Boone County, Missouri
Unofficial Document

Filed for Record, Boone County, MO
Bette Dorsey, Recorder of Deeds

688

Special Warranty Deed

This deed made and entered into this 23rd day of January, 2001, by and between F. Garland Russell, Jr. and Peggy Lee C. Russell, husband and wife, Grantors, of Columbia, Boone County, Missouri, and Columbia Audubon Society, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation chartered under the laws of Missouri and qualified under Section 501 c (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, having a mailing address of 204 S. Garth Avenue, Columbia, Missouri 65201.

Witnesseth, for and in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars ($10) and other good and valuable considerations, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, Grantors do hereby Sell and convey to Grantee and Grantee's successors and assigns the following described real property in Boone County, Missouri, to wit:

Tract 1-B on the Survey Plat recorded in Book 1681 page 774 of the records of Boone County, Missouri; being more particularly described as a tract beginning at the south quarter-section point of Section 16, Township 48 North, Range 13 West, thence N 87 degrees, 01 minutes, 20 seconds W 1011.81 feet, thence N 0 degrees 24 minutes 00 seconds E 680.00 feet, thence S 86 degrees 38 minutes 35 seconds E 245.13 feet, thence N 47 degrees 11 minutes 30 seconds E 184.67 feet, thence N 16 degrees 55 minutes 20 seconds E 140.43 feet, thence S 87 degrees 01 minutes 20 seconds E 575.73 feet, thence S 0 degrees 41 minutes 00 seconds E 600.97 feet, thence S 84 degrees 26 minutes 15 seconds E 300 feet, thence S 0 degrees, 41 minutes 00 seconds E 350 feet, thence N 84 degrees 26 minutes 15 seconds W 300 feet to the point of beginning, containing 22.04 acres.

Subject to the easement recorded in Book 1681 page 773 of the records of Boone County, Missouri, and other easements and restrictions of record

This conveyance is made subject to the following conditions which shall be binding upon Grantee, its assigns and successors: the property shall be used exclusively for educational, cultural or environmental purposes or for administrative or executive offices of the Grantee or other organizations pursuing similar aims and qualified under Sec. 501 c (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, with buildings and parking areas contained in the area beginning at the southeast corner of the property and running west along the south line 850 feet, thence north 350 feet, thence southeast 863 feet to a point on the east line of the property 200 feet north of the point of beginning, thence south along the east line to the point of beginning and containing 5.36 acres, more or less, and with the remainder as a nature preserve with development limited to walking, biking or fitness trails, picnic areas and shelters and markers which are appropriate for those purposes; access shall be allowed from the adjoining residential property in said Section 16, Township 48 North, Range 13 West. In the event that any portion of the property ceased to be so used, the Grantors or their heirs shall have the right to terminate the estate herein granted, and to reenter and retake the premises as owners of the entire property herein described in fee simple.

http://www.ShowMeBoone.com

Boone County, Missouri
Unofficial Document

To have and to hold the same, together will all right, immunities, privileges and appurtenances, unto Grantee and Grantee's successors and assigns forever.

And the Grantors hereby covenant that these premises are free from all encumbrances except as set forth above, and that Grantors will warrant and defend the title to these premises unto the Grantee and the Grantee's successors and assigns forever against the lawful claims of all persons claiming through the Grantors.

Witness the hand of the Grantors this 23rd day of January 2001.

F. Garland Russell (L.S.)
F Garland Russell, Jr.

Peggy Lee C. Russell (L.S.)
Peggy Lee C. Russell

STATE OF MISSOURI)
)
COUNTY OF BOONE)

On this 23rd day of January, 2001 before me personally appeared F. Garland Russell, Jr. and Peggy Lee C. Russell to me known to be the persons described in the foregoing instrument and acknowledged that they executed the same as their free act and deed.

In Testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal the day and year first above written

Notary Public

Accepted: Columbia Audubon Society, Inc. by

Robert Bradley Jacobs
Robert Bradley Jacobs

BRIAN HARSZY
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF MISSOURI
COMMISSIONED IN BOONE COUNTY
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JAN. 30, 2004

STATE OF MISSOURI)
COUNTY OF BOONE) SS.

Document No. 1379

I, the undersigned Recorder of Deeds for said county and state do hereby certify that the foregoing instrument of writing was filed for record in my office on the 24th day of January , 2001 at 1 o'clock and 12:24 minutes PM and is truly recorded in Book 1682 Page 688.

Witness my hand and official seal on the day and year aforesaid.

BETTIE JOHNSON, RECORDER OF DEEDS
by Lydia Renner deputy
Lydia Renner

http://www.ShowMeBoone.com

Source: Parks and Recreation Commission

FISCAL and VISION NOTES:

Agenda Item No. _____

City Fiscal Impact Enter all that apply:	
0	City's current net FY cost.
0	Amount of Funds Already appropriated
0	Amount of budget amendment needed
0	Estimated 2 yr net costs: One-time / Operating / On-going
Program Impact:	
N	New program/ agency (Y/N)
N	Duplicates/expands an existing program (Y/N)
N	Fiscal impact on any local political subdivision (Y/N)
Resources Required:	
N	Requires add'l FTE personnel? (Y/N)
N	Requires additional facilities? (Y/N)
N	Requires additional capital equipment? (Y/N)
Mandates:	
N	Federal or state mandated? (Y/N)
Vision Implementation Impact Enter Below All That Applies: Refer to Website:	
Y	Vision Impact? (Y/N or if N, go no further)
12.1	Primary Vision, Strategy and/or Goal Item#
12.2, 12.3, 12.4	Secondary Vision, Strategy and/or Goal Item#
	FY10/FY11 Implementation Task#

TO: **City Council**
FROM: **City Manager and Staff**
DATE: **May 6, 2011**
RE: **Recommendation on dogs and bicycles ordinance at Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary**

SUMMARY:

At their April 21, 2011 meeting, the Parks and Recreation Commission accepted public comment on a proposed ordinance that would set limitations on dogs and bicycles at the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary. A recommendation is hereby submitted to the Council.

DISCUSSION:

The Commission heard a staff presentation from Director Mike Hood. This issue had been referred to the Commission by Council, after drafting an ordinance setting limitations on dogs and bicycles at Bonnie View. At the February Commission meeting, the Commission had recommended restricting bikes to hard surface trails and prohibiting dogs in Bonnie View.

Eleven residents gave input at the Commission meeting. A copy of the draft minutes from the meeting, including public comment and Commission discussion, is attached to this memo.

Donaldson made a motion, seconded by Pauls, that the Commission recommend to the Council they accept the Council's compromise of allowing dogs on the Scott's Branch Trail, north of Rollins Road down to Weaver, not to extend west on the Scott's Branch Trail.

Blevins, Davis, Donaldson and Pauls voted in favor of the motion. Devine and Hutton abstained. Motion passed.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No fiscal impact is anticipated as a result of this report.

VISION IMPACT:

The proposed master plan for the Bonnie View Nature santuary helps meet vision goals 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 and 12.4 which identify the need to plan and develop a variety of well-maintained parks, exciting and diverse recreation facilities and an extensive network of greenways and trails.

SUGGESTED COUNCIL ACTIONS:

Consider the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Commission.

DRAFT MINUTES
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Thursday, April 21, 2011, 7 p.m.
ARC, 1701 W. Ash

MINUTES

Commission Present: Marin Blevins, Sue Davis, Bill Pauls, Meredith Donaldson, Linda Hutton, Dan Devine (arrived late)
Commission Absent: Terry Kloeppel
Staff Present: Mike Hood, Mike Griggs, Erika Coffman, Tammy Miller

Blevins called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

Agenda: The agenda was approved on a motion by Pauls, seconded by Hutton.

Minutes: The March minutes were approved on a motion by Donaldson, seconded by Hutton.

Monthly Report: The March monthly report was approved on a motion by Pauls, seconded by Davis.

Public Hearing: Maplewood Barn
Hood commented on the work of a planning committee dedicated to rebuilding Maplewood Barn, which was destroyed in a fire last April. Parks and Recreation staff have been working with the Maplewood Barn Community Theater, the Boone County Historical Society, Firefighters Local 1055, Crockett Engineering and Lyria Bartlett, a local architect from Studio4. The engineers and architect have donated their services on the project, Hood said. The working committee has had 10 meetings and 4 public input meetings to come up with the existing plan. Funding for the project includes $200,000 from the Park Sales Tax, between $90,000 and $100,000 from insurance and $50,000 in donations raised by the Community Theater.
Hood asked Bartlett to make comments about the plan.
Bartlett reviewed the floor plan with the Commission of the proposed new barn. She said the primary precedent while developing the plan was the original barn. It has a similar footprint and to maintain the ambience of the historical park, the siding of the new barn would be red and the trim would be white. It is sited a little differently to make the orientation more beneficial for sound, to avoid surrounding traffic as much as possible. The new orientation would also allow for more audience space and buffer space.
Bartlett described the interior of the proposed barn, including an open area for building sets and rehearsal space. There will be a large door for loading supplies as well as a shop area with sinks, restrooms, and dressing areas. The plan also includes ticket window and space for selling pre-packaged concessions if desired.
Storage spaces would be located above in the mezzanine of the barn.
Blevins opened the public hearing for comment.

