKT and he noted he used to use one all of the time. There were never cars parked on the street at that location. They rode their bikes from nearby neighborhoods to hop on the trail. The people that had to drive to trails would likely use the accesses with parking lots, such as Grindstone Park, Capen, the access off of South Providence, the Stadium access, the Forum Boulevard access or Scott Boulevard. With regard to the concern of low water bridges causing flooding and limiting travel of aquatic life, he commented that he would be surprised if the design and engineering did not address those concerns. He understood some were concerned it would bring in student rental and noted there was student rental in just about every neighborhood in Columbia. He believed trail access would increase property values and discourage someone from buying a home as a rental investment. He stated the Bluff Dale connection was a matter of safety for him and his children, who might in their teen years ride their bicycles on Broadway or Stadium to get to downtown from their home in the Shepard Neighborhood. This connection would connect

to an ADA trail into the East Campus Neighborhood. He stated he looked forward to the day his family could ride their bikes to a downtown restaurant and leave the van in the garage. He asked the Council to take an objective look at the trail connections as well as the benefits the trails would offer to all of the citizens of Columbia and those who visited the City. He asked them to think about what Columbia would be like if the opposition to the MKT trail and the bridge burners succeeded in stopping its development. He also asked them to think about what Stephens Lake Park would be like if there was not access on Broadway, Old 63 and East Walnut.

Tim Turpin, 717 Bluff Dale, stated he opposed the trail on Bluff Dale as it would be less than the length of the Council Chamber. It would not be in his back yard. It would run down the middle of Bluff Dale, which was a 25 foot street with parking on both sides. As an avid bicyclist, he knew not to ride in the door zone of cars. That only allowed about 8 feet of riding area if cars were parked on both sides of the street. The street had two big hills and one 90 degree turn. If there were old people walking on the trail on Bluff Dale, they would be smashed because they would not be able to get out of the way for one lane of traffic. It would not be safe to have a trail down the street with cars parked on both sides. He reiterated he was an avid bicyclist and commuted to the University on a bicycle for over ten years. He found a way. There were no bike lanes and he rode in the street. He understood Mr. Cunningham did not feel there would be a parking problem. He noted this would be the closest place to park and get on the trail. The East Campus Neighborhood Association met with them and told them to not count on the City to assist with parking problems. They had single car garages with on-street parking, so they would have parking problems. He was three doors from where the trail would come out on to the street. He reiterated if people were going to ride to campus, they would park on their street as it was the closest place to park to get on the trail toward campus.

Johnna Turpin, 717 Bluff Dale, stated she agreed with the comments of her husband and noted she had two children, ages 8 and 11, that played in the front yard. She would not allow her children to continue playing in the front yard when they would be 50 feet from anyone coming up and down their street. She recommended the Council look at other options.

Al Lackey, 608 Old 63 South, stated if one lived on Bluff Dale and did not turn on Old 63, one would go onto his driveway because his driveway was an extension of Bluff Dale. He noted he was present in support of his neighbors who were opposed to the Bluff Dale trail. The most telling comment made this evening was by Ms. Forte who stated that if they were trying to find \$5 million and this project was estimated at \$4 million, it would be 80 percent of the savings needed. He commented that he lived on the creek. He was on the east side of Old 63, opposite of Bluff Dale, where Hominy Branch entered the creek. When he looked out of his window this morning, he could not see a crossing due to the rain. He understood another trail was being made below his deck in the floodplain. He asked if there would be a path there as he did not see it on the map. He asked if it had already been approved and funded. Mayor Hindman replied it had not been funded. Ms. Hoppe asked if he was referring to a path going down Moon Valley and under the bridge on the north side of the Hinkson. Mr. Lackey replied yes and asked how they planned to get across the creek. Mr. Glascock

replied they would put a bridge across the creek at some point. Mr. Lackey stated he hoped it did not get washed out.

Scott Wilson, 2412 Meadow Lark Lane, stated he was opposed to the Bluff Dale connector and encouraged everyone to walk through the area. It was a riparian forest. He commented that he knew it was a riparian area because there were signs on Grindstone and along Stephens Park. When one saw a functioning riparian corridor that was absorbing the water before it went into the Hinkson Creek, it showed Mother Nature was doing her job. He felt any kind of hard surface or point on Hinkson Creek would affect the natural meander of the creek and increase the flow into the Hinkson Creek. It was fresh water and he believed they needed to respect their fresh water and natural spaces. He stated he respected the spiritual connection the people on Bluff Creek had with the natural spaces. From a hydrology standpoint, the water was being filtered, it was decreasing flow and it was allowing upward and downward migration of creatures. He felt there was a balance they needed to have with the natural Columbia as well as transportation and GetAbout Columbia. He noted it would take out a lot of trees and open up a lot of space at Rockhill Park. He thought an environmental impact statement was important for a project like this. He noted this was not the MKT. The MKT was an existing railroad bed. This would be brand new and cause some natural damage.

Ms. Hoppe understood he was opposed to the Bluff Dale connector and asked if he was also opposed to the whole trail going down the Hinkson to Grindstone. Mr. Wilson replied yes. He understood the intersection of Old 63 and Stadium and Old 63 and Broadway were in the works and those were the accesses he was looking for. He did not think the end justified the means to cross that valley.

Dennis Knudson, 2100 Southwood Drive, stated he resided on the corner of Southwood and his back yard ran along Bluff Dale. He did not believe going down Bluff Dale was the best way across there. He suggested looking at places they could cross the highway to go east and north. He thought they would need something other than just getting off of the bridge on Bluff Dale. He suggested they go further south to come across. He thought the best solution would be to go on University property as only one low water bridge would be needed. He felt they would destroy the neighborhood by having the trail on Bluff Dale.