Michael Scott, president of the board for the Maplewood Barn Community Theater, 5747 E. Sing Drive: I'd like to make two points. Everybody here and everybody on our board and a good number of Parks and Recreation personnel, on the night of April 5, 2010, when we heard about the fire, we all headed straight there. A good chunk of the board members, the Parks and Rec folks, were there right till the end. I think those of us in the theater had no idea what was going to happen next. A 143-year-old barn, a 38-year-old theater, and a barn that was owned by

Parks and Recreation and the City of Columbia. It wasn't too long, in the next 24 hours, that we heard from Mike (Hood) and Mike (Griggs) that it was their hope and intent to rebuild the structure in Nifong Park. That's far and away my number one place of gratitude. It's absolutely amazing. Number two, since that day in meeting with the committee and our Board of Directors working tirelessly to raise funds to supplement the funding from the City to build this barn, that I am completely overwhelmed.
I could thank you all night long but I won't, you have a lot of meeting to go through. But we will keep moving forward and keep working and will raise the funds that we need to build this barn. Thank you.

Blevins asked for other speakers. He closed the public hearing and opened the discussion for Commission comment.
Pauls moved that the Commission recommend approval of the Maplewood Barn plan to the City Council as presented. Motion seconded by Donaldson.
Motion passed 5-0.

Scott's Branch Trail alternate route (Council report)*
Hood gave a brief presentation about the proposed alternate route of Scott's Branch Trail. Staff presented the original plan to the Council on March 21, which the Commission had recommended to the Council. Council asked that the Bike and Ped Commission review the plan, so they tabled it at that time. Council also requested a report on an alternate route that would avoid sidewalks on Weaver, Bray and Dublin streets.
Staff considered several options that would have the least impact to the Audubon property. The alternative route would take the trail along the southern edge of the Audubon property, using topography to minimize cutting. A wider easement could provide more flexibility to allow the trail to go around existing physical features. Plant screening materials would be planted. The trail easement would either be purchased or the City could trade land with the Audubon Society, Hood said.
This alternate trail proposal was presented to the Audubon Society, which opposed it. The Society voted as an organization to oppose any trail that allows bicycles on their property. Staff had identified this as an alternate route early in the process, Hood said, but dropped it because it was unacceptable to Audubon.
Hood shared some concerns raised about using the sidewalks as the trail route, namely the number of driveways and intersections that would have to be crossed. Hood also addressed some commonly asked questions, saying that bicycles may be ridden on sidewalks but park sales tax funds could likely not be used to repair or widen sidewalks. Hood also showed a map of how the alternate trail might fit in with the Audubon property. The cost of the alternate trail would cost between $120,000 and $150,000 to construct. The project budget would cover that cost.
Hood said staff has also been asked about condemnation. The City has condemned property for trails in the past, in fact, he said that he could not think of many trail projects that haven't had at least one condemnation. Recent trails with condemnations are the south fork of the Grindstone, Hominy Branch phase I, and Providence Road Trail.
Another question has been gravel as opposed to concrete. Hood said staff would consider gravel, though it would not be recommended. Gravel washes out easily and would have to be maintained more intensely.

Though not a formal public hearing, Blevins invited public comment from the audience. He asked speakers to sign in and limit their comments to three minutes.

Howard Hinkel, president of the Columbia Audubon Society, 405 Edgewood – I wish to explain briefly why Columbia Audubon opposes the concrete alternate trail through Audubon's property.

The first text I will cite will be our own by-laws, a mission statement. The purpose of this Society shall be to promote an understanding and appreciation of the unique and important natural habitat of Missouri, especially mid-Missouri, the birds and other wildlife they support and the benefits to humans. This mission statement is an adaptation of National Audubon's statement and purpose. We believe that our position is all about good stewardship. A second reason is that our opposition to the concrete bike road closely correlates with goals and strategies expressed in the recommended groupings of related goals and strategies called for by the 2007 vision report. I will be either paraphrasing or quoting directly from the goals and strategies. From group 3, the section on education: Columbia should emphasize quality education as a community value by fostering volunteer-service related hands-on learning projects for students. Here are just three instances of the current Audubon opportunities of volunteering and hands-on learning. We've had three Eagle Scout projects resulting in four park benches constructed and two bridges, and soon, we will have kiosks placed at strategic spots along the trail. We have a family stream team who has volunteered to monitor both Audubon and Bonnie View sanctuaries. By providing hands-on nature learning, it enables Columbia Public Schools to expand their current nature learning curriculum for science credit. From the fourth group, environment: here are three relevant passages. Under the subject land preservation, from the document, land will be preserved throughout Columbia and Boone County to protect scenic views, natural topographies, rural atmosphere, watersheds, healthy streams, natural areas, native species and uniquely environmentally sensitive areas. Secondly, Columbians should engage in a lifelong understanding of the value of environmental stewardship. Third, Columbians should evaluate potential land preservation areas in Columbia and Boone County based on ecological, geological, and hydrological significance, scenic beauty, historical significance, protection of native wildlife, both plant and animal. Audubon believes that the goal of non-motorized connectivity can be achieved without tearing out a section of the nature sanctuary land. The Audubon goal of preservation and restoration of valuable habitat and wildlife, on the other hand, in the area proposed for the alternate, could not be realized. A strategy in group seven, transportation, offers a solution to the situation we face this evening in considering two seemingly incompatible positions. This strategy states that Columbia should coordinate efforts of different interest groups to develop and fund a multi-use trail network using sidewalks where trails are not feasible. From Audubon's point of view, the proposed alternate bike road across Audubon land is not feasible. Thank you.

Marge Meredith, 203 Orleans Court – For the Scott's Branch Trail to go through the Audubon Nature Sanctuary and through Dublin Park, is unacceptable because it would cause destruction of the trees and other natural growth as well as destruction of habitat for birds and animals. The continued use of this paved trail through these areas would result in the continual destruction of wildlife. I don't know if all of you walk these properties, if you haven't, I urge you to do so and see first hand what wonderful areas they are and see the destruction that would be caused to the Audubon property. And see the undesirable muddy route that would have to be raised through Dublin Park. Mr. Hood, I don't know if you've seen it, but it would have to built up somehow. I think it's unacceptable to consider the alternate route for Scott's Branch Trail. It would be a tragedy to run this trail on the alternate route. Thank you.

Hank Ottinger, Sierra Club, 511 Westwood – This is a tough issue. I see friends here who are on the opposite side of this and on 99 percent of most environmental issues, we would be in accord. I don't want to repeat what Howard Hinkel has said, other than to say we support the Audubon position on this. I think two operative terms here that need to be pointed out, one is sanctuary and the other is road. When you have a 30-foot easement to put in a concrete trail, we're really not talking something that is benign and innocent such as a trail. That sounds very nice really and has a positive connotation. But it jars with the notion of a sanctuary, a place where preservation occurs, where there is in fact a mission to establish a natural area, to

recover and restore a natural area, much in keeping with the Russell family who is associated with this whole park. So with that, I will conclude my comments but we stand with Audubon on this. Thank you very much.

Alyce Turner, 1024 Fieldcrest – I usually call myself an environmentalist. I've been on the Environmental Commission for 10 years but I'm not representing them in any way. But I also live about three blocks from this area and when I became aware of it recently, I really had strong feelings for neighbors and for the traditions that neighbors have had for years. Walking on these lands, walking with their kids, their dogs, there wasn't a bike trail. And I still feel rooted in that. I work in public health and I think it's important that people can come home after a long day of work and they walk their dog and their children and they get a chance to be outside, and not get in their car and drive someplace. So I guess I support this alternate route though concrete is not my choice. I bike and I have to say sidewalks can be very dangerous. I had a biking accident recently in Florida and there was a skinny sidewalk. Someone wouldn't move over and I fell. I really am opposed to sidewalks as the alternative. It can be quite dangerous. This is the closest way for me to get on a bike trail. I am very interested in having this completed but I have to say that you really need to look at how the neighbors feel. They probably helped create this for years and they've used it for years. It's their neighborhood. Thank you.

Ian Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive – I am the executive director of the PedNet Coalition. I'm not representing PedNet tonight, the board will be discussing this issue next Wednesday at our board meeting. I want to start by thanking the Commission for all of your volunteer work, overseeing park and trail planning in Columbia. Columbia has a fantastic system that is also the results of tremendous work from the department and the staff. I also want to thank the Audubon Society for their environmental stewardship of land and concern for environmental protection, species protection and open space. The principles and values Howard that you outlined are ones that I think probably almost everyone in this room agrees with, and ones I think are consistent with Columbian's values throughout the community. I want to look at the big picture. Over a couple of centuries, we've done tremendous harm to the natural environment through industrialization and in very large part through our transportation development. The network of real roads that automobiles drive on create pollution in the atmosphere has done tremendous damage to our natural environment. By moving back to a system where short journeys are completed through low-impact modes of transportation such as walking and bicycling, we can really help to rectify that situation, as well as create a future generation of our children as they grow up to be not so reliant on the automobile. This trail would be a tremendous way of investing in future environmental protection. At present time in the United States, 50 percent of all journeys are three miles or less and 25 percent of all journeys are one mile or less, yet only 10 percent of those journeys are taken by walking or bicycling. Those are relatively short journeys. The reason is that there are not safe, connected pathways that people can use. Columbia is a leader in the country in our trail system and our promotion of alternative transportation. This trail is a critical piece of the long-range plan. The alternative route through the neighborhood, Bray and Dublin, really is not an alternative at all. It constitutes a gap and will be an entirely different experience. As has been pointed out, riding on sidewalks is very dangerous and not something we ever recommend at the PedNet Coalition. On our staff, we have about 15 trained and certified bicycle instructors. We teach people how to ride on the street and encourage people to ride on the trails. If people haven't been taught how to ride safely on the street that is something they need to do. I think it's really important to note that a lot of neighbors in this area, neighbors of the Audubon Society, support the system with the trail going through the parkland. It's very valid that we should respect the property owners' desires for the land, but I think it's also valid that neighbors should have a role in that final position. I think we will hear from some of the neighbors tonight, I know that we will over the next few weeks. I would ask you to consider that this is not just a single organization or a single property

owner, but it is part of a neighborhood and the solution should be the best compromise for everyone. Also, I want to note that in the legal documents by which the 22-23 acres was transferred to the Audubon Society, walking and bicycling trails were specifically mentioned as an acceptable use of the property. That was obviously something that the previous owner felt was at least acceptable. So, the final decision you have to make is the level of impact. I really believe that Mike and his staff have done a tremendous job of designing a trail system that has the minimum possible impact while allowing people to leave the roads, to get around Columbia via low-impact transportation modes and still enjoy natural area. Thank you.

Sarah Read, 3802 Bedford Drive – I am one of those neighbors. I live a couple of blocks from the Audubon property. I'm not a member of the Audubon. I share very much the environmental values of the Audubon and in sharing these values, I am kind of appalled at the idea of putting a concrete path through this beautiful area which the Audubon has been very generous with. I want to start by thanking them for opening their property, making it available for joint management as a nature sanctuary and putting in very nice trails. I walk it regularly, it's a beautiful area. I use the parks a lot. This is a very unique area. I don't think that Audubon's generosity has been acknowledged very well by PedNet. I went to some of the first neighborhood meetings and PedNet has been very aggressive all along in pushing for this trail. I thought that when the master plan was approved, that we had the compromise. It was the Weaver to Rollins path that had been agreed to initially and connectivity to the neighborhood. I'm not saying that Dublin connectivity is the best because it is a quiet street. It's very steep and it does have a lot of driveways along the sidewalk. I am very surprised that PedNet and the park district haven't look at some other options such as extending the pedway that goes down to Chapel Hill extension across Scott, down to Cunningham, which is a pretty wide, quiet street and having street access right down to Bray and Weaver. That would be less than 15 driveways and fewer intersections, but there's just been a focus on we want this. This is not a need, and it is totally inappropriate for eminent domain. We have an opportunity to have a unique nature sanctuary, a great learning environment for our kids. I don't think safety is the issue because my kids grew up in this neighborhood. Kids ride bikes around this neighborhood all the time, it's a very quiet neighborhood. These aren't dangerous streets. What we have is a recreational want to have a path through this beautiful property. I used to teach my kids, a want is not a need. You can't always have what you want, especially if it belongs to someone else, no matter how many good reasons you can think of why you should have it. It's a want. We shouldn't be using eminent domain for this kind of bike trail. There are other trails around that provide connectivity. There are plenty of places to walk. A bike trail like this doesn't make a community, but how we treat our neighbors does and the Audubon has been very generous. They've been very transparent. They've tried to compromise and I think their efforts to preserve and restore the land should be respected. I would suggest that the Parks Commission reject both of these options and make it clear that the Audubon property is going to be preserved and tell the parties to come up with other options which you'll be happy to evaluate if and when they present themselves. Thank you.

R. Dannie Weddle, 1015 Westport – We are at the end of the street, next to the soccer field. We back up to the Audubon property. I want to thank you for all your efforts. Part of the reason for buying our property was that we had Audubon-protected land back there and we could watch the animal life and interact. Before they started expanding and putting other homes back there, we'd have a herd of 15 deer that used to come in our yard in the wintertime. We have owls, woodpeckers, some of these birds and animals have disappeared with all the construction going on out there. This winter, I only saw about 4 or 5 deer come through the area. We have raccoons, possum, a large variety of animal life that comes across our property. If you put a bike trail with concrete through there, it's going to destroy the animal life. It will take away from the fact that it's a preserve. Animals enjoy it out there and find homes in the woods there. I also see

Scout troops and other young groups go back in there and learn nature from their leaders. We have people who actually do walk their dogs back in that area. Leaving it like it is without a concrete runway, the only thing I would find acceptable on the outer edges, you may take a mower and cut a pass so that people don't have to walk through weeds. I don't' really find a concrete path through there very acceptable. Thank you very much.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane – I'm the co-chair of the Bike and Pedestrian Commission. I'm also a member of the PedNet Board, speaking on my own right now. The point that I want to make is that the north-south connector on the east end of the park from the Weaver stub to Rollins should be 10 feet wide at least instead of 8 feet. The reason this is requested is that the ASHTO guidelines from the highway department for a shared use path, the minimum width is supposed to be 12 to 14 feet. Absolute minimum is 10 feet for safety reasons. Because of the connectivity between neighborhoods to the south and the north, to the school, to Fairview Park, to neighborhoods to the east of there, this would be a heavy-use part of the trail. At Stephens Lake, you have the outer trail that is 10 feet wide and the lake trail is 8 feet wide. On the outer trail, people can be walking along, and a bicycle can go past and it's pretty safe. On the inner trail, it's tough to ride bikes in the evenings or on weekends, because of all the people walking. So I think that that portion should have another two feet, because you're never going to go back and add another two feet later. On the 8 feet, the inner trail at Stephens Lake Park, there are quite a few spots where the truck comes in and it cuts the corners, cuts around and leaves these big ruts on the sides. You'd be better off having a 10-foot wide trail. In addition, the Russell family when they gave this property, they gave an easement for Cunningham Road to go through for the City. As far as I know, that's never been vacated by the City. Another point would be is that the Russell deed specifies that acceptable uses would be picnic shelters, bike trails and hiking trails. Another point I want to make is that with these tall grass prairies, which I'm not sure why the City gets to have grass taller than 12 inches but us residents can't have it…but anyway, these tall grass prairies dry out and I guess that they have to be burned once a year. It would be nice to have a fire break. Thank you.

Joyce Hulett, 3501 Bray – Thank you for your work. I live in the middle between Weaver and Cunningham and I'm one of those neighbors. We did negotiate for that house because of the park. And it is a lovely sanctuary and I'm not afraid of the tall grass. I'm not worried about it burning from that. I know it is going to be well thought out. If you've been to the Runge Center and I'm sure all of you have, this is going to be better. Busloads of kids over there. I've been there with children. I've helped develop an outdoor classroom at Rock Bridge Elementary in the 70s and look forward to helping with this. It is a wonderful place for children to learn. A concrete trail through there would just destroy the floral and wildlife there now. I'm hoping that you will use the alternate and not run concrete through. If we tear that up now, we can't go back. But in 20 years from now, if we decide that we need to that, we can still do it. So let's don't have to remove it. I know people worry about traffic on that street. I live there, you're welcome to come sit on my porch. It's busy at 8:00 in the morning but kids go to elementary not before 8:15. I watch them go by and they come home before 5:00. We're lucky that this connects with Fairview Park, it's a wonderful place and I hope we can keep it a learning place. Thank you

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane – Made the point that the Audubon Society wishes to host groups of school children on field trips. They should remember that some of those children may be in wheelchairs so the site needs to be accessible to all. Thank you.

Les Borgmeyer, 3817 Dublin – Tonight I'm speaking on behalf of several of the residents on Dublin Avenue. I want to thank the Commission for your efforts. I also appreciate what you've done to help Columbia to be one of the great places to live. I also wanted to say thank you to the Audubon. They have so many supporters because they've helped Columbia be what it is

also. I have lived on Dublin since 1994. While speaking with several of our residents, there has been a little bit of concern that we weren't aware of the connector trail going through on Dublin. We really don't advocate one stand or the other at this point in time. We're just concerned that there was no awareness with the activity associated to Dublin Avenue. We heard of the Bonnie View Park and we were aware that there would be a trail going through. But we didn't hear of any activity associated with that moving to Dublin as an alternate route. So perhaps that's on us. But I talked to several individuals who are very visible and very active as to what is happening in the city. There is a little bit of concern about communication. After being involved in this short period of time however, there are a number of things I'd like to bring up. Anything that you do as it associates to using Dublin as a trail from one area to another area, the Scott's Branch and to Scott Boulevard, is going to impact the Dublin neighborhood, not just the future of the trail. Keep that in mind as you're looking at that. As I said, I've been there 17 years, most of the individuals have been there that many years. The neighborhood has not only grown around us but we've grown into the neighborhood. So I would like that point to come up especially when you consider that I don't know if many people from Dublin have been involved in the decision-making process. I do know from the Bicycle Commission last night that the PedNet supporters do not want to go down Dublin. I know the Audubon Society does not want a bike trail on their property. I have heard one person speak on behalf of the Bray to Weaver to Dublin and I appreciate her comments tonight. No one else has spoke in support of using Dublin as a trail connector. Most residents on Dublin that we've talked to had no awareness of the trail, until we provided flyers up and down their street the last couple of days. I do know that it would cost money to build Scott's Branch Trail even though neither Audubon nor PedNet supports that activity. Another thing I do know is that nothing to do with the Weaver to Bray to Dublin activity has any impact on the Bonnie View property. All of that can go forward whether or not there is a trail down Dublin or Cunningham or the Bonnie View property. That is a good thing. Because of that, I encourage the Commission tonight on behalf of several Dublin residents that you delay a recommendation identifying Dublin as a connector trail. Not only in terms of looking at all sides of the issue, but I think the people of Dublin have earned a voice in what is happening in the neighborhood. And please, I've heard Cunningham mentioned. If Cunningham is an alternate route, they need to have an opportunity to hear what is happening with the area also. Obviously, you're not going all the way down, but there is a great residential area that individuals drive and live in and they need to have that voice. I'm not sure that we're necessarily hearing the voice of everyone involved and I don't blame anyone for the communication aspects of it other than the fact that everyone was so focused on Bonnie View property that the idea of a connector trail just did not hit anyone in the head as it would go down to Scott's Branch Trail. I would also encourage you and the Council to delay any recommendation having to do with Dublin. We may end up supporting a trail to go down Dublin Avenue. But at this point in time, it seems that we haven't had a voice and we discourage any final recommendation. Thank you very much.