Ms. Hoppe understood he was on the Parks and Recreation Commission. Mr. Knudson stated he was. He noted he was also on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission and enjoyed it. He thought they were doing great things, but this was just one he did not agree with.

Kathleen Weinshenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated she wanted to remind the Council of a group of people who were too often forgotten, which were people in wheelchairs. Many people with wheelchairs did not have cars. Trails would be a good and safe way for them to get around as they would use it daily.

David Heise, 1707 Hinkson, Apt. 2, stated he was the Chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission and asked about the color scheme. He wondered if they were implied priorities or reflective of the purchase of land and easements necessary. Mr. Glascock explained the colors were based upon the difficulty of acquiring the trail easements. Mr. Heise understood they were not meant to be a priority of those individual projects. Mr.

Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Heise noted Mr. Curtis provided them this list of projects some months ago. They reviewed it and in general felt they were good ideas to move forward with. They had concerns on some particular projects since they had representation throughout the City. They had not had a chance to review the projects with the intent of narrowing them down to the \$13 million figure. If time warranted, he stated the Commission would welcome the opportunity to make a recommendation.

Steve Kullman, 205 South Garth, recalled someone asking if the trail would include soft shoulders and noted he was almost certain the adopted trail standards included soft shoulders on both sides. He stated he was a member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission and the PedNet Coalition, but was speaking as an individual. He commented that they were building infrastructure, which needed to be looked at differently than if they were building a badminton court or a park. They were building a non-luxury item. It was for a mode shift. If this were a sewer system, they would not be building a partial sewer system. They would not pick and choose what pieces to build. They would build the most complete system they could. Staff would be directed to perform the engineering and acquire the right-of-way. This was the plan and it had been examined by committees and commissions. He felt they needed to listen to the experts and pick the best solution for the entire City versus looking at what individuals felt would be the impact on themselves. He noted this was his opportunity to get his neighborhood connected as he lived on South Garth and was in favor of the South Garth connection.

Fred Schmidt, 1304 St. Christopher Street, stated he was handed an e-mail from the Missouri Bicycle Federation outlining their thoughts on sidepaths and noted the e-mail had been sent to Council, but had not reached them. He explained the Missouri Bicycle Federation did not oppose wide sidewalks. They actually supported them. If a wide sidewalk was available, some bicyclists would operate on them, so it made sense to design them with that in mind, but they should not be labeled or named as a bicycle facility. This practice had been the City's practice and was well supported by the Federal Highway Administration and industry literature. He stated he was concerned about the name "South Providence Bikeway" as it deviated from best practices. The City could open itself up to lawsuits by designating a facility a bicycle facility that was not really designed as a bicycle facility. He feared a lot of money would be spent on the path, but not on the intersections at Green Meadows and Nifong, which might defeat the purpose. He noted they did not have to give up much infrastructure to provide all of the programming wanted. He felt the shining star of the project to date had been bicycle education classes and the work of the signal technicians from the City Street Department.

Rachel Brekhus, 703 Hilltop Drive, stated her property backed Rockhill Park and if the City wanted to build a concrete trail behind her house, she was supportive. She was not afraid as she already had a path pedestrians used. She noted people shot off illegal fireworks behind her house all of the time and felt it was part of living where she lived. She bought there to have easy access to the University. She specifically looked at renting on Bluff Dale when she moved to Columbia, but did not because she wanted an easy connection to the University. Someone at her place of work resided in the Shepard/Bluff Dale area and was hoping a path would be created so she could have access to MU. She stated she grew

up in an area in Maryland that had a nice concrete bike trail. Her sister had been run over by a bicyclist when on it and she still felt, on balance, that path was a good thing in their lives. The park her parents backed up to now was on the borderline of a nice area and a poor area. It had a trail with various connectors and they had not seen increases in crime. She believed trails were good and thought they should keep the big picture in mind. She stated she liked wilderness as well, but understood she lived in a City. When living in a City, things developed and people needed to keep in mind they were near destinations and others wanted to get to those destinations. She felt a trail was better than a road through the back yard and believed that was a fair compromise. She noted she would be happy to have it in her back yard.

Jack Wulff, 605 Rockhill Road, stated he owned Lots 54, 55 and 56 in the Inglewood Subdivision for about 55 years. He explained in the 1970's, a walk-through park was put in their neighborhood and felt that unless someone had one of those on their property, they would not understand the issues. They had people come to the house to use the bathroom, phone, etc. People would also have parties. He commented that the park used to have signs indicating no bicycles or fires were allowed. That was not adhered to when mountain bikes were discovered. In addition, the Fire Department had been called a couple of times as a result of vagrants. He stated he was opposed to anyone paving anything on the property. The trail was on an easement and he owned the land on both sides of it. He thought it was illegal to use a utility easement for anything other than a utility easement, but it had happened. If it were paved, his trees would be destroyed. He stated the City could expect a lawsuit from him if they decided to go through Rockhill.