Karl Kruse, 2405 Lynnwood – I'm the chair of the PedNet Board of Directors and as Ian mentioned, we haven't taken a position on this although I suspect next Wednesday at our board meeting, we will and I think it will pretty definitely be the option that you see on the screen ahead of you. I just want to make three quick points. I totally appreciate what Audubon Society is coming from. I've been a member of the Audubon Society and a member of the Sierra Club. It almost breaks my heart to come here tonight in opposition to people like Hank Ottinger, Jerry Wade and others who I've served on the Council with or been involved in a number of environmental efforts with. But in fact, I simply just disagree. Not all Audubon Societies take positions that paved trails through the nature sanctuary are the end of the world. In fact, in Joplin, Wildcat Glades Audubon Society is connecting people to nature. On their web page, it says, "imagine a place where you can hike the savanna woodland, and chert a glade trail or enjoy a relaxing stroll along an Ozark stream with more than 3 miles of paved and natural trails throughout the park. The Audubon Center offers plenty of ways to experience a variety of

unique Ozark landscapes." Secondly, Hank mentioned the 30-foot right of way as if 30 feet of woods would be cleared and I just don't think that is what would happen. I trust parks staff to design a paved path through there that would respect the topography and the existing flora. I bike and walk on trails that snake through beautiful woodland without having to take down trees 15 feet on both sides of the actual paved surface. Originally the plan was to put a bike path down through Scott's Branch all the way from the top down to the southwest corner. It's a beautiful valley, I've walked it recently and I had no idea it was so scenic. It is stunningly beautiful. I totally understand the Audubon's position after their wish was approved on a number of different occasions by lots of different groups. I think this Commission, certainly the City Council, lots of planning documents reflect that as a part of our trails plan that was abandoned. So it seems to me that the most reasonable compromise where everyone gets pretty much what they want is this proposed paved path through the southern portion of Audubon property. We have other public natural areas that aren't called nature preserves, but we have the Grindstone Nature Area which has a heavily used bike trail. I know, I use it all the time, that you see every different kind of wildlife that you see in every other natural habitat in Columbia and Boone County, the usual critters, foxes, coyote, deer, snakes, coons, possums, woodpeckers and a lot more. I just can't imagine that an 8 or 10-foot paved path would have any significant negative impact on that wildlife habitat. So with that, I hope you will endorse this alternative. I totally get Les Borgmeyer's point that a lot of people in the neighborhood just have not had the chance to take a close look at this and it might be worth giving them a little more time. Thanks for your time.

Christy Kruse, 4020 Dublin Avenue – My house is at the very end of the street. I concur with Les that the neighbors of Dublin did not have the chance to talk. I am not opposed to the trail, I live by the park. But I will say that there have been young bike riders, inexperienced, who have driven down that very steep hill on Dublin. There was an incident where there was a young girl who was going down the hill, used my driveway to brake and she ended up running into the garage. She was not seriously hurt but it is a pretty big hill. I think with young, inexperienced bikers that there may be alternate ways we can look at. I'm not opposed to the trail, I just want these things to be considered. Thank you.

Mary Kay Wade, 1221 Bradshaw – I'm usually called Edge, I've lived at 1221 Bradshaw since 1982. We live here because we want to live here; Columbia is a wonderful place for many reasons. One of them is our outdoor opportunities. However, I find it challenging as an outdoor educator to see evidence that we have become such urban creatures that we do not know the difference between a truly natural ecosystem and an area that we call a nature area. We do not know the difference between what that area gives and what is possible. Or what we have destroyed in making some of the things we do for access. This is regrettable. I come before you as a neighbor, an outdoors enthusiast and environmental educator who for years has walked the land that will be affected by the proposed Scott's Branch Trail. I know the area very well. I've walked it at a slow, learning-friendly pace many, many times. My comments address the choices we have before us for the one portion of the proposed Scott's Branch Trail. What are the costs, what are the options? Are our choices limited to the creek bottom in Dublin Park or the street along Dublin Avenue? Are we clear as to whether this is proposed as a recreation or transportation route, or some sort of it does it all combination? At the heart of the choice of routes in question is, how important is it to run an 8- to 12-foot wide concrete pedway built within a 30- to 50-foot right of way through the Scott's Branch creek bottom, which Mike calls a drainage area. That's an interesting difference, he's right but I call it a creek bottom and also a riparian corridor. Sometimes our terms reflect how we perceive it for what is useful for. At the northern terminus of this bike route is Rollins, an east-west street. This is where this trail ends. That forces one to go east toward Fairview or west toward Scott, along the street to get further north. All of this fuss about the south end, it goes nowhere at the north end. The cost has varied,

I've heard as much as $216,000 to $296,000, depending on the bridge or not that might be built along Scott's Branch. The cost is high. The cost in terms of what we'll lose is greater. To construct a trail along the creek, we must severely compromise a riparian corridor. This means ripping out bank stabilizing trees, constricting the waterway by building an artificial bench for the trailway, eliminating part of the floodplain, burying parts in culverts, increasing run-off downstream, back-up flooding upstream. It is ecological mayhem. It is the loss of a natural water course forever. Do we need to choose between running a route along Dublin Avenue or through Dublin Park? Other options exist. Sarah and I have not been in cahoots before these presentations. Cunningham, a GetAbout Columbia green route, is only one block east of Dublin. Routing the trail along Cunningham saves a quarter of a million dollars, preserves the flood-prone Scott's Creek riparian corridor and takes users past the fewest driveways from Chapel Hill to Bray to the Weaver stub into Bonnie View. There are no driveways on that portion of Chapel Hill, along Cunningham there are a total of only 10. The rest of the houses face the other way. That's the east side, on the west side, there are 21 driveways. From Bray to Weaver, on the south side, there are 6 and on the north side, 9. Yes, funds for these two routes come from different pots. That is no reason for unnecessary duplication. I urge you, in your recommendation to the Council, to support the route as it enters Bonnie View from the Weaver stub, and to encourage the Parks and Recreation Department and Public Works Department to work together to use Cunningham as the most direct, safest, easiest route from Chapel Hill to Bray to Weaver. I welcome any questions. Thank you.

Stephanie Browning, 3307 Appalachian – I border the Bonnie View park property on the north. I actually agree with many of the previous speakers so I'm not going to repeat their comments. But I do want to echo something that Les said. I live in Broadway Farms, I've been there 11 years. I am fairly knowledgable about what goes on in the City. And I've tried to stay abreast of this development over the years. And yet until I saw an article in the Missourian the day following your February meeting, I did not realize that dogs were being restricted, I didn't realize the bike path was as it was going to be and as I talked to my neighbors, no one—and I talked to probably 100 neighbors—knew this was happening. I don't fault Parks and Rec, they held meetings for planning and I watched what was going on, on the web site as the plan was developed. But it wasn't until that Missourian article that anyone even publicized anything as important to neighbors as being able to walk with their animals and use a bike path. Many of us feel like we have not had an opportunity to provide our input. We bought our house because of the park that was going to be there. We walked it, it's a beautiful property. I like the idea that it's going to be kept in some form of a natural state. Do I think that it is a pristine nature sanctuary? No, I think that the asset we have in the south, the southeast regional park, Philips and Gans, I think that is the most pristine nature area that we have. But I have to also say that I'm a parent, my youngest daughter is going to graduate from high school but her best friend lived in the area across the southern part of the park. When she was in school at Fairview, I wouldn't let her ride her bike along the street. This would have been the ideal way for her to get to her friend's house. In fact, Les' daughter and my daughter, she was maid of honor at my daughter's wedding. We live at extreme ends. They could have gotten together in the days before they drove. As a person that believes very strongly in the health of community and watching as adults and children are at alarmingly increasing rates of obesity, I believe everything we can do to get people out walking, biking on safe, inclusive paths, I believe that is in our best interest for the community and I really urge you to support this trail. Thank you.

Mary Martin, 1609 Pickard Way – I'm one of the houses that back up to Cunningham. I'm used to seeing bicycles and scooters and all kinds of things on Cunningham, that doesn't bother me at all if that was going to be some kind of connector. The only thing I wanted to mention, on my street that backs up to Cunningham, I have a very long sidewalk. I also have a lot of trees in the easement that the City never objected to. But I walk my dog along Bray and Cunningham. One

thing a neighborhood of that age has is trees and bushes that encroach on the sidewalk. So if you were going to say the connector will be on the street, that's one thing. But if connectors are on the sidewalk, I have to even zigzag around people's bushes because they are not trimmed, or you have tree branches. When you put someone up on a bike, they are 3 feet higher. So I would like the plan to acknowledge that putting people on these sidewalks is not a good idea, they're narrow, they are bordered by trees and bushes. Some of them have tree roots that affect the sidewalk, some put trash out on trash days. Thank you.

Mary Catherine Jurczyk, 3808 Bedford Drive – I just have a couple of points to bring up. This trail is happening, there are two sections that will be built. What we have in the middle is a gap that is in dispute. From my perspective, anything that puts that gap on the streets is no longer a trail. It's an interruption of a trail. And I think that that is a tragedy for the neighborhood and the City and something that we would all regret in the long run. Not to mention safety issues and it would just destroy the whole character and usefulness of the concept of a trail. Another point was that I think the park planners in our parks department have done an excellent job in developing Bonnie View Park with respect for the Audubon property next door. That is a nature sanctuary for a reason because they have been so mindful of incorporating the property and making sure it's consistent. That being the case, I don't have any reason to believe that they would, in constructing this alternate trail through the Audubon property, be reckless in their development of that trail, mindlessly hacking trees and building a trail that would damage the floodplain. I've walked the property too and there is already a footpath and there is some erosion and from my perspective, a concrete trail would in some ways stabilize that area. Another point is that Dublin Park, as it currently exists, is a dead-end trail. It's always been under-utilized and we walk there but it's not very satisfying because you walk one section and then have to turn around and come back. We were very active in fighting to get that park and we would love to see it connected to a trail so we could actually use it more frequently. I want to briefly address this idea of running the trail down Cunningham to Chapel Hill. I've heard this alternative discussed before and I really have safety concerns. Having two children riding bikes through the neighborhood, ages 10 and 12. There is a lot of traffic at times on Cunningham but I don't worry about that. But Chapel Hill Road, that section is now 40 miles per hour speed limit. And cars drive faster than that on a regular basis. That is not a safe alternative. As far as I'm concerned, the safest alternative is this one through the Audubon property. Thank you.

Janet Godon, 3061 Maple Bluff – I'm representing my family, the Fairview PTA wellness committee, and I'm an outdoor enthusiast of every kind except ice fishing. This dialogue has been mostly related to discussing the trail as a commuter connection. I think the point can possibly be made that it's a recreation trail. Recreation trails in general are in short supply in this highly dense neighborhood surrounding Bonnie View Park. If you take the commuting component out of the discussion, trails for safe, accessible recreational cycling and wheeling for general health and wellness are by no means abundant in the western quadrant of Columbia. I would even say non-existent with the exception of the Chapel Hill extension pedway. That's less than one mile. Bicycling trails of any substantial length are not available to residents north of Chapel Hill, south of I-70 and to the west of Stadium. During the public input meetings that I attended, most individual residents voiced the desire to have the lengthy trail amenities of Stephens Lake Park, while preserving the natural beauty of the existing open space. I agree with that wholeheartedly. For comparison, Columbia residents living north and northeast of the Business Loop have access to the Bear Creek Trail, Cosmo Park trails, Garth Nature Area, Albert-Oakland trail, a combined total of about 12 miles from the Parks and Recreation web site. Residents living south and southeast enjoy the MKT, Hinkson Creek/MU Rec Trail and the Grindstone Nature trail which totals about 16 miles. East in Columbia, residents enjoy Stephens Lake trails, and plans are moving on the proposed Hominy Creek Trail, with phase I and phase II leading to Clark Lane. I think there is a lack of recreational trails. Second point I would like to

make and this is my personal opinion; recently I think a fear monger mentality is surfacing from an individual and support of the Audubon position. Citing a lack of eyes on the trail as opposed to eyes on the street, and I'd like to quote something that was stated, "I wonder if in fact the alternative paved route from Scott to Dublin Park through the Dublin Park riparian corridor, up the hill in the Oak Hickory Woods onto Columbia Audubon Nature Sanctuary and through the grasslands is actually the least safe route. There are no eyes on that entire route. Urban safety is the result of visibility, eyes on the street watching what is going on." As a parent who encourages and wants my children to get out and visit this nature area and lots of other nature areas, I am offended at yet another stranger danger approach to getting my kids outside. I don't want to hear about the boogeyman on trails. Parents who walk with kids on sidewalks, they do this due to the unsafe infrastructure, including sections not designed correctly, high speed traffic, narrow sidewalks without a buffer zone. Parents will most often never leave young children on trails whether they are paved, gravel or a footpath. They will walk together and enjoy the surrounding beauty whether it is a Saturday afternoon walk or a walk to Fairview School or Smithton School. My final point is--I wish we could all get along and be collaborative in this effort but my point is that I'm certain that if this section of land were in my backyard or a private business, that the process of friendly condemnation would already be occurring and these discussions would not even be happening.

Jan Coffman, 3809 Bedford Drive – I am a person who likes to walk and I need to walk at my age. I walk 3 miles a day and I prefer walking outside. When the weather doesn't allow that, I walk here at the ARC. I feel like it is safer and more enjoyable if I walk in parks rather than on the streets. My husband and I have to be very careful when we're on the street to watch curbs and it's just much safer if we can walk where we don't have to constantly watch for cars and curbs. I've walked through Bonnie View property and through the Audubon property many times and I just love it. I love being out in nature. I've walked through the Dublin Park and I've really enjoyed that. This morning when I was walking in Dublin Park, there were 5 deer, one of them just stood there and looked at me. It's a different experience walking through a parkway, in nature. I don't feel like a street is a trail at all. I prefer if this would go through the Dublin Park and the Audubon property. I feel like it's very important that we provide this place. Thank you.

Sandra Elbert, 3809 Dublin – I'd first like to say I'm really upset by somebody coming up and saying that someone was putting out stranger danger. No one has said anything like that at all. I also get the feeling tonight that we shouldn't even have sidewalks because they are so dangerous. That's all I've heard tonight and how dangerous it is for kids to bicycle. Kids are going to be doing this anyway. I don't think anyone realizes that just because Dublin is a steep hill that where they are proposing this trail and that riparian corridor is steep, probably just as steep. There is so much that will have to be taken out. A 30-foot wide part of it being concrete is not really a trail. The comment was made that the people north of Chapel Hill would be able to use this. The people from Cunningham going west and from Chapel Hill up to the Russell property, they really wouldn't be using the trail that much going from one place to another. The only two access points are at Cunningham and at Dublin Park. So these people and their children using their bicycles, they would have to ride through the street and sidewalk to get to those access points. I do agree that Cunningham would be a much wiser solution because of the fewer number of driveways and it's directly accessible rather than have them come down out of the park to Cunningham over to Bray and then down Dublin. To me that doesn't make any sense. I think we also have a big problem as to who we're really doing this for. Is it for the nature area, the people who want to ride their bicycles, the people who are going to be commuting, or people just enjoying the trail? The people commuting are not going to be taking this trail. I know from experience that you are not going to be commuting by taking the scenic winding trail. You are probably going to be taking the shorter route with less traffic. Are children on bicycles going from one point to another? The idea of going to the neighbor's house with the daughter riding

her bicycle, she's not talking about the distance between Cunningham and Chapel Hill. That would not be the short way to go between two houses. That doesn't apply. It definitely is a wonderful, natural habitat. Seeing the deer is wonderful but they're not going to be there if you put this wide trail through here. I didn't really understand what the lady was saying in the electric wheelchair. I wonder how much power it would take to get the wheelchair up from one end to the other of this trail. That would be a big use of the electric power. (Weinschenk: no it would not). Thank you.

No other comments, Blevins opened the floor for Commission discussion.
Pauls asked if there was an option to delay?
Hood said Council planned to discuss this at their May 16 Council meeting. They wanted feedback prior to that date. The next Commission meeting is May 19.
Hutton said she supported the staff's compromise and thanked them for their effort. She said that asking kids to use the streets was not safe. She cited Columbia's visioning statements in promoting health, safety, trails. She said she still disliked the lack of connection to Stephens Lake Park to Old Hwy 63 because people did not want the trail in their back yards. She said she hoped the citizens here understood that this is just a recommendation and that the final authority rests with the City Council.