Ms. Hoppe asked for a clarification as to where the Inglewood Subdivision was located. Mr. Wulff replied the Inglewood Subdivision was Rockhill Road. It was the old Moss Street. Ms. Hoppe asked what the main cross street was. Mr. Wulff replied it went to the University and Broadway. He explained there used to be a rock quarry there and people walked the trail to go on top of the bluff. He wondered who was responsible if people fell off of the bluff with regard to liability.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluff Dale Drive, stated she felt there were a lot of good projects associated with GetAbout that she wanted to see completed. She thought a problem was that the maps showed short little lines making these connections look so easy. She felt the people from Shepard and East Campus had been shown this short, inexpensive trail for a connection to campus. She stated they needed to be shown a 3-D model because Rockhill Park was not an easy hill to climb. She commented that every time they asked questions about this project, they received a different answer. They had asked if the engineering studies were complete and for them to be shown to them. She stated Rockhill Park was not near her, but she loved it. She wanted them to picture two semi-trucks, side by side, as that was equal to the width of a 17 foot trail. She felt it would take a 50 foot easement and the cutting of a lot of trees to place the trail at the corner of the park. The shade would no longer be available. She noted those trees were keeping the soil from running off of the hillside. If they cleared vegetation and constructed a concrete path, they would have water runoff and destruction of the hillside. In addition, the construction vehicles would put further stress on an already environmentally impaired area. The Hinkson Creek was on the 303-D impaired

list. She thought runoff would go into the creek because it was currently being absorbed by the leaves, roots and soil. She felt this could be avoided by using Old 63, which had been criticized for being too steep. She noted Chapel Hill was a lot steeper and she believed the Rockhill Park trail would be a lot steeper. She commented that Section 12 of the City's Stormwater Management Plan indicated that roadways parallel to streams were not recommended. She felt a 10 foot wide bike path was a road. It was also recommended that alterations that would cause upstream flooding should not be made. She noted she was also concerned about the cost. The Parks and Recreations Department was trying to cut their budget and cutting through the floodplain would add to the Parks and Recreation budget. She asked for other alternatives to be considered.

Mr. Skala commented that they started this process at the Council retreat with a presentation involving \$17 million in projects. At that time, they decided to conduct some informational sessions to determine how they wanted to proceed and some of them had held those informational sessions in their respective wards. They also recently had a work session and discussed those items they wanted to include on the list and ended up with about \$13 million in projects. The list went to the Advisory Committee and they added a couple projects to bring it back up to \$17 million. He felt the homework for the work session was to look at these individually to determine what would give them the most bang for the buck knowing they had \$13 million and wanted to maximize model shift and have connectivity. He did not think that was a bad list, but if they were going to add projects, something had to give because they only had \$13 million. Ms. Nausser asked if someone had that list. Mayor Hindman thought there had been additions. Mr. Janku stated he had proposed some at that meeting and thought they had been included. He had not suggested anything since then. Mr. Skala agreed they were included and noted there had been additions by the GetAbout Columbia Committee that were not on list from the work session.

Mr. Wade stated there were many comments about the Garth Avenue trail that were in accurate. There was an impression that the opposition was to the Garth connection. He explained the resistance was initially due to it being a top down project dropped on them. Once they started talking, they found they shared many values and goals. The neighborhood created a six member team to work with the GetAbout staff. The opposition was to a specific trail and not the connection. They were opposed to the specific way to make the connection, which someone had indicated was not used 40 years ago by kids because it was a bad trail. They had come up with two new paths, which took into account the Grasslands' interest of a walkable connection to the Library and Grant School. He understood the GetAbout Columbia staff was beginning to do the analysis to determine if one of those connections might be better or cheaper. There was a respectful and congenial relationship within the neighborhood.

Mayor Hindman asked about the list they were previously discussing. Mr. Glascock stated it was the list from the work session and totaled \$12.9 million. Mr. Janku noted it included the Bear Creek trail connection. Mayor Hindman stated the list he had totaled \$17.9 million. Mr. Skala explained it was because it included the three projects in purple. Mr. Janku stated the top purple item had been included. Mayor Hindman thought the Hinkson Creek trail from Grindstone to Stephens was included in the list with the exception of the Bluff

Dale link. Mr. Skala stated that was not correct. Mr. Janku reiterated the Bear Creek trail connections he requested were included.

Mr. Skala stated he favored the Hominy Woodridge/Clark, Wabash Walkway: Station to Vandiver and Walnut: William/Old 63 projects because they were relatively isolated areas that would finally be connected.

Mayor Hindman commented that he thought the Hinkson trail from Grindstone to Stephens was very important. If one wanted to go from the east side of town with Shepard as an example, one would have to go to Broadway and then go south to the University or take Stadium to the University. With this trail connection, the East Campus Neighborhood and the University would be connected to Stephens Lake. The people on the south side of town would be able to take the trail system up to Stephens Lake and the shops at Broadway. The people in the area opposed to this had to go east, up a hill to Stadium or Broadway and then west to get to the University even though they lived close to the University. He noted it was a populated area. He stated the trip took 3 or 4 times the distance than if they could just go straight across. He believed this would generate interconnectivity and the mode shift with the population and close, shorter trips. There was currently a major barrier. If one wanted to go to the University from the Bluff Dale area, one would have to go up a 90 foot hill. Ms. Hoppe noted going up Rockhill and Rollins was more steep than going up Old 63. She commented that as the bird flew, it looked like a great idea, but one would have to go up a steep hill and it was not ADA accessible. Mayor Hindman pointed out one would have to go up a hill again if they wanted to go to the University from Bluff Dale. They would go out to Old Highway 63 and up the hill to Stadium or to the north to Broadway and up the Broadway hill before going south again. They were forcing people to go four times as far. Witness after witness had indicated they would like the direct route.