Blevins agreed, saying he supported this alternate. He said he is thinking in the long-term as far as safety. He felt this alternate route was the least intrusive. He pointed out the large number of public hearing and planning meetings on this issue. He said there has been a lot done over the years. He thinks this is the best, viable alternative.
Donaldson said she had concerns about the Scott's Branch area, that it is a complex watershed with a grade. She doesn't agree that putting concrete there is going to help with what is going on naturally. She asked if a trail could be built effectively that considers the flow of the water?
Griggs said that stormwater controls mandate all policies that follow. Water flow cannot be constricted, the stream can't be damaged. Those things would be part of the engineering. Staff has walked it numerous times. The trail route follows the topography.
Donaldson asked about gravel versus concrete?
Griggs said it would similar to other trails. Gravel would be subject to wash-outs and higher maintenance, but he said it is do-able either way. Some sections of the Bear Creek floods frequently and the gravel washes away. But Griggs said staff is open to direction.
Davis asked about all the different views expressed during meetings, if there was any kind of general consensus?
Hood said the consensus was based on the people who attended. He said staff has advertised the meetings and tried to get the word out, but now it seems there are people who do not feel included. But any kind of consensus was based on the attendees.
Donaldson mentioned that at the meetings she attended, there was not a lot of discussion about the trail.
Blevins asked about Council's request?
Hood said they had asked for an alternative that would not use sidewalks. So Council will be considering these two options, one that went forward with original proposal, this one and possibly the third one mentioned tonight.
Blevins mentioned his involvement in coaching kids soccer and his thought that he would hate for kids not to have a safe place to walk to and from school.

Pauls commented this is a really tough decision. He said he disagreed with Hutton and agreed with a commenter's view that this is a want, not necessarily a need. He said the animals, flora and fauna could not be replaced. He also pointed out he does not support concrete trails. He said recreational trails are different than those used for transportation. He commended staff for

the beautiful trails already in existence. He said he respected both sides but he would tend toward the natural sanctuary part of it.
Donaldson said she has been vacillating. She cited the low-income individuals at the end of Scott with no bus service. This would enable them another route if they would use it. But she is concerned about the wet area. She wants to err on the side of caution. She said kids are riding bikes in that area already.
Davis pointed out that appropriate caution signs may be useful. She agreed with Pauls on protecting the wildlife and nature.
Hutton said she disagreed, saying that she remembered being at Stephens Lake in the 50s and the Audubon property was there. Columbia is going to continue to develop. She thinks that areas will come back.
Donaldson said that once concrete is down, it's a permanent decision.
Hutton said the animals will come back, citing all the homes in the area.
Donaldson proposed that the decision be delayed and examine it further, mentioning all the homes that may still be impacted and examining the Cunningham route. As a commuter route, she wouldn't mind the streets but for recreation, she would mind being interrupted on her route.
Blevins agreed that he didn't like the park to street to park option, that it didn't make sense for a trail route.
Pauls said the same situation exists on the Bear Creek Trail.
Blevins asked if this was the only alternative?

Hood said that it was only one recommended to Council. Staff considered alternates going straight north following the stream (the original proposal from 2002). Staff also looked at the west route but feels it is not viable due to topography problems, it goes through the back yard of Mr. Russell which staff felt was inappropriate after his donation. As far as Cunningham, staff did not consider that. They were looking at ways to get from park to park. The Trail Master Plan shows Scott's Branch as coming from Scott all the way up to Bonnie View. Hood pointed out that the sidewalks are there anyway whether they are designated or not. People will use those sidewalks if they are there. Staff just suggested the sidewalks be the link.
He said using Cunningham to Chapel Hill, it's a commuter corridor, but not a trail. He said he felt part of the divide was what we are trying to achieve, a recreation trail or commuter trail as well as the vision for the Bonnie View and Audubon properties. He pointed out the property is not pristine, it is a farm property, but has potential for pristine development. Hood said the competing visions have made the issue difficult to work out.

Pauls said the best thing the Commission could do would be to forward this whole discussion to the Council.
Blevins added that a letter or conversation with Councilman Dudley may also be appropriate.
Hood reminded the Commission that they already on record as making a recommendation from the February meeting. If they don't change, their original recommendation will stand.
Donaldson said the trail system proposed in the bigger picture would mitigate pollution and be best for the city. But safe pathways are needed too. She also thought the issues of Cunningham and residents who said they did not have a voice need to be revisited.
Blevins pointed out that the original motion in February was to accept the trail route as it was with the caveat that staff would explore other options. Pauls said he would let that motion stand.
Blevins agreed.

Hutton disagreed. She made a motion that the Commission accept this other alternative plan provided by staff and recommend the plan to the Council. The motion died for lack of a second.

Blevins said he hated to be wishy-washy on this issue, but it was a tough one.

Hood agreed, saying staff has struggled with it for years.
Hutton again encouraged the public to contact the City Council about this issue.

Bonnie View dogs and bikes policies (Draft ordinance)*
Blevins asked Hood for a staff presentation.
Hood told the Commission the Council had referred management policies of dogs and bikes at Bonnie View to them after requesting an ordinance be drafted. The ordinance would restrict bikes to hard surface trails and prohibit dogs south of Rollins Road, unless the dog is on-leash and on the Scott's Branch Trail or the trail leading from the Scott's Branch Trail to Fairview.
At the February Commission meeting, the Commission had recommended restricting bikes to hard surface and prohibiting dogs in Bonnie View.
Hood showed a map of where dogs would be prohibited under the proposed ordinance. Council has tabled this until the May 16 meeting.

Though not a formal public hearing, Blevins invited public comment from the audience. He asked speakers to sign in and limit their comments to three minutes.

Stephanie Browning, 3307 Appalachian – My house is on the north side of where the park is (pointing to map). Yes, that's exactly it. I want to restate that I have had such an issue with the notification of the neighbors. Mike and I have talked about this. I know there were meetings held, they were advertised in the newspaper. In this day and age of digital media, many people read their newspapers online, they do not see the expensive ads in newspapers. Unless you were aggressively watching the city's web site, you probably would not know this to have been the case. When I've talked to the neighbors at Rothwell, Broadway Farms, Fairview neighborhoods, no one was aware of the issue that would prohibit dogs from the area. There were naturally a lot of concerns and a lot of people who felt they had been not given their opportunity to provide that feedback. Prior to the March Council meeting, several of the neighbors met with Councilman Dudley and he had proposed at that time a compromise that would have kept some mowed path areas along Rollins Road in the area where the trees were not, also, along the Scott's Branch Trail with the idea that in the area where the tree canopy was that dogs would not be allowed in that area. That to the neighborhood at the time seemed like a very reasonable compromise. In fact, many people went to the Council meeting hoping that was going to be the compromise put forward. Instead it was the one that limited it entirely to Scott's Branch Trail access. I really think there were comments made that night at the Council meeting that we would have access to Fairview Park. There were also comments made that soccer fields were inappropriate places for dogs and so now we'll be pushed into the soccer fields where people may not think is an appropriate place for animals either. I walk a dog two times a day, 30 minutes per time. I walk that property 2 to 3 times per week with my dog on a leash. I should own stock in Mutt Mitts because we do it for a lot of them. I'm a firm believer in the rules. What bothers me is the neighbors. I know that there is one park ranger to cover all these parks. I absolutely know that people will walk with their dogs on these trails and yet I am truly an ordinance-abiding citizen as Mike would tell you. I know that is going to bother me every day as a neighbor to this park that people will violate that rule constantly but I'm going to follow it. I love this property, I don't believe that dogs are predators. To the gentleman who lives on Westport that misses his deer, I will tell you that there are 12 every night in my back yard outside my fence. My dog and I can be out working in the garden and those deer do not run from my dog and he doesn't chase after them. I can live with this compromise, I would like it to be a little more expanded than that because I do support what we're trying to accomplish. I have a hard time believing that dogs on a mowed path trail are going to harm the habitat anymore than the mower. Thank you.

Marge Meredith, 203 Orleans Ct – A sanctuary is defined as a refuge, a place of quiet, safety, calm and peace. As such, dogs are incompatible with this area because they are sometimes noisy and they do disturb and destroy wildlife. Some birds and animals do nest and feed on the ground and would be disturbed by dogs. Also, dogs leave feces, I've almost stepped in some several times in the Audubon sanctuary. Several years ago, I was walking in the Bonnie View area on the east side and a lady came up to me and said she had been bitten a day or two before by a dog on a leash. So for all these reasons, dogs should not be allowed in nature sanctuaries. Cycles in a nature sanctuary would result in ruts and erosion of the footpaths. However, in this case because the proposed ordinance would allow dogs and cycles only on the paved trail, it is to run only along the eastern edge of the sanctuary, I believe that the compromise is acceptable. The Bonnie View Sanctuary is a unique place and it's important to do everything we can to keep it as undisturbed as possible. Thank you.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest – I didn't mention before that I really can't walk these trails. I may not look it, but I have a bad knee. That's why I love our trails in Columbia, I can bike on them and be in nature. But I decided to call a friend who lives out west because I remember being in Arizona in the sensitive climate, she was explaining to me that deer, elk whatever didn't really have a negative effect on these lands. In fact, walking on the turf was good for it. We talked about dogs and she didn't really understand the problem of dogs. I'm not suggesting have an unleashed area because there is concern. But I wanted to give that feedback. That's a very sensitive climate with almost no rainfall. They really have to be concerned with the greenery. We got 50 inches of snow, not including rainfall, not the same kind of climate conditions. I am for supporting dogs on this proposed trail. Dogs are part of our life, we walk them in all conditions. They deserve to be outside. They need exercise. I don't run my dog loose, I try to obey the ordinances and I think many people are that way. We can't expect people to go get their exercise and leave their dog at home, or take them for another walk. There may not be time in their life. I think it's important to include dogs in what we're saying. I support having dogs on the trail, so I guess I do support the compromise. Thank you.