Ms. Hoppe stated she lived on Bluff Dale and explained she currently used the lanes on Old 63, but noted they would have a pedway as an alternative in the future. She felt there were a lot of ways to get to campus without going through Bluff Dale. She noted the people in Bluff Dale voted and overwhelmingly did not want the connector. It was called a neighborhood connector, but only a couple people in the neighborhood wanted it. With regard to hills, there was a steep hill going up Rockhill Park and Rollins. It was not ADA accessible. She stated she went up and down Old 63 all of the time and would not bike up that area. She would prefer to go north on Old 63 to the Walnut pedway, which was planned, and the bike boulevard on Williams. She felt that was the most direct route to get to the University from Bluff Dale. Mayor Hindman did not believe the most direct route was to go the opposite direction or way out of the way north or south. Ms. Hoppe explained it depended on where they were going. If Bluff Dale were a connector, it meandered to the south coming out at Rollins, so it was not a direct route either. One would then have to go north on Williams to go to Broadway or the University. She stated her point was that there were a lot of other ways. There were also issues with regard to costs and the natural area. She noted Rockhill Park and the property on the Grindstone were a couple of the most pristine areas in the City. She pointed out the Hinkson was an endangered area. She did not believe Bluff Dale for the Shepard Neighborhood was a convenient or fast route due to the hills. She suggested looking at a connector close to Shepard if they did the Rockhill –

Hinkson project. There was property zoned R-1 and if developed, it would have to have road access and a pedway could go with the road access for a connection. She did not believe the Bluff Dale route should be considered. She reiterated she lived on Bluff Dale and noted it was a very narrow area where Bluff Dale intersected with Southwood. There were three piano teachers in the area with cars parked there all of the time. She felt it was a dangerous area for people to be adding bicycles. She thought they would decide it did not work and look for another access. She stated they had a lot of other alternatives. She proposed going up Ashland Road as there was already a bridge over the Grindstone in that area. It was also cheaper. They could improve the intersection at Ashland and Stadium because people were using it right now and it was dangerous.

Mayor Hindman noted they had many people from Shepard stating they would like to be able to go to Bluff Dale to the University. He understood she was proposing they go down to Ashland and Stadium. Ms. Hoppe stated that if the Hinkson – Rockhill connector was okayed, it would be just as convenient to go down Old 63 and take Hinkson to Rockhill Park, as it would to go way north to Bluff Dale, which was out of the way. She noted Bluff Dale was way north of Shepard toward Broadway. They would then have to back track and go all of the way south while meandering back and forth. She did not believe it was a short cut to go through Bluff Dale. Then they still had the hills at Rockhill Park and Rollins. She asked that they look at a route closer to Shepard, south of Valley View. Mayor Hindman noted that was a very steep hill and hard with regard to building. He commented that they could go down Woodland or Southwood to get to Bluff Dale.

Mr. Wade stated the Bluff Dale/Rollins/Stadium was the one project he would oppose. He understood it created a significant difficulty in the connection from that area. In terms of the numbers, many were in support of it, but there were also many who signed petitions and did not feel the need to show up because they were being represented by the Neighborhood Association. He commented that he felt this was the one project that was totally incompatible with the geography. Because they had the ability with powerful machines to drive through bad geography did not mean they had to do it. If they were looking at the natural resources inventory without knowing of the trails, this would probably be the number one priority in Columbia. It was an incredible urban riparian forest that connected up the hill with the old hickory forest into Rockhill. The amount of destruction of a paved road would be very significant. It was a very small part of the amount of remaining habitat with no development. He stated he could not support the City being the developer. He commented that he had a hard time justifying the habitat destruction in the name of green transportation. He noted there were alternative routes at each end with Stadium and Broadway. He agreed they were less than ideal, but were not that much greater in distance. He believed the net elevation was moot because it all started at the Hinkson. He also had a problem with the process of citizen engagement with this project. He noted they required private developers to engage in honest conversations with the neighborhoods for the good of the community and thought the City needed to meet those same expectations. In this case, the exchanges with the various neighborhood associations involved being told what would be done with no real efforts in finding what would work for everyone. He commented that he had voted against a development in March with one of the primary factors being the way in which the

neighborhoods had been engaged and he saw a similar pattern here. He had a problem with it and noted his real opposition was that this was the one project that was incompatible with the geography and the nature of the habitat.

Mayor Hindman stated he had gone out and met with the people of the neighborhood at least two times. He presented the priority slide show, etc. The kinds of objections the Bluff Dale people had were the same objections he had heard every time he had been involved with a trail issue. In this case, they were only asking to be able to use the public street for bicyclists and pedestrians. He believed the people in the neighborhood would end up being the primary users and happy with it. They would not have had the MKT trail if they had accepted these objections as they had gone through exactly the same thing.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there were a lot of new trails going around this area. There would be a pedway down Old 63, an intersection improvement at Old 63 and Broadway, a trail under Broadway to the east of the intersection connecting Stephens Lake Park, a pedestrian light at Walnut to join Stephens Lake Park, a pedway up Walnut and the bike boulevard down Williams Street. She noted she had asked that the connection from Ashland Road be looked into because the people using it would not divert to this trail. She stated there were a lot of improvements being made and felt the question involved wants versus needs. This was a cul-de-sac and the neighbors liked their privacy. It affected a lot of older people who were terribly worried their way of life was ending. She noted they had limited resources and were doing a lot. They were in favor of access and connections, but wondered if they had to do everything now. She asked that see how it worked and fit together first. She felt it would be better for the people in the area to see it was working and to ask to be hooked into the system versus having it shoved down their throats. She reiterated there were other options and connections, so the Bluff Dale connection did not make sense. She noted East Campus and Shepard Boulevard voted to stay neutral on the Bluff Dale connection because they wanted a connection, but not any particular connection. She commented that she was also torn with regard to the Rockhill Park/Stadium connection. As a concept, it would be easy to bike there. She stated there was also a nature consideration. It was a pristine area and the Hinkson was endangered. She felt they needed a better analysis of the area by looking at all of the uses because biking was only one use. It might be best suited as a nature area with walking trails. She noted when people from East Campus walked the area and saw what would happen to Rockhill Park, they started having second thoughts. There were issues with regard to low water bridges as kayakers could only use the creek. They could not use a road. She stated they had many conflicting uses that needed to be reviewed.

Ms. Nauser commented that they had 15-16 projects totaling \$17 million on the list. They could not do everything on the list. She thought a reasonable method to approach this would be to remove the controversial projects from the list since there were only a few. If they moved forward with the contentious areas, they would take away from the projects where no one was unhappy. She thought that would potentially reduce the \$17 million by \$2.5 million and noted they had to get it down to \$13 million.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with Ms. Nauser and pointed out that was the method by which they achieved some sort of consensus at the work session. They overlooked the ones

they were arguing about and put the rest of the list together, which totaled \$12.9 million. The other projects appeared due to the Advisory Committee. If engineered, there would be a road up the side of a hill so these people were not just giving up the street in front of their houses. It was a little more than the street in front of the house. He noted he did not buy the arguments regarding crime, people on the trail, etc. They only had \$13 million. He commented that he would love to be able to do all of the projects and find a reasonable way to accommodate this area Mayor Hindman felt was critical to the plan. He noted the area he lived in was also critical because it was totally isolated. He stated they could argue about a couple of these projects for an hour and half when they did not have the money to fund all of them. He reiterated he thought they should move forward on the ones they had reached some sort of consensus on and put the other ones on the list for future planning or money.

Mr. Janku stated he also agreed with Ms. Nauser and Mr. Skala. He understood the goal was to have a measurable impact by the fall of 2010 when they reported to the U.S. Congress, so they needed to begin implementing projects. The fact that some projects could be done quicker to allow the mode shift to begin was important because mode shift took time. He suggested they look for more money to begin planning or reviewing options to address the controversial connections in order to come up with something that was community acceptable. He stated he was a proponent of the Broadway: Fairview/Stadium project and felt part of the cost should be covered by the TDD. He thought a third of the project was within the TDD, so there might be some money there. They also had possible money from signage and thought they should look into that. He noted he had been around the battle between cyclists with regard to bike lanes versus pedways, etc. If there was not strong support for bike lanes, he suggested they look at the \$1 million budgeted for it in order to fund more infrastructure. He thought they should look at the other expenditures programmed in the budget as well.

Mr. Sturtz stated he thought they needed to remember there was a good chance they could get more money in the future and felt they needed to show the federal government they were moving projects along without dividing the community. He commented that he also did not buy into a lot of the arguments made by the Bluff Dale residents with regard to the loss of privacy, trash, homeless people, etc. He agreed they had a fairly pristine wilderness area and would hate for them to rush it through tonight and forfeit the ability to do something a little different due to federal mandates regarding right-of-way, etc. He believed they had more than enough projects with a high impact that would bring the community together.

Ms. Hoppe pointed out there were people in the area who were interested in looking at an alternative that did not go through Rockhill Park, but connected to Old 63 and the University. She thought there were possible routes they could explore like they were doing with Garth to determine if there was something that would function in the same manner without the negative effects.

Mr. Wade stated he had a specific request on the Garth connection because he felt there was clearly a commitment to it. He understood there was money within the GetAbout Columbia program to move the analyses, studies, preliminary designs, etc. to as high a stage as possible without having to go into a construction contract. He recommended they bring the Garth connection as far as it could go with the analysis being done by the neighborhood

and the GetAbout Columbia staff. If one of the optional paths was viable, he felt it would be significantly cheaper than the cost of the pathway that would be required down Garth, which might allow them to find supplemental sources to move it to completion. He believed the Garth connection was important, but did not believe it was ready for approval for full project funding.

Ms. Nauser commented that in review of the work session list with the numbers from the colored list, they were at about \$13.5 million. If they had additional funding from the Broadway-Fairview TDD, it would be reduced some. She thought it was a good place to start and noted it had projects in all wards. Mayor Hindman asked how she came up with the \$13.5 million. Ms. Nauser replied she used the numbers from the color-coated sheet. Mr. Watkins asked what was being removed. He explained the difficulty was that two projects had some part of it below the line or on the second page. The existing intersections were \$2.5 million and \$700,000 was proposed as design, but had not been funded. The Providence Bikeway South would need \$300,000 for the old bridge. Ms. Nauser stated she had included it. Mr. Watkins thought the total was \$14,861,000. Mr. Wade stated he had \$13.6, but had left the off the Greenbriar to Hinkson Creek trail and MU project. Ms. Nauser stated she took out the MKT connector, which totaled \$860,000. Mayor Hindman asked why she took it out. Ms. Nauser replied she was going on the premise of removing all controversial items. Mr. Wade noted that included the Garth connector. Mayor Hindman stated the Garth connection was only a small part of it. It included Wilson's and getting off at Stadium, etc. Mr. Wade stated he did not know the Garth cost estimate and asked if it was \$600,000. Mayor Hindman thought the Wilson's connection might be arguable if there was money. Ms. Nauser asked what that connector would be. Mayor Hindman replied the easements would be donated, but a bridge would be required across the Hinkson.

Ms. Hoppe stated she understood they were removing items, but noted she was concerned with doing the bike lanes on Ashland to get the alternate route. Mr. Janku pointed out there was money for bike lanes. Ms. Hoppe stated the intersection at Stadium and Ashland was another need. Mr. Watkins explained there were five intersections left to do that Council still needed to select. Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted that to be one of the intersections. Mr. Janku suggested they debate that another night.