Susan Clark, 520 Stalcup – I want to support the comments Stephanie Browning made about communication. Another thing is I want to support the things she said about dogs and having dogs on-leash and expanding the areas in the park. Another thing I would consider is all the residential areas pay taxes for this and limiting us to specific areas in the park is basically disenfranchising us. I would ask that you take that into consideration too. Thank you.

R. Dannie Weddle, 1015 Westport – I believe the lady thought I was against dogs out here, but no, we're for dogs in that area. We interact with people who bring their dogs down Westport and enter the soccer field. Usually they have them on-leash. About 1 percent have them off. Most people who walk out through the soccer field and some of them that go through Bonnie View have them on leashes. There is one person with two dogs and that follow within 10 feet of her. Most people will pick up the poo. We really don't mind it. I wasn't talking about the dogs chasing off the animals. The squirrels sit there and chatter at them until they go away. It's nice to interact with the people. I love animals, I love dogs and I would not be opposed to it. Thank you.

Hank Ottinger, 511 Westwood – I'm representing the executive committee of the Osage group of the Sierra Club. Although there are some members of our group that will not agree with our position, prior to the proposal of the compromise, the executive committee voted and I can be very brief, it's no dogs. There are 60 other some odd park units that allow dogs. Let's have one that is supposed to be designated as a natural area without any dogs. I sympathize with people who have spoken before. I know there are people who have dogs that are polite, well-trained and people are responsible and they scoop the poop and all that. There are also a lot of people not just one percent as someone said, but people don't always have their dogs on leashes. I've

been charged by dogs, I've stepped in poop, enough with the dogs. Let's have one place without dogs. That said, and I'm speaking for myself at this point because the executive committee hasn't met about the option, I would think that we would support the compromise. Thank you.

Joyce Hulett, 3501 Bray – I'm the closest neighbor to the park. I support keeping the dogs in just a limited area because I just think we need to keep this as a sanctuary. It's not there yet but it is going to be worked on. I think that people who have to walk down to Fairview Park to walk, then they get a little more exercise. They can also walk the dogs in front of my house. I hope you will have the dogs in just the designated area and keep the rest of it pristine. Thank you.

Bill Mees, 2746 Willowbark Ct – I am a member of the Columbia Audubon Society. I am here tonight to ask you to again support the exclusion of dogs from Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary. This was your recommendation at your February meeting. The Columbia Audubon Society's Board and membership voted to support your recommendations for the Bonnie View Master Plan and we subsequently voted to exclude dogs from Columbia Audubon Nature Sanctuary. We do support a compromise amendment to your original proposal that has been suggested by Councilman Dudley. His amendment would allow dogs on Bonnie View property north of Rollins and on leash on the pavement running along the east side of Bonnie View from Rollins down to Weaver and any property east of the pavement. This compromise will allow easy access from both the north and south into Fairview Park which continues to allow dogs on leash. Subsequent to your February meeting, Bonnie View has had a name change, as suggested by Councilman Dudley and accepted unanimously by the City Council. It is now officially Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary. This new name emphasizes a different purpose and mission for this facility compared to all the other park facilities. It connotes a mission to connect people with nature, and nature study. As such, limiting dog access is appropriate. The prohibition of dogs is not unprecedented. The Missouri Department of Conservation has 7 nature facilities. The mission of these facilities is to provide nature education and to connect people with nature. Each of these 7 facilities specifically prohibits dogs. Although Bonnie View does not have the funding necessary to match the bricks and mortar of the Conservation Department's facilities, the land management and mission are similar.
People who want to walk their dogs have other options available and four are located nearby: Rothwell Park, Dublin Park, Bonnie View north of Rollins Road, and Fairview Park (easily accessed along the 8-foot concrete bike road on the eastern border of Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary). Lest we forget, there are also 62 other parks in Columbia that welcome dogs. I ask you to reaffirm your previous decision, amended to include Councilman Dudley's compromise refinements, and restrict dogs in the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary. I have been keeping track at Audubon since the last Council meeting. We've had 13 dogs on the property. One was on-leash. One individual had two dogs. He said, "what are they going to hurt?" I said there is a leash law. He didn't even have a leash with him. One dog was digging, the other was running around all over the place. I think Councilman Dudley's compromise was reasonable. I felt like, and maybe Mr. Hood can back me up, that when he offered his compromise I don't think it was heard or understood by a lot of people in the audience who were speaking in favor of dogs that evening. They felt they were being disenfranchised. I think that term was used here this evening. And I guess with Fairview Park at 27 acres right there and easily accessed, I guess I have to ask, how are people being disenfranchised? Thank you.

Mary Kay Wade, 1221 Bradshaw – I am a member of Columbia Audubon and I'm addressing you in that context. We are aware that we do not have a pristine, natural nature preserve sanctuary now. We have a lot of work ahead of us. But more than the actual work than restoring this land to become an educational center area for environmental studies whether it's restoring prairie, wetlands, savanna, putting in willow stakes to stabilize that creek so we minimize runoff

and erosion, trail maintenance that we know is going to occur. The biggest job of all that we are going to have is educating people. We have been remiss and we know it, and we apologize to the commissioners for that. We did not do our part in preparing the general public for what we are trying to bring about, working so hard as Mike and Mike know, with Parks and Rec through a long, long process of bringing something unique. Not just special, unique to all of Columbia. We have never had a natural area. We've called some places nature areas, and that was probably a mistake because it gave people a misconception of what a natural area, a nature sanctuary, an environmental studies area is and can be. We will work harder to educate people as to what we are trying to create. We need to give a better explanation as to why dogs and a nature sanctuary don't work. The idea of having a trail through here of walking dogs through here, enjoying nature, yes everyone here enjoys nature. But you're talking about it as spectators and here's the difference. When you're walking on, or riding a bike or jogging with a bunch of friends along the concrete trail, you are a spectator of what is around you. What we're trying to create for everybody is a place where you can be a part of, and you learn about the other parts of natural ecosystems. As an urban society and as a national society, we have gotten away from our understanding of how we fit into nature. We are asking for opportunity to address that, to bring kids and adults along to understanding natural systems. Domestic dogs are not part of natural systems. Wildlife of all sorts in a nature sanctuary is more than deer and squirrels. We're talking about plant communities, animals that people have never seen that live there or would live there given the opportunity to come back. We're talking about bird species that we're just beginning to see that we know would be more there. Things that to the tropics for the winter and come back here in the summer. They nest on the ground by the way. We ask that you support Councilman Dudley's compromise. It has been a compromise, we have compromised giving away the northern part, we have compromised giving away the east side. The original lands were for joint management, including Fairview Park. We realize that was unrealistic. This leaves Fairview as a neighborhood park for dogs and other activities and preserves the nature center as something unique. Thank you.

Sarah Read, 3802 Bedford – I'm just coming up to ask for clarification from the last two speakers. I'm totally fine with no dogs and also fine with the compromise that Councilman Dudley proposed. However, when he proposed it, we weren't talking at all about this alternate Scott's Branch Trail and he was very specific, it was the Scott's Branch Weaver to Rollins. I think this ordinance is written just on the Scott's Branch Trail. So I'm asking Edge and Bill are you limiting your support to the Weaver to Rollins route?
Wade: I should clarify, unfortunately the dog issue came up after the trail issue and they have become inextricably entwined. If the trail were to be run along the south side of the Audubon property coming up, that would negate this compromise. It would mean dogs throughout the area because we would not be able to restrict them to that east side and it would give them access to the entire Audubon property. We would not support that position.
Read: I just wanted that to be very clear.

Janet Godon, 3061 Maple Bluff – Can I ask a question? I was curious, I wanted to clarify a statement made earlier. Is it true that there is joint management on this entire parcel of land between Audubon and Parks and Recreation?
Hood: We certainly are going to be neighbors and working together. I don't know that there is a formal agreement at this point, but I expect to work together.
Godon: Second question, on the paved trails that currently exist, there are footpaths that go off those trails? So of the 120 acres of the land, and not over 2 paved trails, so there would still be 120 acres or so for people to enjoy nature, bird-watching and that kind of thing.
Donaldson asked if she supported the compromise?
Godon: I'm in support of the area meaning paved trails however that plays out and the existing primitive trails, which I guess people would go off the trails.

Blevins closed public comments and opened Commission discussion.
Hood reminded the Commission that at the February meeting, they recommended that dogs be prohibited at that time, Bonnie View Park.
Hutton commented that she voted for that because she felt she was going along with the rest of the Commission. However, with all the development and dog-owners around the property used to walking their dogs on the property, she thinks enforcement will be difficult. She thinks dogs should be allowed in the nature sanctuary.
Davis said she has pets and supports animals, however, she realizes there are places she cannot take her pets. There are other areas in the park system to take dogs. She would favor no dogs or the compromise.

Pauls said he agreed with Hank, Bill and Edge, but he liked the compromise. He actually would support no dogs at all. Nature sanctuaries and dogs are mutually exclusive. I think to Councilman Dudley's credit, he came up with the best solution. Pauls mentioned in the monthly report there were four citations by the Park Ranger and 16 warnings for dogs off leash in parks. Some dog owners follow the rules, possibly 30 percent, but he feels like the majority does not. He thinks if you allow dogs anywhere, you will have violations and it will be incumbent on the Park Ranger to enforce rules strictly. Pauls said if the compromise is allowed, he expects it to be enforced. He doesn't want to hear from the neighbors about citations or fines about dogs off-leash in that area. He described several incidents he had seen on trails with dogs. He thinks the compromise is fantastic.

Blevins mentioned he had trained hunting dogs for a while. He said dogs will be dogs, but that owners should be owners. He felt that Pauls mention of 30 percent following the rules was probably too high. He agreed with the compromise, but also agreed with Pauls that we should be strict with enforcement. He asked about the north side of the road, if that is going to be developed?
Hood the master plan at this point does not call for anything. It's rugged and steep. No improvements are planned.
Blevins said he really appreciated the owners with dogs, but supported the compromise.

Pauls asked Hood that if the trail were to go through the Audubon property, can Commissioners still limit dogs?
Hood said at this point, they would have to clarify that as long as this section of trail extends from Rollins.
Pauls said he would want to protect the Audubon property if the trail went through.
Donaldson said that at Rock Bridge State Park, one of four times when she is with a group of kids, they have a dog run up to them and can be threatening. They are supposed to be on-leash, so it's a problem there, Donaldson said. She envisioned a Friends of Bonnie View group with patrols and enforcement. She thought that would provide support for the Ranger. Donaldson would like to see no dogs at all, but she liked the compromise as it is now with the trail.
Blevins asked for a motion.

Donaldson made a motion, seconded by Pauls, that the Commission recommend to the Council they accept Councilman Dudley's compromise of allowing dogs on the Scott's Branch Trail, north of Rollins Road down to Weaver, not to extend west on the Scott's Branch Trail.
Blevins, Davis, Donaldson and Pauls voted in favor of the motion.
Devine and Hutton abstained.

Commission Budget
The City Clerk has asked if the Commission would like to request changes to the proposed budget for FY12. It would be the same amount as the current budget, $2,750.
Pauls made a motion, seconded by Davis, that the Commission request that the budget remain the same for the new fiscal year. Motion passed, 6-0.

Following the Commission budget report, Hood asked the Commission if they would like to condense the rest of the meeting into highlights, due to the late hour. All items requiring action have been taken care of at this point, Hood said. Commissioners agreed.

Staff Comments
Hood showed a brief Powerpoint of capital project updates and recreation highlights as staff made comments.
Griggs clarified recent boost in enforcement of the leash law by the Park Ranger. She is targeting specific problem areas in the park system where there have been numerous reports and complaints of dogs off-leash.
Coffman mentioned that staff had just conducted a first round of interviews to fill the vacant CARE coordinator position. Kim Partney, the former coordinator, resigned her position on April 1. Hood commented on the CARE Gallery magazines distributed to Commissioners. The magazines are published annually and highlight the creative writing and art of CARE Gallery participants.

Commission Comments
Blevins commented that it was a pleasure to work with this particular group of Commissioners, particularly with tough issues such as the ones discussed tonight. He asked Devine, who arrived late, if he had any comments to make.

Devine said he had read all emails about the subjects of dogs at Bonnie View and Scott's Branch Trail, as well as fielding several phone calls. He said he would stress that this is all a work in progress. He thought it would be worth talking further about extending the southern portion of the trail to Cunningham. He said he thought the dog issue needed to be discussed further because he thought parks needed to be used and accessible to as many peole as possible.

Meeting adjourned at 10:03 pm.

Introduced by _____

First Reading _____ Second Reading _____

Ordinance No. _____ Council Bill No. _____B 102-11_____

AN ORDINANCE

amending Chapter 17 of the City Code to restrict dogs and cycles in Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary; and fixing the time when this ordinance shall become effective.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 17 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Columbia, Missouri, is hereby amended as follows:

Material to be deleted in ~~strikeout~~; material to be added underlined.

Sec. 17-115. ~~Reserved~~ Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary; limitations on dogs and cycles.

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person owning or responsible for a dog to allow the dog to be in any portion of Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary south of Rollins Road unless the dog is held on a leash by a competent person and is on the Scott's Branch Trail or the trail leading from the Scott's Branch Trail to Fairview Park.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to ride a cycle, as defined in Sec. 17-140, in Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary other than on a hard surfaced area.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage.

PASSED this _____ day of _____, 2011.

ATTEST:

_____ _____

City Clerk Mayor and Presiding Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
City Counselor

Agenda Item No. _____

Source:
Mike Hood
Parks and Recreation

FISCAL and VISION NOTES:

City Fiscal Impact Enter all that apply:	
$0	City's current net FY cost.
$0	Amount of Funds Already appropriated
$0	Amount of budget amendment needed
	Estimated 2 yr net costs:
$0	One-time
$0	Operating / On-going
Program Impact:	
N	New program/ agency (Y/N)
N	Duplicates/expands an existing program (Y/N)
N	Fiscal impact on any local political subdivision (Y/N)
Resources Required:	
N	Requires add'l FTE personnel? (Y/N)
N	Requires additional facilities? (Y/N)
N	Requires additional capital equipment? (Y/N)
Mandates:	
N	Federal or state mandated? (Y/N)
Vision Implementation Impact Enter Below All That Applies: Refer to Website:	
N	Vision Impact? (Y/N or if N, go no further)
Item #	Primary Vision, Strategy and/or Goal Item#
Item #	Secondary Vision, Strategy and/or Goal Item#
Task #	FY10/FY11 Implementation Task#

TO: City Council
FROM: City Manager and Staff
DATE: March 25, 2011
RE: Restricting Dogs and Bicycles in Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A council bill has been prepared that would restrict dogs and bicycles in Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary.

DISCUSSION:

As requested by Council member Dudley, a council bill has been prepared that would prohibit dogs in Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary except for the area north of Rollins Road, the Scott's Branch Trail and the trail from the Scott's Branch Trail to Fairvew Park. The bill would also restrict cycles in the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary to hard surfaced areas.

At the March 21 City Council Meeting, options relating to two management issues impacting use of the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary were discussed. The two management issues concerned whether dogs and bicycles were to be allowed on the property. The two options presented with respect to the dog issue were:

1. Allow dogs on the area, but require the dogs to be on leash at all times.

2. Prohibit dogs from using the property.

A compromise third option was offered by Council Dudley as follows:

3. Dogs on leash would be allowed on the Bonnie View Property north of Rollins Road and on the portion of the paved Scott's Branch Trail located within the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary (extending from Rollins Road in the north to Weaver Street in the south) as well as the paved connector to Fairview Park.

In regard to the bicycle issue, the two options presented were:

1. Allow bicycles throughout the property.

2. Restrict bicycles to the paved trails only

As noted at the March 21 Council meeting, the Park and Recreation Commission recommended that: a.) Dogs be prohibited on the property; and b.) Bicycles be restricted to the hard surface trails.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No significant fiscal impact.

VISION IMPACT:

None.

SUGGESTED COUNCIL ACTION:

If the Council wishes to limit dogs and bicycles in Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary as outlined above, pass the ordinance.

Supplemental Information

Source: M. Hood MH

FISCAL and VISION NOTES:

City Fiscal Impact Enter all that apply:	
$0	City's current net FY cost.
$0	Amount of Funds Already appropriated
$0	Amount of budget amendment needed
	Estimated 2 yr net costs:
$0	One-time
$0	Operating / On-going
Program Impact:	
N	New program/ agency (Y/N)
N	Duplicates/expands an existing program (Y/N)
N	Fiscal impact on any local political subdivision (Y/N)
Resources Required:	
N	Requires add'l FTE personnel? (Y/N)
N	Requires additional facilities? (Y/N)
N	Requires additional capital equipment? (Y/N)
Mandates:	
N	Federal or state mandated? (Y/N)
Vision Implementation Impact Enter Below All That Applies: Refer to Website:	
n	Vision Impact? (Y/N or if N, go no further)
#	Primary Vision, Strategy and/or Goal Item#
#	Secondary Vision, Strategy and/or Goal Item#
	FY10/FY11 Implementation Task#

Agenda Item No. B162-11

TO: City Council
FROM: City Manager and Staff
DATE: April 12, 2011
RE: Council Bill 102-11 – Request to Table

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

City staff is recommending that consideration of Council Bill 102-11, an ordinance amending Chapter 17 of the City Code to restrict dogs and cycles in the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary, be tabled until the May 16, 2011, City Council meeting.

DISCUSSION:

Following discussion of a staff report suggesting a possible alternate alignment for the proposed Scott's Branch Trail at the April 4, 2011, City Council meeting, it was noted by Council members that Council Bill 102-11, an ordinance amending Chapter 17 of the City Code to restrict dogs and cycles in the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary, was scheduled for a final vote at the April 18 Council meeting. It was suggested that it might be more appropriate to consider Council Bill 102-11 at the same meeting at which the final routing of Scott's Branch Trail will be acted upon. The Scott's Branch trail proposal has been tabled until the May 16 Council meeting to allow for review by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission and the Disabilities Commission.

Based on the above discussion, staff is recommending that Council Bill 102-11 be tabled until the May 16, 2011, Council meeting. Such action would also allow the Parks and Recreation Commission to review and comment on the recommendations included in Council Bill 102-11 at their April 21 Commission meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Tabling this ordinance until the May 16 Council meeting will not result in any additional fiscal impact.

VISION IMPACT:

None

SUGGESTED COUNCIL ACTIONS:

Pass a motion tabling Council Bill 102-11 until the May 16, 2011 Council meeting.