Ms. Nauser asked for an explanation of the suggested Wilson's connection. She wondered how much of the \$860,000 might be available for it. Mayor Hindman stated he did not know. Mr. Glascock replied it was lumped together. He stated he thought the bridge would cost more than \$260,000. Ms. Nauser asked what it might be if they did it without the bridge. Mr. Glascock noted they needed to get across the creek. Mayor Hindman understood \$860,000 was an unrealistic number for those projects. Mr. Glascock replied it was if \$600,000 was the cost for Garth. Mr. Wade stated he might have been wrong about the estimate for Garth. He thought Garth was at least half of it though. Mr. Glascock explained that if they kept to existing right-of-way, he was not sure it would be. Mayor Hindman stated it was fairly short and if they followed the right-of-way to the trail, which he was not sure they wanted to do due to trees, etc., a ramp could be built to it. He did not believe the project would be that expensive. He noted he thought they wanted to leave the money in there for the other accesses to the MKT trail.

Mr. Wade asked for an explanation of the Greenbriar to Hinkson Creek trail and MU project. Ms. Nauser replied it was a trail connection from the back of the Greenbriar Subdivision to the Katy trail to the tennis courts across Providence. Mr. Janku stated it was a good connection because it would benefit all of those neighborhoods there. Ms. Nauser noted the neighborhood had a meeting and everyone was in support of it.

Mayor Hindman understood the present plan for the Old 63 Grindstone project called for a very expensive widening. He believed it could be done for less if they did not have to blast a hill, etc. and asked if staff had any thoughts. Mr. Glascock replied it had very steep terrain. He explained they looked at cantilevering the hill and earthwork. It was an expensive proposition regardless of the method used. Ms. Hoppe asked if they were talking about closer to Stadium and Grindstone. Mayor Hindman replied part of it would be in that area. Ms. Hoppe stated it was popular in that it served a lot of students and noted she had not heard a lot of opposition. Mayor Hindman agreed, but noted the MKT was a very well used commuter trail now and they needed to be able to get people off on the shoulder of Stadium. They involved a bunch of little things, but would make a huge difference. He thought they needed to be included.

Mr. Skala noted the Old 63 Grindstone project was \$2.4 million and would get them there. Mayor Hindman agreed, but did not think they wanted to limit it yet. Ms. Hoppe noted they had MoDOT funds for the Old 63 pedway from Hinkson to Grindstone. Mayor Hindman pointed out this was a different project. Mr. Wade stated removing the Old 63 Grindstone project would get them there. Mayor Hindman did not think they needed that much. He understood they were at \$14 million and need to get down to \$13 million. Mr. Wade stated his numbers were different, but they were close. He explained he added all of the projects except the MKT connector and Hinkson trail at Grindstone and came up with \$13 million. Mayor Hindman noted they might not need the full amount, but thought they needed some funding for the MKT connector. Mr. Janku asked how much he included for the Broadway: Fairview/Stadium. Mr. Wade replied he included the full amount. Mr. Janku thought they could assume the TDD was picking up 25 percent of that cost. Mr. Wade stated that if the TDD picked up a third, it would leave them enough to do some of the other connectors. Mr. Skala thought they would also have to eliminate the Old 63 Grindstone project. Mr. Wade noted it did not include the planning for the I-70 bridge overpass. Mr. Watkins understood the plans with the TDDs for Stadium and Broadway did not include any sidewalks along Broadway after the intersection improvements, so he did not think it would be 25 percent. Mayor Hindman stated he did not think they had to approve it if it was not included. Mr. Glascock pointed out they approved the agreements last night. Mayor Hindman thought the plans were not done and they would have a chance to see them. Mr. Glascock stated there was a layout or conceptual plan. It only went to Crossroads on Broadway. Mayor Hindman stated he was under the impression they were going to see what it was because there were items he was interested in, such as the sidewalk and bicycle situations. Mr. Glascock explained everything they were touching would have a sidewalk, but they were not going further back on Broadway to include what they were wanting. That project did not include that piece of the road. It included Bernadette, Beverly, Knipp, Stadium, Ash and Worley, but did not go to Fairview on Broadway. Mr. Janku was not suggesting it would. He was only

suggesting the frontage on their property, which extended westward from Stadium some distance. Mr. Glascock stated it only went back to the front side of Crossroads, which was the cheap part. The rest of it was the open ditch.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted to revisit the Old 63 Grindstone project and noted it would connect a lot of people and provide a big modal shift due to the students. She understood it was expensive, but reiterated it would provide a large modal shift, which was what they were trying to achieve. She thought they needed to look elsewhere in saving money and pointed out it was non-controversial.

Mr. Glascock asked where they were. Mayor Hindman replied \$14,861,886 if they kept everything. He stated something he thought was significant, but was not being discussed was Stadium from Providence to College. Ms. Hoppe thought the connector down Rock Quarry Road was another. Mayor Hindman thought that if they had Stadium from Providence to College, people could go to the University and take the trail behind the Arena to the Reactor. At this time, they did not have shoulders or sidewalks on Stadium. Mr. Janku understood there was already a sidewalk on Ashland Gravel to Stadium. He asked if they could take the Old 63 pedway to Ashland Gravel. Mayor Hindman stated that would not help much because the cut was between there and the Grindstone Nature Area. Ms. Hoppe noted the money from GetAbout Columbia would start at Grindstone and go south.

Mr. Sturtz asked for an explanation regarding the Stewart/Westwind project. Mayor Hindman thought it might be a possibility because it was primarily sidewalks. Mr. Wade stated it was sidewalks with striped bike paths. Mayor Hindman thought they might be able to get by with just striped bike paths. Mr. Wade stated he thought they could put it on hold, but noted it needed to be brought back to the table. He thought it was close to having completed design work. He commented that he believed it would be nice when done, but would have a lower level of mode change impact than the other projects. Mayor Hindman agreed since they would still be striping the bicycle lanes. Mr. Wade stated one of the problems was that they did not have a sidewalk and it caused an unsafe walking situation. Mr. Sturtz asked how much they would save with only striping. Mayor Hindman thought they would save nearly the entire cost and stated that brought them to \$14.2 million. Mr. Glascock thought if they took \$1 million from wayfinding, they were there. Mr. Janku asked how much would then be left for wayfinding. Mr. Glascock replied he thought they had a lot in wayfinding. Ms. Nauser stated they had \$2 million in it. Mr. Glascock suggested they start with taking \$1 million from wayfinding. Mr. Janku thought they could look at the stripping costs, etc. later. Mr. Glascock agreed. Mayor Hindman understood they had it down to \$13.2 million. Mr. Glascock thought that was close enough.

Ms. Nauser asked for a recap. Mr. Skala asked if they could make a motion to move forward with everything listed above the Broadway: Fairview/Stadium project. Mr. Wade replied no and asked if the Stadium: Providence/College project was moving forward. Mayor Hindman understood it called for pedways or sidewalks on both sides and wondered if they could just do one side to get it started. There was already a wide sidewalk along Hearnese that could be used. Mr. Janku noted the hotel should be building one as well. Mayor Hindman asked if the hotel was building one. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mayor Hindman thought it could be widened at the City's cost. Mr. Glascock explained they were bonding it

because they wanted a wider sidewalk. They would provide a bond for their portion and the City would build it. Mr. Janku thought the University should participate as well. Mr. Skala agreed. Mayor Hindman thought the VA should participate as well. Mr. Janku believed at a minimum they should get 50 percent from all of the entities there. Mayor Hindman asked if they should move forward with one side and if they could get participation, they would move forward with the other side.

Mr. Janku asked if the Bear Creek connectors were included in the numbers. Mayor Hindman thought they were. Mr. Wade stated he came up with \$13.4 million with nothing purple included. Mr. Janku stated Pythons Court could be left out, but the connector to the trail from Blue Ridge needed to be included. Mr. Wade stated he did not include anything purple, the MKT connectors and the West: Stewart/Westwind. Mayor Hindman asked if he reduced it \$1 million for the signage. Mr. Watkins suggested staff read down the list so everyone understood what would be included.

Mr. Glascock understood the Council wanted to move forward with the following projects: Green Meadows to Rockbridge estimated at \$1.1 million; Providence: Smiley to Blue Ridge estimated at \$600,000; Walnut: William/Old 63 estimated at \$126,000; Greenbriar to Hinkson Creek Trail and MU estimated at \$810,000; Old 63 Grindstone estimated at \$2.4 million; Downtown HUB: Prov/Douglas to FLB & Rpl. Ped Overpass estimated at \$1 million; MKT Connectors/Improv estimated at \$860,000; Providence: Wilkes/Texas estimated at \$380,000; 763 BS Lp/Big Bear estimated at \$570,000; County House Trl Ph 1: Twin Lakes/Stad estimated at \$775,000; Intersection Improvement estimated at \$2.5 million; Hominy Woodridge/Clark estimated at \$1.4 million; Wabash Walkway: Station to Vandiver estimated at \$1.2 million; Broadway: Fairview/Stadium estimated at \$545,000; Bear Creek Connector estimated at \$280,000; and Stadium: Providence/College on one side estimated at \$200,000.

Mr. Wade noted the MKT Connectors/Improv project did not have to be the full \$800,000. Mayor Hindman thought it would depend on what they included. He understood if they built the Wilson's connector with a bridge, staff felt the number was too low. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct unless they were taking out Garth. Mr. Skala thought they were taking Garth out. Mr. Wade explained he was recommending they move Garth up to the point of construction. Mayor Hindman asked how they would pay for it. Mr. Wade replied they would have to find additional money to complete it. Mr. Watkins understood the Garth connector would only involve design work. Mr. Wade stated that was correct. Mayor Hindman stated he did not like the idea of not funding it. A set of kids would not be able to use it to walk to school with every year that went by. Mr. Janku thought that if they came up with an acceptable alternative, it would be brought forward. Mayor Hindman understood, but wondered where they would get the money if they spent all of this. Mr. Watkins suggested they leave it at \$860,000 with the understanding that would be as far as they went as it would allow them to have some money. Mr. Wade thought that was acceptable.

Mayor Hindman asked if the Intersection Improvement project included the three being bid. Mr. Glascock replied it did not. He explained this only included five. Mr. Janku understood the three being bid were already removed from the total. Mr. Watkins stated they were the \$1 million item included on the other sheet.

Mr. Glascock asked if they were doing the West: Stewart/Westwind project. He thought they were only striping there. Mr. Watkins understood that one was out.

Mr. Janku asked if the Hominy Woodridge/Clark project included the part that was already built. Mr. Skala asked if he meant the part at The Links that was already built. Mr. Janku replied yes. Mr. Glascock thought this only went to I-70 because they were only going as far as the sewer and the sewer went to I-70. Mr. Glascock stated the estimate only included that portion.

Mr. Janku thought the Broadway: Fairview/Stadium would be reduced some. Mr. Watkins stated they would work on that.

Mayor Hindman asked what the projects listed by Mr. Glascock totaled. Mr. Glascock replied \$14.7 million. Ms. Nauser noted they were taking \$1 million from the wayfinding signage. Mr. Janku stated that got them to \$13.7 million. Mayor Hindman asked if that was close enough. Mr. Watkins replied they were about \$1 million over because they only had \$12.3 million to spend. He noted they had \$750,000 in contingency and thought they needed to keep it as it was lower than he would have liked.

Ms. Nauser commented that they were including the full Broadway: Fairview/Stadium, but thought they would only pay for about two-thirds. Mr. Janku stated that was only a modest amount. Mr. Watkins agreed and thought it would only be about \$100,000.

Ms. Hoppe asked if there was a possibility of savings if they did not pave some of the projects or if they only had an 8-foot width versus a 10-foot width. Mayor Hindman did not think those would add up to much of a savings. Mr. Watkins agreed. Mr. Janku asked if the standard would be 10 feet for all of the projects. Mr. Glascock replied some of the pedways were 10 feet and some were 8 feet wide.

Mayor Hindman asked about the possibility of the Wabash Walkway going to Business Loop 70 instead of Vandiver. Mr. Janku asked what kind of trail and sidewalk money they had in the regular budget, such as ballot issue money that had not been allocated. Mr. Watkins replied the ballot issue sidewalk money was rear end funded. He thought it was about \$250,000 per year. Mayor Hindman asked about the possibility of taking it up to the first stop light. Mr. Janku stated he was thinking the same thing and thought that would be at Heriford. Mayor Hindman noted it would not be as good as going to Vandiver, but someone could go across and get on the sidewalk system. He thought they could stripe Paris. Mr. Janku did not believe they could stripe it. Mr. Watkins stated he did not think they would want to stripe Paris. Mr. Janku thought that if they got the bridge in, they could initially make the trail gravel. Since it was in the railroad right-of-way, there was not a lot of flow across it. He thought Vandiver down to the bridge could be gravel. He noted it was an old railbed like the MKT, so he suggested making it gravel initially. Mayor Hindman pointed out they could not put it on the old railbed because the rails were there. Mr. Janku thought they could have it next to it. Mayor Hindman asked for the difference in cost between the two distances. Mr. Skala replied Wabash to Rogers was \$262,000 and Vandiver to Rogers was \$953,000. Mr. Hindman asked if that was due to the bridge. Mr. Skala replied yes. Mr. Janku thought the bridge was probably \$500,000. Mayor Hindman thought they could install a walk button so people could use the present bridge. He understood that would save about \$900,000. Mr. Janku felt more people would bike if they built the northern end because it would get people

safely onto Paris. Once they got across I-70 and the Business Loop, they would figure out a way to make it into town. They would not come down Paris Road. Mr. Skala stated the northeast was the same, which was why the two spokes tended to be important. Mr. Janku thought it made more sense to build the outside part first, although it was the expensive part. Mayor Hindman asked if they could build the northern part to the last stop light to get across. He noted he did not like it much because people would be on the sidewalks facing traffic.

Mr. Watkins suggested they approve the list without the Wabash Walkway with the understanding that staff would come back with some alternative costs. He noted by taking it out, they would get to the number they were looking toward. Mr. Janku was agreeable if it could be the first alternate if another project fell through. He knew a lot of people were interested in it. He asked that they be provided cost estimates to include having it as a gravel trail. Mr. Watkins replied they would provide it with gravel trails at different lengths with and without the bridge. Mr. Janku suggested they provide different bridge options. He noted there was a bridge, but there was not a stop light nearby.

Ms. Nauser stated she wanted a detailed breakdown of the MKT connectors to include the cost projection of the design of Garth and the cost of the Wilson's option. She understood the Wilson's option might not be feasible now, but thought it could be of interest for the future.

Mayor Hindman asked if they could apply for safety money for Stadium between College and Providence. It was a situation with a lot of students with no sidewalks or shoulders and very heavy traffic. Mr. Glascock replied he did not think they could get safety money for the sidewalk, but thought they might be able to get enhancement funds for it if the City and University worked together. Mr. Watkins asked if there were enhancements funds left. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know. Mr. Watkins did not think there were. He thought the State had allocated all of the funds. Mr. Glascock pointed out safety funds were normally for intersection improvements and accident data was required.

Mr. Janku thought they had their list and understood additional information would be provided for the Wabash Walkway project. Mr. Watkins understood that was the only one on the list Mr. Glascock read that would be considered an alternate. They would proceed with everything else except for it and the connectors as a breakdown was requested for the MKT connectors as well.

Ms. Hoppe asked if Old 63 would be an 8-foot pedway or a 10-foot pedway. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it would be 10 feet due to the hill. He pointed out they were looking at different alternatives there as well in order to reduce the cost. Ms. Hoppe thought if the 8-foot pedway would reduce costs while serving the purpose, they should go that route. Mr. Janku hoped all of the projects would be reviewed closely. He was also hopeful they would receive community support in donated rights-of-way.

Mayor Hindman made a motion to proceed with the projects on the non-motorized projects list with the removal of the West: Stewart/Westwind project, doing only one side of the Stadium: Prov/College project with the hope of the University participating in a cost share, the removal of the Wabash Walkway: Station to Vandiver but it being alternate number one if another project fell through and the removal of the Hinkson Trail Grindstone/Steph III, and to

reduce the budget for wayfinding signage so it could be used toward projects. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman commented that there were a lot of projects they wanted to do and many projects that were not included in the list. He stated they were fortunate in being one of the four pilot project communities. He understood there was a strong movement toward having this portion of the transportation bill reauthorized to include more communities. In that situation, it was expected the communities would have to compete for funding. He thought they should make it a high priority to lobby and cooperate in the lobbying for the extension of this program in the transportation bill and to compete for funding. He believed they would have an excellent chance.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to draft a policy resolution for consideration with regard to this being a high priority of the City. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:04 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk