

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
JUNE 2, 2014**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, June 2, 2014, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK and TRAPP were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mayor McDavid explained the minutes of the May 19, 2014 Council Meeting had not yet been completed.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor McDavid asked for B134-14 to be moved from the consent agenda to old business per the request of a constituent.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B134-14 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Hoppe and a second by Ms. Nauser.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(A) Construction of the Westwood-Glenwood Avenue Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Skala commented that he felt this type of project went a long way toward addressing some of the sewer overflow needs of local citizens, which was in addition to that needed for downtown infrastructure, and noted he was glad to see this kind of accommodation being made.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to proceed with the final plans, specifications and construction of the Westwood-Glenwood Avenue Sanitary Sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(B) Construction of the Thilly, Lathrop, Westmount PCCE #8 sanitary sewer, water line replacement and electric line burial improvement project.

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock and Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood there would be a cost to the residents if they chose to underground some of their utilities, and asked how much it might cost. Mr. Johnsen replied there would be a cost, and explained the cost would be based upon the amount of feet it took to get from the transformer pad to the house, which was estimated at \$800-\$1,500 per residence although it could vary.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Leslie McKennon, 400 Westmount Avenue, asked who would be coordinating the electric line burial. Mr. Johnsen replied Dan Clark, an engineer in the Water and Light Department, typically handled this type of activity.

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

Mayor McDavid commented that this \$3.3 million project involved a comprehensive and massive rehabilitation of crumbling infrastructure in a beautiful historic and affluent neighborhood in the inner Fourth Ward. He noted the neighborhood would benefit from the \$19 million pool of user fees collected from citizens in Columbia, and felt they were able to do this due to Columbia's dramatic economic expansion, less affluent citizens living in new neighborhoods on the periphery of town had paid into that pool. He stated he hoped they could avoid the fair share argument in terms of infrastructure because he did not want to try to discuss whether the Fourth Ward was paying its fair share. He noted there were benefits of an intact sewer system to the community. He explained he was supportive of economic expansion and felt the tremendous economic expansion of Columbia over the last twenty years had created this pool of fees that would allow them to fix this particular sewer issue. He suspected that the inner Fourth Ward would not have been able to afford this had it been its own municipality. He thought they were able to improve this vital part of Columbia by working collectively.

Mr. Thomas stated he would support this needed infrastructure improvement project as there were seriously deteriorated infrastructure facilities in the area. He believed a logical way to fund the infrastructure problem was to collect over and above the cost of service. He thought the City should collect enough in rates to cover ongoing maintenance, repairs and rehabilitation, and allocate those funds where they were most needed. He commented that a separate issue being discussed was the amount that should be allocated to new developments to accommodate expansion of the system due to new residences, or if that should be absorbed into the rates. He noted he supported the use of the rate structure to address needed repairs and maintenance where needed, and pointed out the City had a large inflow and infiltration mitigation program for the sewer system.

Ms. Hoppe stated she supported this project, and noted the Fourth Ward had been paying fees into the system for many years in anticipation of maintenance when needed and for new infrastructure. She explained the Council was reviewing the fee structure as the existing user fees were not covering the cost of maintenance and new development. She pointed out new developments, whether affluent or not, would want likely require maintenance in the future so the City had to find a way that made sense to fund it.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought it was hard to generalize neighborhoods in terms of whether they were more or less affluent, and suspected the fair share argument resonated with the public these days. Although he agreed economic expansion had fueled a lot of this, he pointed out growth had costs as well as benefits. In addition, some of the infrastructure was wearing out because enough funding for maintenance had not been provided. He thought the time had come for that maintenance, and this was a step in that direction based on need, and not based on income.

Mr. Trapp commended City staff for working together on this sewer, water, and electric project even though it was difficult and took more time because it lowered ancillary costs and lessened the disruption of the neighborhood. He commented that one of the beauties of a community was the fact people were able to pool their resources together to take care of overall community needs, and this project was an example of that in terms of the inflow and infiltration reductions, a cleaner environment, etc. He noted he planned to support it.

Ms. Chadwick understood this project had begun in 2008, and noted a large portion of the money for this project would come from the 2008 and 2013 sewer ballot issues. She stated she was glad the City was moving forward.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with the final plans, specifications and construction of PCCE #8 – Thilly, Lathrop, Westmount sewer improvement project, water line replacement project and electric line burial project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(C) Construction of pavement improvements on Keene Street, from I-70 Drive SE to East Broadway (Route WW).

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the bike lane was concrete and would be resurfaced with asphalt, and asked for clarification. Mr. Bitterman replied this had been done on Worley Street last year and they had been pleased with the result. He explained there was not a lot of differentiation when a street was the same color and the only thing separating bikes from vehicles was a white lane. On Worley Street, the middle portion where cars drove had an asphalt overlay so it was a black color and the pavement for bicycles was more of a white color. Staff's observation was that vehicles tended not to stray into the bicycle lane as much. Mr. Thomas understood only the central slabs, which would be the driving lanes, would be resurfaced, and the existing slabs at the curbside would become the bike lanes. Mr. Bitterman stated that was correct, and explained a milling machine would mill the pavement right next to the bicycle lane so what was there today for bicycles was what would be there in the future. The vehicle lanes would be paved over with asphalt. Mr. Thomas understood the

slabs at the curbside would not deteriorate significantly or be left in a deteriorated state. Mr. Bitterman stated they would replace any broken places in the vehicle and bicycle lanes. Mr. Thomas noted he liked this idea because the total area to be resurfaced would be reduced, and there would be less wear and tear in the bike lanes, so the maintenance costs would be reduced as well.

Mr. Skala understood this would not greatly change the configuration of how traffic flowed on this street. Mr. Bitterman stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala asked if there was any provision for crosswalks on this stretch of road. Mr. Bitterman replied there was a crosswalk by the hospital, which they planned to keep as the volume of pedestrians was high at that location. A study had been done with regard to a crosswalk by the retirement home a couple of years ago, and there were very few pedestrians at that time so they chose not to move forward. He noted it was not something that had come up during the interested parties meeting.

Ms. Nauser asked if any type of traffic calming or if traffic study would be completed on the other roadways that could potentially be impacted by the change in traffic patterns. She understood some people were concerned traffic would deviate from this roadway and travel on their roads, which would increase traffic and create a greater safety concern for kids and pedestrians. Mr. Bitterman replied staff did not anticipate traffic pattern changes as they were just paving over the existing surface. There would be a slight disruption for the few days when the paving occurred, but after that traffic patterns were anticipated to be the same as they were today.

Ms. Nauser asked if the lanes would be narrowed. Mr. Bitterman replied they would not be any narrower, but would be a different color because asphalt would be used instead of concrete.

Mr. Trapp understood the local match would be funded with street maintenance funds instead of sidewalk funds even though there were 19 curb cuts. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He explained many overlay projects were totally funded by the operations budget. Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds would be used for this project.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp thought it was great to save on asphalt while changing the color of the lanes, and felt this visual narrowing of the vehicle lane might result in traffic calming. He stated he appreciated the fact curb ramps were being constructed with street maintenance funds. He thought the amount the City spent on sidewalks was undercounted because sidewalks were paid for through road work. In addition, sidewalks were revitalized as part of sewer and water line projects.

Ms. Hoppe stated this was a major employment and office area so she thought it would be used a lot.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for the project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(D) Construction of the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard Project.

Item D was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Jarvis provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there was concern regarding buses being able to get over to the bus stop at the Broadway intersection, and asked if the barrier to the north could be moved toward the east. Mr. Jarvis replied the modeling software used for this scenario had indicated there was enough distance for the bus to make that maneuver.

Ms. Hoppe asked why the southbound and northbound vehicle traffic was unable to turn at the intersection. Mr. Jarvis replied it had to do with safety as left turn movements at intersections were the most dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists. Restricting that movement and giving priority to bikes provided safety to pedestrians and bicyclists.

Ms. Hoppe asked why vehicle traffic going south on Aldeah Avenue or north on Edgewood Avenue was restricted from crossing Broadway. Mr. Jarvis replied a safe haven for pedestrians and bicyclists to wait in the middle for a gap in traffic was needed. In addition, they were providing a priority to bicyclists so they did not have share that narrow space with a vehicle. Mr. Thomas understood the goal as to create a safe space in the middle for bicyclists and pedestrians, and thought it had the same impact as left turns. Ms. Hoppe asked if the goal was also to reduce through-traffic by encouraging vehicles to take a route other than the bike boulevard. Mr. Jarvis replied yes. Mr. Thomas thought it encouraged the use of a different mode of transportation as well.

Mr. Skala understood bike boulevards did not entirely exclude automobiles. They only reduced traffic volume and gave priority to bicyclists and pedestrians. He thought this bike boulevard was different than the Windsor Bike Boulevard in that it prohibited north-south traffic from traveling to areas where there were residences. Mr. Jarvis pointed out eastbound traffic on Broadway would still be able to turn right on Edgewood Avenue.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the center median at Broadway was wide enough for a bike to stop in the middle. Mr. Jarvis replied yes, and noted the gap was 10 feet wide while a bicycle was typically designed to be six feet.

Ms. Chadwick understood three intersections would not provide shelter for pedestrians or bicyclists, and those were at Ash Street, Worley Street, and Sexton Road. There was a relatively clear view and time to wait at the Worley Street and Alexander Avenue intersection. She asked for the sight distance at the Ash Street intersection when going north and looking west as she thought it was difficult to see. Mr. Jarvis replied 382 feet had been measured there. Ms. Chadwick noted there was a hill there and vehicles popped over it relatively quickly. She thought it might be helpful to have a traffic signal at the intersection, and asked if that would be considered. Mr. Jarvis replied an all-way stop at that intersection had not been warranted. Mr. Thomas thought they had discussed the potential of a HAWK signal or something similar that would only be activated when a bicycle or pedestrian needed to cross. Mr. Jarvis replied staff was still evaluating that as an option. Mr. Thomas asked for the approximate cost of that type of signal installation. Mr. Jarvis replied the cost of a rapid flashing beacon was about \$8,000.

Mr. Skala noted there had been discussions regarding the widening of Broadway to three lanes, a two-lane thoroughfare with turning lanes, and asked if those plans had been abandoned and whether any anticipated significant improvement to Broadway might interfere

with this bike boulevard. Mr. Glascock replied those plans had not been abandoned, but the project was not currently funded. He noted funding was dependent on whether it was included in the next ten-year ballot issue. He stated improvements to Broadway were needed, but pointed out this project only gave preference to bicyclists on a north/south roadway. Mr. Skala understood this would be accommodated if there were improvements in the future. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked if Mr. Skala was referring to the neighborhood plan that had been discussed about six or seven years ago. Mr. Glascock replied they were referring to the conceptual plan for Broadway from Garth Avenue to West Boulevard. Mr. Thomas understood it did not involve four or five lanes. It would only include one through-lane of traffic with some turning lanes. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Chadwick commented that many constituents had concerns with traffic increasing on other roads, like Sanford Avenue, and asked if staff had looked at traffic on the side roads and whether traffic calming could be done on those roads. She noted Sanford Avenue did not have sidewalks and was a vastly traveled road. Mr. Jarvis explained a traffic count would be done before and after the project was constructed to determine the impact. An evaluation of traffic calming would be done on parallel streets then as well. Mr. Bitterman replied a lot of options could be looked into if a traffic problem developed on Sanford Avenue, such as speed limit signs, parking, etc.

Mr. Thomas asked where staff planned to measure traffic impacts for the before and after study. He understood a traffic study already existed for West Parkway Drive and would be repeated. Mr. Jarvis replied staff would conduct a count on West Parkway Drive again after the project was completed. In addition, a consultant would do a full study of the bike boulevard in order to observe how bicycles and vehicles interacted before and after the project was completed. Mr. Thomas asked that traffic counts be conducted on Maupin Road between Edgewood Avenue and West Parkway Drive before and after the project was completed as well so they had a sense of whether traffic was being diverted onto that street. Mr. Bitterman replied that could be done.

Ms. Nauser understood a traffic study had not been done to determine the impact of the bike boulevard on surrounding streets in terms of traffic. She asked if they would study whether there was an impact on every roadway or if those that were impacted would have to wait for those residing on the street to ask for a traffic study to be conducted. She wondered if the consultant would look at the entire network of parallel roads. Mr. Bitterman replied the specific task of the consultant was to look at how bicycles and vehicles interacted on the roadway. The traffic calming studies and counts would be done in-house by City staff. Ms. Nauser asked if that would be done at the request of constituents. Mr. Bitterman replied it would be done at the request of Council or the constituents. Mr. Glascock stated staff would look at the areas where left turns were restricted. They would not wait until complaints were received for those roadways because they wanted to ensure this did not impact anyone significantly. He noted there would be impacts as people would turn left elsewhere, but only 29 homes were directly impacted by the left turn restriction on the one block. He reiterated they would track the traffic counts in-house.

Ms. Nauser asked about the purpose of this north-south route. She wondered if major points of interest or employment areas were being connected. Mr. Glascock replied this route had been identified by the GetAbout staff and input from interested parties meetings. The federal funds received were to encourage mode shifts, and a bike boulevard would assist in that goal. He noted the bike boulevard on Windsor Street, which was an east-west route, had performed admirably and was a benefit to the neighborhood, so they wanted to look into a north-south route. The GetAbout staff chose this route because there were already a lot of cyclists going in that direction and Council had approved it. Ms. Chadwick explained it would connect the MKT Trail to Parkade Plaza where the Moberly Area Community College was located. It also connected to Hickman High School. Ms. Nauser understood there was an elementary school near the other bike boulevard, so there was a destination for those who preferred an alternative mode of transportation. She thought it was helpful to know what would be connected. Ms. Chadwick stated it would essentially go from the MKT Trail to Hickman High School and to the Business Loop.

Ms. Hoppe understood traffic calming had not been necessary on streets adjacent to the Ash-Windsor Bike Boulevard, and asked if traffic counts had been measured in that area. Mr. Bitterman replied staff had not received many complaints. He thought MoDOT had adjusted the timing of the signal at the intersection of Paris Road and College Avenue, and that there might have been a few other adjustments. Ms. Hoppe understood traffic calming measures were not done on any of the side streets.

Mr. Skala understood there had been discussion in terms of replacing the temporary delineators on College Avenue as part of the Ash-Windsor Bike Boulevard with a permanent safety island, and asked for an update on that project. Mr. Jarvis replied staff expected that project to get underway this construction season so it was in place before school started in the fall.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition, which was an independent non-profit organization that provided advocacy and educational programming to promote active transportation that included walking, biking, using a wheelchair and public transit. On behalf of PedNet and their membership that represented over 2,500 people across Columbia, she stated her support for the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard project. She explained they had been engaged in the public input process for this project for over a year, and noted they had been pleased with how City staff had responded to their concerns and suggestions. This proposed project was very different from some of the original ideas due to the public input process. She stated PedNet was founded with a vision of a network of infrastructure facilities across the City that would make active transportation a safe and convenient option and included trails, bike lanes, sidewalks, and efficient public transit. The MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard would create an essential piece of this active transportation network by providing a safe route for bicyclists through the north central area of the City. The bike boulevard would form a crucial north-south thoroughfare for bikes between north central neighborhoods and the downtown-campus area, and would provide key connectivity to the MKT Trail, which connected to other City trails and the statewide Katy Trail. The MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard would also connect to the

existing east-west bike boulevard on Ash Street and Windsor Street. She noted this project would create major infrastructure improvements that would make it safe to walk or bike across some of the City's busiest intersections, such as the Business Loop, Broadway, and Providence Road. It would also improve transportation equity in the First Ward, an area that had not seen a lot of infrastructure improvements to support active transportation. She believed one of the best parts of the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard was the spur on Forest Avenue that extended to Hickman High School. This route and the major intersection improvements on Forest Avenue at Providence Road would make it safer for students to walk and bike to Hickman High School. Currently there was no safe place for students to cross Providence Road in the one-half mile between the Business Loop and Worley Street. She commented that while they were overwhelmingly in favor of this project, they recognized the plans might not be perfect as City engineers could not exactly predict how traffic patterns might change in the future. She urged the Council not to delay or derail this plan in pursuit of a perfect plan and asked them to allow City staff the flexibility to address any minor issues that might arise in the future as traffic patterns changed. The results of the bike boulevard on Ash Street and Windsor Street were overwhelmingly positive, and included a decrease in vehicle traffic and speed, an increase in bicycle traffic, and strong neighborhood support. She noted bike boulevards improved safety for walking and biking, and resulted in getting people to bike because they felt safer, which contributed to a mode shift where people chose biking for transportation for short trips and decreased traffic. She asked the Council to approve this project, and to continue supporting safe, healthy, and active transportation in Columbia.

Kurt Albert stated he had an office at 1512 Windsor Street and owned a house at 19 Aldeah Avenue, which was just north of Broadway, and noted the property owners had not been informed of this project so their opinions and comments were only now being heard, which he did not believe was the way it should have been done. He commented that homeowners had a lot more invested than bicyclists, and the loss of access was significant to their property values. He was concerned about the loss of the north-south access, and stated he believed in sharing the road, but not in stopping traffic entirely. He noted he was also concerned about access for emergency vehicles. He commented that Broadway was a major street, and normal traffic flow would be stopped for bicyclists. He understood the computer model had indicated buses could maneuver on Broadway, but he believed the barrier to the north was too far west and too far into the street. He stated he was agreeable to the left turn restrictions, but wanted vehicles to be allowed to cross Broadway in a north-south direction at Aldeah Avenue. He understood no counts had been taken so staff could not say there would not be a 100 percent increase in traffic.

Mr. Thomas understood City staff would obtain baseline measurements before the change was made so they would know if there was an impact. Mr. Jarvis stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked if residents of Aldeah Avenue had been notified of the interested parties meeting. Mr. Jarvis replied letters had been mailed to all of the homeowners and landowners along the corridor of the main trunk and the two spur lines for both interested parties meetings, the previously scheduled public hearing, and this evening's public hearing.

Ms. Hoppe asked staff to address the emergency vehicle issue. Mr. Jarvis replied the islands proposed at this intersection and at the Worley Street intersection would be mountable curbs so emergency vehicles were able to cross. Ms. Nauser understood that was similar to what existed at the round-a-bouts. Mr. Jarvis stated that was correct.

Troy Balthazor, 3615 Chatham Drive, pointed out people that used wheelchairs or had other mobility impairments would also benefit from this project. He noted they were always looking for ways to make public rights-of-way safer for people with disabilities, and this would provide separation, greater visibility, and awareness due to lower traffic speeds. He commented that as the City tried to develop a more comprehensive bike trail network, certain sections of the network would help people with disabilities while other sections would be unusable. This route would provide access to businesses and residents and make it easier to get across the Business Loop. He noted ADA did not apply in public rights-of-way, and although the City had responsibilities under the ADA to be non-discriminatory when it came to building codes and building in the public rights-of-way, the ADA regulations were not costing the City extra money.

Matt Struckhoff, 113 Park Hill Avenue, stated he was speaking on behalf of the Park Hill Neighborhood Improvement Association and noted their qualified support for the bike boulevard plan as the improvement was important in connecting communities, improving the transportation portfolio, and contributing to community health, but pointed out they had some concerns as well. It was unclear as to whether the City had a firm grasp of the potential impact of the bike boulevard on broader traffic patterns within the area. He explained a large portion of the traffic on Edgewood Avenue was a result of cut-through traffic between Broadway and Stewart, and about one-third of the vehicles using Edgewood Avenue exceeded the 25 mph speed limit. He understood through conversations with City staff that the potential rerouting of traffic had not been considered in the development of the bike boulevard, so they did not know the fate of the vehicles that would be rerouted off of the bike boulevard. He commented that much of the traffic from Edgewood Avenue would be rerouted to adjacent streets, such as West Parkway Drive, East Parkway Drive and Garth Avenue, that already experienced significant cut-through traffic, often in excess of the speed limit. He stated the proposed bike boulevard would also increase traffic on Maupin Road, Crestmere Avenue and Park Hill Avenue. He explained Maupin Road was the most susceptible to increased safety risks because it connected to the proposed bike boulevard and did not have any sidewalks. In addition, Crestmere Avenue and Park Hill Avenue were too narrow for two-way traffic and lacked full-length sidewalks to accommodate the pedestrian traffic associated with the Columbia Public Library, Grant Elementary and Stewart Park. He commented that as a result, the Association was seeking a commitment from the City for a comprehensive approach to traffic management within the area, which would address traffic flow on nearby streets to mitigate the effects of the altered traffic and improve safety for pedestrians accessing the library, Grant Elementary or Stewart Park. They were also suggesting the City take an incremental approach to the development of the bike boulevard because they felt a phased approach would minimize financial commitments in the early stages and allow repeated traffic assessments to measure intended and unintended effects. In practice, he thought this might involve the use of temporary traffic controls and

signage that achieved the desired effects of the bike boulevard, but still allowed for changes before too much money was committed. The Association also wanted the City to commit to assessing the impacts of the changes and to adjust plans based on the assessment results. The assessment should include traffic studies to determine the volume and speed of traffic, and include pedestrians and cyclists, and if the assessment revealed safety concerns, traffic calming measures should be given immediate priority. He commented that the residents of the Park Hill Neighborhood were happy to provide input to ensure the development of the bike boulevard progressed in a way that improved traffic flow, community health, and safety for all users. He understood most of the traffic would be encouraged to take parallel streets, and believed good traffic design did not encourage diverting traffic to residential streets as traffic should be diverted to arterial roads. He also asked the City to identify the specific triggers that would initiate traffic calming on neighboring streets as the bike boulevard proceeded.

Gail Plemmons, 17 Aldeah Avenue, commented that the City had installed a raised median about three years ago at the intersection of Broadway and Aldeah Avenue, and she believed it had become more dangerous over time due to the perception of safety by bicyclists and pedestrians because vehicles did not stop. She felt a flashing yellow light would continue this confusion because Broadway was a major thoroughfare. She suggested a push button red light or no light instead of a flashing yellow light.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, stated he was the President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association and explained the Association had benefited from the bike boulevard at Windsor Street and Ash Street. He encouraged the Council to pay attention to the concerns of the Park Hill Neighborhood Association, and thought it was wise to complete and assess this project incrementally. While the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association had seen considerable benefit from the existing bike boulevard, he felt this bike boulevard was considerably larger and should bear great scrutiny.

Will Scherer, 19 W. Parkway, commented that he was a property owner and had not been aware of the interested parties meeting. He stated he was a big supporter of active transit and rode his bicycle to work, and believed many in the Park Hill Neighborhood had similar views on active travel. In the spring of 2013, the neighborhood had requested a traffic study because they felt there was a lot of traffic and speeding, and that study revealed 51 percent of cars traveled at 26-49 mph. The proposal the Council was considering with regard to the bike boulevard did not give consideration to the impact of traffic on adjacent streets. He asked that it be included for safety purposes as there were many points of entry on West Parkway due to Stewart Park.

Jill Lucht, 100 Aldeah Avenue, stated she was very concerned about the safety of the intersection at Aldeah Avenue and Broadway as she had seen multiple accidents and many more potential accidents, and suggested a light that could only be activated by pedestrians be installed at this location. She noted she had similar concerns for the Worley Street crossing, and suggested a safe haven in the middle for that intersection. She also felt more people would travel on Ash Street as they would likely avoid Broadway and Worley Street, which would make its intersection with the bike boulevard even more dangerous than it was currently. She explained those traveling north on Aldeah Avenue could not see clearly to the

west due to a hill. She commented that she agreed with those in the Park Hill Neighborhood as vehicles did not respect pedestrians even at pedestrian crossings. In terms of the Edgewood/Aldeah/Broadway intersection, she asked if cyclists would ride to the right of the median on the northeast corner going west on Broadway. Mr. Jarvis replied no, and explained they would be in the driving lane. He noted that gap was for drainage.

Dierik Leonhard, 204 E. Parkway, asked if pedestrian traffic that frequented the two elementary schools and the park had been taken into consideration prior to proposing this bike boulevard. He thought the entire area should be considered and addressed. He believed this project would make it less safe for those walking and learning how to ride a bike on East Parkway Drive and West Parkway Drive. It would increase the danger to children, decrease property values, and make people not want to live in the neighborhood. He commented that this was one of the oldest neighborhoods in the community, and believed it was worth preserving. He suggested a comprehensive plan be developed before the bike boulevard was constructed. He stated it would be the fault of the City if a child on their street was in an accident.

Darin Preis, 4803 Chilton Court, stated he was the Executive Director of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), which had offices at 807 N. Providence Road, and expressed his support for this proposed plan. He thought it was interesting that people testified in favor of certain projects only if it did not affect their neighborhood and felt it was important to consider the overall picture. He noted CMCA served 10,000 low-income families per year in the mid-Missouri area and many lived in the First Ward area, which was targeted by this boulevard. He pointed out the cost of transportation was one cause and condition of poverty, and opportunities to reduce dependence on motorized transportation was critically important to families who could not afford to own their own vehicle. This bike boulevard traveled to Parkade Plaza where Moberly Area Community College was located, and many of their clients were taking classes there. He commented that at certain times of the day he could see kids crossing the street at random places from his office on Providence Road, and believed the intersection improvement at Forest Avenue and Providence Road would allow them to cross in a safe manner. It would also positively impact traffic flow. He noted, personally, this bike boulevard would provide him another option to ride from his home in the south side of town to work in the central city area.

Joe Silsby, 1105 S. Glenwood Avenue, stated he was an independent contractor with the GetAbout program as he taught safe cycling classes and lead rides throughout the City. He explained they tried to show people good routes to take to get from point A to point B, which was often difficult for those not familiar with Columbia due to the many sequitious paths. The proposed bike boulevard could be shown on a map and clearly identified, and would greatly help the north-south bicycle traffic flow. He commented that he had lived on Edgewood Avenue for 25 years, and agreed cars zipped through the short two-block area in the Park Hill Neighborhood. He thought the proposed project would improve property values on Edgewood Avenue. In terms of West Parkway, he noted he never drove his motor vehicle down West Parkway because it curved at both ends and felt narrower. He thanked the Council for the already approved infrastructure throughout the City as there were many connections that made it safer for kids to get to parks, etc., and suggested better advertising

to promote those routes. He hoped the Council would vote in favor of this proposed bike boulevard.

Barbara Bauer, 1016 Lagrange Court, commented that for the last two years she had been taking this exact route from her home to Parkade Plaza, and was thrilled about the construction of this bike boulevard because she had experienced many heart-stopping experiences at Broadway since vehicles did not stop even though there was a marked crosswalk. She had also experience problems when crossing the Business Loop by Parkade Plaza, and felt this would make for a much safer and widely used route. She noted the community college had expanded and this would broaden opportunities for people to use non-motorized transit to get to it. She hoped the Council voted in favor of this project.

David Roloff, 200 Edgewood Avenue, stated he and his wife lived at the corner of Maupin Road and Edgewood Avenue, and noted they were concerned about the restrictions at the intersections and the result of those restrictions. There were 29 households on the Edgewood Avenue block, and most traveling west on Broadway would turn on West Parkway Drive and then take Maupin Road to their houses. This portion of Maupin was like a country lane, which caused him concern since he saw people walking to Grant Elementary or in the neighborhood every day. He believed someone would get hurt at some point, and suggested they not even put anyone at risk.

Jonathan Sessions, 115 Aldeah Avenue, stated he had received many notifications about this project and explained two letters from him had been included in the Council packet, one that showed his unbridled enthusiasm and the other that showed a concern he had about an intersection. Prior to moving to Aldeah Avenue, he had lived on Melbourne Street and Ann Street in the Benton-Stephens Neighborhood, and had seen the benefit of the bike boulevard when it had been implemented in that area although he was unsure of how it would work when it had first been discussed. He noted that bike boulevard continued to be improved, and would soon be improved by a change at the intersection of Ash Street and College Avenue. The proposed bike boulevard would provide opportunities to improve safety as it would slow traffic and allow kids to walk to Grant Elementary. It also provided a diverse group of neighborhoods increased access to recreational opportunities in terms of the MKT and Katy Trails and educational and employment opportunities in term of the Business Loop and north Columbia. He commented that intersections at Providence Road and Business Loop were dangerous, and stated he was excited for the improvements that would benefit people traveling to Hickman High School and the businesses in that area. He asked the Council to vote in favor of this proposed bicycle boulevard.

Shannon Canfield, 304 Sanford Avenue, stated she owned homes at 213 Alexander Avenue and 304 Sanford Avenue, and thanked the Council for their past support of safe cycling and safe pedway journeys. She commented that they had heard a lot of wisdom from the neighbors that lived along the boulevard, and thought they should accept some of their recommendations. She noted this project was in her backyard, and did not feel that should disqualify her concerns. She stated much of the traffic would likely be diverted to Sanford Avenue because traffic traveling west would have to turn southbound onto Sanford Avenue to travel in that direction. She explained they had been advocating for traffic calming on

Sanford Avenue for years, and suggested a traffic study be completed for all streets that would be affected so they had the data to make good decisions.

Lou Mazzoco, 301 W. Parkway, stated he was a lifelong resident of the John Stewart Park and the Park Hill Improvement Association area as he had resided in the same house for 42 years. He pointed out he was a concerned party since he resided on a neighboring street and should have been informed of the interested parties meetings, and suggested that policy be reviewed. He understood the bike boulevard was to go from the MKT to Parkade, and he personally did not think of Parkade Plaza as Parkade as he thought of the Parkade Neighborhood, and this did not cross I-70. In addition, this boulevard did not make it to the MKT Trail as it was south of Stewart Road, and there was no improvement plan for Stewart Road, which had travel speeds similar to Broadway. He stated he was concerned about the impact on parallel streets, and there was nothing in the proposal that would guarantee follow up studies for those streets. He suggested that be included. He commented that Cosmo Park had a 10 mph speed limit while the speed limit at John Stewart Park was 25 mph, and students and community members traveled through there to get to Grant Elementary and the library.

Lawrence Simonson, 2706 Hillshire Drive, explained he was happy with how the City had handled this process and believed the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard would be another gem for Columbia in terms of bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure. He stated he currently used his bicycle for 90 percent of all trips, and traveled on Maupin Road, Edgewood Avenue, and Parkway Drive every day to and from work. He also picked up his son from the babysitter across I-70 and typically used Garth Avenue to get there. This bike boulevard would allow him to cross the Business Loop to Parkade Plaza and then get over to Garth Avenue to go under I-70 in a safe and efficient manner, and was another step toward creating viable transportation for its most vulnerable citizens, which in turn would benefit all users. He understood some neighborhoods were experiencing speeding and people were worried this would worsen with cut-through traffic being diverted to their neighborhood. He agreed with their concerns as he believed traffic traveled too fast on all Columbia streets since those streets had originally been designed to move cars as fast as possible, but he also felt the bike boulevard would lead to greater transportation safety for all streets and neighborhoods near the bike boulevard, as it would encourage more people to choose biking as their transportation method. He thought a red light should be considered for the Broadway intersection, but felt the benefits of the bike boulevard outweighed the inconvenience of not being able make a left turn. He pointed out the neighborhoods along the bike boulevard included a large number of families with children, and as those children began to ride, it would provide families safe access to trails. In addition, he believed it had been well documented that properties on or near bike infrastructure increased in value.

Ms. Chadwick asked Mr. Simonson for the best route when traveling north across the Business Loop. Mr. Simonson replied he currently took Garth Avenue, which was quite frightening at the intersection of Garth Avenue and the Business Loop.

Michelle Windmoeller, 705 E. Rockcreek Drive, commented that her son who was 16 years old did not have his driver's license as he was not interested in obtaining one at this time, and this bike boulevard and connection would be a fantastic addition for kids needing to

get to Hickman High School for before and after school activities. She appreciated the improvement this would make for teenagers to be able to get to Hickman High School safely.

Jerry Benedict, 307 W. Parkway Drive, explained he had always lived in Columbia and thought the quality of life was something everyone cherished and this plan had that in mind. He commented that his biggest concern was the implementation of this plan without identifying where traffic would be diverted and how any problems would be mitigated. He thought there should be a plan in place to slow traffic as many people walked to Grant Elementary through the park. He pointed out the neighborhood paid the maintenance, taxes, and liability insurance on the park, and could be impacted if there were increased safety problems. He asked that a plan be in place to reduce the speed of traffic on adjacent and connecting streets.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he was pleased with this project as he believed the City had inadequate north-south motorized and non-motorized transportation routes. He noted he would have liked to have seen a map a few miles out from this area to know what other non-motorized routes existed. He understood traffic engineering books had very rigid rules, but felt those rules could be more flexible, and suggested more questions be raised in the future in terms of warrants and why the City could or could not do certain things. He also suggested this issue be tabled until an analysis could be done and a plan was in place in terms of what was known would happen. The cost of that plan could be incorporated in this project. He believed there would be problems on side streets and felt those people would have to go through a lot in order to get any traffic calming. He reiterated he thought it was better to plan for this now.

Richard King, 109 W. Parkway, stated he was a PedNet Board Member and had resided in the neighborhood in question since 1989. He explained he had taught his children how to ride bikes on West Parkway Drive, and understood the traffic issues. He felt the real issue was the speed of traffic in the neighborhood, and believed that problem was being connected to the proposed bike boulevard, which he thought was a great idea as it would connect the MKT Trail to the Parkade Neighborhood. He stated he endorsed this project and wanted Council to vote on it this evening. He understood 29 households would be affected, and believed half were on the north side of Broadway while the other half were on the south side of Broadway. He noted those were his neighbors so he did not mind them using his street to get to and from their homes.

Carrie Gartner, 115 Aldeah Avenue, stated she was very much in favor of this bike boulevard as she believed it was a fantastic way to give diverse neighborhoods the awareness of and access to the MKT Trail. She noted it had been difficult to figure out how to get to the trail when she first moved to the neighborhood, and pointed out the trail was closer than many people thought. It was just not well marked. She had frequently used the Windsor Bike Boulevard prior to moving to Aldeah, and although it was not perfect, it worked. The City had made improvement to that bike boulevard over time based upon its usage. She felt they needed to keep in mind the fact that cities were living entities and were constantly changing, so even if they had the perfect plan, changes would likely be required in the future as circumstances, traffic patterns and residential uses tended to change. She thought they needed to constantly review streets, bike paths, sidewalks and transit routes in order for them

to be usable. She suggested they proceed with the project as it would be functional and good for a lot of neighborhoods, and the City could then make changes to address any problems as some of the problems mentioned tonight might not become a problem.

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

Ms. Nauser commented that she thought caution when seeing a flashing yellow light, and did not necessarily think someone would walk out into the street, so she agreed with some of the comments made in terms of the crossing at Broadway and Aldeah Avenue. She asked why a red light could not be used even if it would inhibit traffic moving steadily on Broadway. Mr. Bitterman replied a lot of rear-end crashes occurred with red, yellow and green lights on major roadways, and pointed out the proposed yellow light was about one-quarter of a mile from the next signal so they could make it a full traffic signal in the future when there was justification. Ms. Nauser asked what would be done in the interim to make it obvious to people in vehicles that there was a pedestrian or cyclist crossing the street, and that it was more than a caution light informing people to slow down. Mr. Bitterman replied the rapid flashing beacon that was at Old 63 near Stephens Lake Park had been successful and he thought that was the safest and best improvement that could be done at Broadway with the current volumes. Ms. Hoppe stated the yellow light on Old 63 really worked well unlike the one on Broadway and the one in the downtown.

Mr. Skala stated he was supportive of the bike boulevard concept, but had a few reservations. In terms of the Broadway intersection, he thought the left turn restrictions and not allowing vehicles to travel that north-south route might encourage drivers to travel faster, but the widening of the safety islands, which narrowed the lanes, would make it less desirable to travel faster. He noted he supported the idea of the bicycle boulevard with some of the suggestions made by the neighbors, such as an incremental or phased approach. He suggested using delineators on Broadway initially to determine the impacts of the diverted traffic and safety. The Council could be provided pre- and post-data, and adjust the situation moving forward so it was safe for pedestrians, bicyclists, and the neighborhoods.

Ms. Nauser understood the City had a long list of streets where residents had requested traffic calming, and asked how they could assure individuals that were concerned about the traffic impacts of this project that funding would be available to address any unintended consequences and that their traffic calming project would be accommodated prior to the other projects already on the list. She was not sure this project should be approved without knowing the impacts and how much money would be needed to address any problems. Mr. Bitterman replied he did not have a perfect answer because some people did not want traffic calming, and as a result, it was hard to say traffic calming would definitely be done. He stated staff had to look at each situation independently and noted they were committed to looking at the traffic volumes once the bike boulevard was constructed. Mr. Glascock pointed out traffic calming was now scored, and a project would not jump ahead of another project if it did not score higher. Ms. Nauser understood the score was based upon volume and speed. Mr. Bitterman explained staff looked at a lot of factors to include how close it was to a school, the speeds, the percentage of cut-through traffic, etc.

Ms. Hoppe understood no studies had been completed to determine how traffic would be diverted. Mr. Bitterman stated the City had existing traffic counts, but staff had not

forecasted the exact number of cars they thought would now go to Stewart Road, Sanford Avenue, etc. Ms. Hoppe commented that she would be interested in requiring a traffic analysis to be conducted and to make it a priority to address issues created by the bike boulevard. Mr. Thomas stated he thought that had already been agreed to by staff.

Mr. Thomas explained he endorsed the requests for a system-wide approach and for the analysis to incorporate all of the streets that could be affected. He thought the incremental approach made sense if there was a way to stage the entire project so post-data could be reviewed before moving forward with every element of the project. He noted speeding was a problem on West Parkway Drive and some baseline data existed due to the residents asking for a traffic study to be conducted to evaluate their eligibility for traffic calming. Even though more than 50 percent of cars traveling on West Parkway Drive were exceeding the speed limit, the problem would not be resolved for at least 5-10 years due to the many other speeding and cut-through traffic problems throughout the community and the current traffic calming budget. He felt this was a systemic problem and the traffic calming budget needed to be increased to address problems more quickly. He commented that traffic studies related to bike boulevards had been done in other cities, and based on his research traffic had not increased on adjacent streets even though it was a valid concern. He stated he thought the proposed bike boulevard was a good plan, and noted staff had worked extremely hard and very creatively to find the right balance. The goal was not to push traffic on to other streets. The goal was to get people to ride their bicycles or walk instead of driving. He encouraged an incremental approach, pre- and post-implementation studies, and the ability to re-evaluate if there was a very negative impact on a particular street or neighborhood. He stated he would support the project. He commented that he had planned to request the segment of Maupin Road, from Edgewood Avenue to West Parkway Drive, to be designated as part of the bike boulevard, but had received communication on behalf of homeowners on that street that it was not something they wanted, so he would hold off on that request. He thought that might be an approach that would lessen the impact of traffic on West Parkway Drive and Maupin Road, and could be considered in the future. He thought this project would continue the mode shift in Columbia and would create vast increases in bicycle and pedestrian journeys.

Ms. Chadwick commented that the most concerns involved West Parkway Drive and Sanford Avenue, and staff had data on those two streets as both rated in the bottom in terms of traffic and speed. She understood the average speed was about 32 mph. She stated the City was trying to create a street that was mainly for pedestrian and bicyclist use, and she was excited about the project. She noted every study she had seen had indicated an increase in property values on bike boulevards. She asked if the light at Broadway could be a red flashing light instead of a yellow flashing light. Mr. Glascock replied that they strived for standardization as they wanted the same effect at every crossing so it created less confusion. He explained the lights at Broadway were not seen because they were so far out. He thought it would be more effective once they were pulled in with the islands as the ones on Old 63 were narrow and much more effective. He noted they would have a paddle notifying people to yield for pedestrians as well.

Ms. Chadwick stated she recalled her own personal resistance to the Windsor Street Bike Boulevard because she could no longer make the turn from College Avenue to Windsor Street to get to her child's school, but she and the other parents became used to the new route after about a month. They were ultimately ecstatic the bike boulevard ran in front of the school. She thanked staff for this putting this infrastructure funding in the First Ward as this was a great opportunity to create something beautiful through the First Ward. She stated she supported the pre- and post-studies, but did not agree with phasing in the project as she had confidence City staff would design a project that was best suited for these roads, the city, and the community.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was little uncomfortable with only a statement that there would be some follow-up, and thought that should be included in the motion to proceed.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications of the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard project, and to conduct pre- and post-traffic studies and address any issues created. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Trapp commented that he moved to Columbia from Berkeley, California and had lived on a road that ran parallel to a bike boulevard without any problems. He noted he purchased a car a month after moving to Columbia due to the lack of ability to get to the places he needed to go and to find employment. He stated this was a more ambitious project than the previous bike boulevard and understood why there were concerns from the neighbors, but having lived parallel to a bike boulevard, he did not feel it impacted traffic speeds or the amount of car traffic. He thought it did cause people to make modal shifts. He commented that he was most excited about the improvements to the Business Loop and Forest Avenue near Hickman High School. He noted the changes at Business Loop and Providence Road had vastly improved that intersection, and the synergistic effects of all of the improvements combined impacted the choice of people to bicycle to make a trip. In terms of the Broadway/Edgewood/Aldeah intersection, he agreed with Mr. Glascock in that the crosswalk was too wide to be effective. He commented that a car culture in a college town was unusual, and thought this was shifting with physical changes. He stated he would support the project.

Ms. Nauser stated she supported the motion of Ms. Hoppe, and suggested they include funding if the traffic studies found streets would need to be improved as she did not feel it was proper to knowingly construct the bike boulevard that created an impact and would require them to compete with other traffic calming projects. She was not sure of the funding amount that would be needed. Ms. Hoppe noted that was the reason she included addressing the issues in her motion, and she assumed money would go along with it. Ms. Nauser thought they would want to ensure there was a funding mechanism identified now. She stated she would support the project with those two provisions.

Mayor McDavid commented that this was dynamic, and there would likely be consequences they did not anticipate, so they would need to be flexible and address those problems as that was their obligation and they had promised to do it.

Mr. Skala asked if an incremental approach would be taken with regard to the bike boulevard. Mr. Glascock replied staff could take that approach, but they wanted to construct the crossing at Providence to assist those traveling to Hickman High School. Mr. Thomas

stated he did not believe they had heard any concerns with regard to that design. Mr. Glascock agreed. He asked Mr. Skala if he wanted staff to report to Council. Mr. Skala replied no, and stated he trusted staff. He only thought it was logical and practical to proceed in that manner. He commented that he was inclined to support the project due to the students at Hickman High School, but was reluctant due to some of the intersections. He also felt they should encourage bicycle and pedestrian traffic, but noted he did not want to exclude vehicle traffic as some people liked their cars. He stated this was a cultural shift instead of a mode shift, and they had to approach it with encouragement. He thought the incremental and phased approach with feedback would help. Mr. Glascock asked if they could do the striping and the hard infrastructure in a temporary manner for the entire length of the project. Mr. Skala replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe asked for the definition of temporary because the delineators were very ugly. She wondered if temporary meant a couple months. She noted the ones on College had been there for 3-4 years. Mr. Glascock asked the Council to define temporary.

Ms. Chadwick understood they had discussed implementing it in two sections in case one of the sections had to be pulled out. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser thought temporary would have to include summer and school. Mr. Glascock agreed they would want to go through part of the school year. Mr. Thomas thought it had to be long enough to do a post-study. Mr. Skala felt it would have to be about a year. Mr. Thomas stated he did not believe it needed to be a year, but thought it needed to be long enough to do a valid post-intervention study and analyze those results.

Mr. Glascock pointed the delineators did not provide the same level of safety as the concrete islands. Mr. Skala understood.

Mayor McDavid noted there was a cosmetic issue with delineators so he did not think they would be well accepted, and stated he would support the project as delivered with the recommendations of Ms. Hoppe, which did not include the delineators. Mr. Glascock pointed out that would be the preference of staff. Mr. Thomas understood that could even be removed without a huge expense. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Skala stated he was agreeable to the more permanent approach.

Ms. Nauser asked if they wanted to include ensuring there was a budgetary line item as a contingency in the motion. Mr. Thomas replied he would not be supportive of that as there was a point scoring system for traffic calming, so the street would be addressed if the impacts were bad enough to elevate it to that point. He did not believe the neighborhoods would be short-changed even if they stuck to the City's existing system. Mayor McDavid pointed out police officers could also slow traffic in the neighborhood if strategically placed.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Ms. Nauser directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications of the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard project, and to conduct pre- and post-traffic studies and address any issues created, was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting against it.

OLD BUSINESS

B133-14 Authorizing the issuance and sale of Water and Electric System Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2014 Series A.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Blattel provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B133-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Trapp asked what the City had done to improve its bond rating. Mr. Blattel replied the ratings were reviewed on an annual basis and when the City had a bond issue, and the City's revenue stream and stability of utilities were considered the previous time the City was rated. The rating had been raised slightly due to consistency since the City had a similar rating for at least a year.

Mayor McDavid asked if the City's rating was AA+. Mr. Blattel replied yes.

B133-14, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B134-14 Extending the corporate limits of the City of Columbia, Missouri, by annexing property located on the north side of Prathersville Road and east of State Highway 763 (1339 Prathersville Road); establishing permanent C-3 zoning.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if this land was inside the urban service area. Mr. Matthes replied it was inside the urban service area.

Jennifer Arnold, 6448 N. Wagon Trail Road, commented that those who lived in the Prathersville area were greatly concerned with the encroachment of the City limits on long-term family owned land. Many of them held considerable areas of wooded acreage that provided natural habitat for wildlife. In addition to preserving these areas, they wished to continue to be able to raise livestock as they had done for generations. She stated they already provided clean, safe sewage disposal via privately-owned, well-maintained lagoons or septic tanks, which could be a viable option for the landowner requesting this annexation as well. She believed the annexation of this area would create an unwarranted burden on the City in terms of an addition to the sewer system and law enforcement. She noted she was a concerned party and had learned of this annexation by accident, and had received a postcard notice after the fact informing her of a planning meeting, so she did not feel concerned parties were being notified.

Ross Mutrux, 6680 N. Wagon Trail Road, commented that he was concerned about the encroachment of the City limits and the method of annexation. He noted the City was annexing a two-acre tract, but there was a lot of area in between this property and the existing City limits as he understood the City limits stopped just north of the Vanderveen area. Mayor McDavid explained a voluntary annexation had to be contiguous, meaning it had to touch part of the City, and he understood a corner of this property touched City limits. Mr. Mutrux stated his concern was that this would virtually be in their backyard as his family owned property was just north of the Prathersville area. He noted his land had large wooded areas that were a sanctuary for wildlife and held sentimental value for his family, and he was afraid the land would be endangered as the City limits came closer to his property. He pointed out it would also bring the City limits to within a one-quarter of a mile from the

Hallsville School District. He did not understand why the City would annex this property based on the request of one landowner.

Justin Dumas, 6625 N. Wagon Trail Road, stated he purchased his property about eight years ago and noted he was concerned about the City limits coming closer to his property. He explained he wanted to raise his kids there, and enjoyed the freedoms of living in the County. He asked the Council to use caution in terms of annexations further north, and reiterated there was a lot of long time family owned land in the area.

Don O'Bannon, 6770 N. Wagon Trail Road, stated his property was located one-half mile north of the proposed site and explained he was opposed to this annexation because he did not want the City limits any closer to him.

T.K. Livingston, 4034 Creasy Springs Road, stated he was the developer and purchaser of the property, and noted this was the recommendation of the City and the Boone County Sewer District. He explained he had gone to the County first, and they had indicated he needed to work with the City. He commented that he did not necessarily want to be within the City limits, but this was the only way they could get a sewer system.

Mayor McDavid pointed out this was a voluntary annexation and noted he was not aware of any plans for involuntary annexation. Anyone interested in annexation would have to come to the City requesting it, and the property being annexed would have to touch the existing City limits.

Mr. Skala explained this fit within the urban service area identified in the Comprehensive Plan the Council had recently adopted.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the City had calculated the amount of money it would receive by having this property within the City limits and whether it would cover the cost of police and other services. Mayor McDavid replied it was a two-acre piece of land, so he was not sure how that could be calculated. Ms. Hoppe stated she was asking about it in terms of property and sales tax. Mr. Matthes read the fiscal impact note, which indicated the City would gain City taxes, fees and revenues as a developed property, and the annexation and rezoning would not create an additional burden on infrastructure and services. He pointed out this was true of all development surrounding the City as everyone on the other side of the City limit line used the same infrastructure without contributing to its maintenance. Ms. Hoppe stated she was not sure that applied to police service and snow removal services. Mr. Trapp understood the first responders were not necessarily based on where the emergency was located. If there was an investigation, the entity conducting the investigation was based on where the incident occurred. Mr. Matthes agreed there were times when both the City and County responded.

Ms. Nauser stated she believed this annexation and zoning was consistent with many other uses in the area.

Mayor McDavid pointed out there was public health interest in having this property connected to a modern sewer system instead of a lagoon or septic system.

John McLeod, 2307 Ridgefield Road, stated many homes within Columbia itself were having trouble with sewage, and thought more emphasis on fixing what they had was needed instead of adding to the system.

B134-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B136-14 Amending Chapter 20 of the City Code to change the terms of Planning and Zoning Commission members from five years to three years.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood the State of Missouri Planning Statute had indicated four year terms were required and asked how they could even entertain a three year term. Ms. Hoppe replied they could set the terms as three year terms since they were a Charter City.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to make a motion to table this issue to allow the Planning and Zoning Commission to comment and to have further discussion on the orientation procedures for new members.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to table B136-14 to the August 18, 2014 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mayor McDavid stated he would vote against the motion to table and against this bill as he did not believe there was a problem.

Mr. Skala stated he would vote against the motion to table, but would try to amend the bill as he believed there was a problem and felt tabling it would create an unnecessary delay.

Ms. Hoppe suggested they vote on the motion to table after public comment was received.

Ann Peters, 3150 N. Route Z, stated she was a former member of the Planning and Zoning Commission and noted she would be in favor of reducing the term limit from five years to either three or four years. She explained the Planning and Zoning Commission had an extremely heavy workload, and understood a number of work sessions had been canceled due to the lack of a quorum. She pointed out there was a backlog of issues needing to be addressed. In addition, the work on the Planning and Zoning Commission was exhausting. They started their work sessions at 5:30 p.m. and those sessions went until 7:00 p.m., when the regular meeting started, and there was a tendency for the members to become burned out. If someone was not worn out and wanted to reapply, they could reapply, and this would allow the Council to evaluate whether they were doing a good job. She asked the Council to consider reducing the terms from five years to four or three years.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Peters what she thought of tabling this item for a couple months to allow more time for discussion. Ms. Peters replied it was up to the Council, and noted the Commission could have come tonight to speak, could have sent e-mails, etc., so she believed there was a lack of interest.

Ms. Hoppe explained she had asked for this to come forward for a variety of reasons. She understood many communities had three year terms for their Planning and Zoning Commission Members, and pointed to Ann Arbor, Michigan, which was a larger university town with likely more development. Kansas City, Missouri had four year terms for its Planning and Zoning Commission Members. She commented that they had more work for

the Planning and Zoning Commission than ever before, and reducing the terms to three years allowed people to get involved without feeling they were being sentenced. She noted life circumstances sometimes changed, and some people tended to not want to resign since it was something they had committed to doing. She stated she had spoken with Jeff Barrow who had served on the Commission for many years, and he was supportive of a shorter term. She had also spoken to Vicky Curby, Tootie Burns, and Matthew Vander Tuig, who were also supportive of the shorter term knowing they could reapply as the Council generally reappointed those that reapplied because they liked the longevity and experience. She understood there had been attendance issues last year resulting in eleven canceled work sessions or meetings, and it was similar in 2012. She noted those she had spoken with also felt a better orientation and training program was needed in addition to reduced terms.

Mr. Skala stated he had served on the Planning and Zoning Commission, and agreed an orientation was needed as he had only been provided the bylaws and rules of procedure when he was first appointed in 1999. He commented that he was not be opposed to a three year term, but thought a four year term might be a more reasonable approach so it was consistent with State statute, and would make that motion if the motion to table failed. He agreed with Ms. Hoppe in terms of the difficulty with attendance as the Commission could not function properly if that many work sessions were canceled, and thought that might be a reason for the increased workload as well. He pointed out the interim C-2 zoning issue had been tabled twice already. He thought it was reasonable to make the terms consistent with State statute and it would avoid any political influence, which was the reason the terms were originally set at five years.

Ms. Nauser stated she agreed with Mayor McDavid in that this was a solution looking for a problem. She was hopeful the workload of the Commission would lessen once the new zoning regulations were adopted. She also questioned the workload argument from people that had served multiple terms because they would not have reapplied otherwise. She thought most people knew what they were getting into with the five year term. She stated life happened, and even Council Members missed meetings or work sessions. She believed they should address the issue of people missing meetings, which she thought had been done, as she felt dismissal from the Commission would deter people from not showing up for the work sessions. She thought they always had enough applicants even though they might not have the number of applicants they wanted or applicants with the ideology they preferred. Mr. Skala noted they had extended the application timeframe a number of times. Ms. Nauser stated that was due to them not liking the applicant pool.

Mayor McDavid read e-mails received from Tootie Burns and Rusty Strodtman, who were current Planning and Zoning Commission Members. Tootie Burns stated she supported a change in the terms from five years to three years as she felt it would encourage more people to apply. She noted she had personally given much consideration to applying for a five year term. She understood there was a steep learning curve to the Planning and Zoning Commission, but did not think that should be a reason for a five year term. She would hope members would reapply after each term. She felt she served with a committed group of people who did not always agree but had the best interest of Columbia in mind when making recommendations to Council. Rusty Strodtman stated he opposed changing the term lengths

from five to three years as there was a huge technical learning curve for the average person coming on for their first term. He did not feel members fully understood their role until the end of year two, and would hate to see the first two years of training be spent for one year of quality work with the potential of not getting selected for a second term. He also did not feel the current structure of the Planning and Zoning Commission was politically motivated, and aligning terms with Council terms would create a political incentive that would make one feel more obligated to vote according to Council ties and he did not want that additional stress. He welcomed and encouraged any joint work sessions with the Council to discuss this or any other topic.

Ms. Chadwick stated she was opposed to the motion to table because she believed those that were interested in providing feedback had been given that opportunity. She noted she had received several e-mails in support of reducing the terms of the Planning and Zoning Commission Members. She commented that four of the current nine members resided in the Fifth Ward, and she felt a shorter term might allow for better representation.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with a lot of points made and thought it would probably be a good move to reduce the term limits, but was concerned with the process since the Commission had not been asked for its opinion. He felt there was a somewhat contentious relationship between the Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission, and would prefer to keep that relationship positive and collaborative, which he believed would be achieved by tabling this issue for two months and asking the Planning and Zoning Commission for its comments.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the Planning and Zoning Commission had not had a meeting since Ms. Hoppe had introduced this idea. Mr. Thomas replied it had not been on the Planning and Zoning Commission agenda. Mr. Teddy stated it was not on the agenda, but staff had made an announcement after the ordinance had been requested so the Commission would know, and the Commission had a spontaneous discussion, which were detailed in the meeting minutes provided to Council. Mr. Skala commented that the Council had received several written responses to the proposal.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Trapp to table B136-14 to the August 18, 2014 Council Meeting was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas and Mr. Trapp voting in favor of the motion.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B136-14 so the terms were four years instead of three years. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Trapp thought the most salient reason in opposition to passing this was that the longer term was protected from political influence, which he thought was helpful, and four years was significantly better than three years.

Ms. Hoppe stated she would be supportive of a four year term instead of a three year term as reducing it was a step in the right direction. She noted the Council changed every year so she did not feel there was a concern or issue with regard to political influence.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B136-14 so the terms were four years instead of three years was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser, Mayor McDavid, and Ms. Chadwick voting against the motion.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B136-14 by changing the third and fourth sentences in Section 20-37(a) so it read “All members serving on the commission on June 2, 2014 shall complete such member’s existing term. Thereafter, the term of each member shall be four years, provided that in order to maintain staggered terms, one member whose current term expires in June 2015 shall be reassigned to a three year term expiring on June 2018 and thereafter to subsequent four year terms as provided herein.” The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Ms. Chadwick thought the term ended May 31 according to the City’s website and asked why the June date was being used. Ms. Amin replied she thought it was because it was today’s date.

Mayor McDavid understood this motion would need to be passed. Ms. Thompson explained it had to be passed in order to maintain the staggered terms.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Ms. Hoppe to amend B136-14 by changing the third and fourth sentences in Section 20-37(a) so it read “All members serving on the commission on June 2, 2014 shall complete such member’s existing term. Thereafter, the term of each member shall be four years, provided that in order to maintain staggered terms, one member whose current term expires in June 2015 shall be reassigned to a three year term expiring on June 2018 and thereafter to subsequent four year terms as provided herein” was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B136-14, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, HOPPE, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NAUSER, MCDAVID, TRAPP. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B139-14 Approving the Final Plat of Rock Valley Plat 5, a Replat of Lot 401 of Rock Valley Plat 4, located on the north side of Chapel Hill Road and west of Madison Park Drive; authorizing a performance contract.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe understood the developer had been blasting rock, which was a concern and disturbance to the neighbors, and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy stated the Fire Department has indicated a permit for the blasting activity had been issued as far back as May 21, 2014. Anyone that was concerned about the activity, suspected something was wrong or being done wrong, or experienced vibration or other effects, could contact the State Fire Marshal’s Office, who would investigate the complaint. He explained blasting took place in Columbia due to its geology, and several permits were usually issued per year. Ms. Hoppe noted some people were concerned about the foundations of their houses, and understood they could contact the State Fire Marshall. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood another concern was that there had been sanitary sewer outflows in the area along the valley of the County House Branch and through the neighborhood park, and asked if the new development would hook up to this same system. Mr. Teddy replied the development would connect to an existing sewer. Mr. Thomas understood the sewers would come together at some point. Mr. Teddy stated he did not have a graphic, but noted he believed there was a sanitary line that drained toward the County House Branch.

Mr. Thomas asked if it was an option for the Council to vote against this plat if they had concerns about the capacity of the sewer system to accommodate additional users. Mr. Teddy replied no issues were identified in terms of sewer capacity in the plan review. Ms. Thompson explained sewer capacity had nothing to do with the physical layout of the property that Council would decide upon when it came to a plat.

Mr. Thomas understood the private property rights to build were already there, and this was to ensure it conformed to that specific set of rules. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct as it had to conform to the subdivision code.

Mr. Thomas understood their review showed no problems with sewer capacity. Mr. Teddy stated a plan review was conducted and included a review of utility systems in consultation with appropriate utility staff. Mr. Thomas explained he had seen an antibiotic sprayed after an outflow associated with the County House Branch and asked if that would show up in the review. He wondered if sewer outflows immediately downstream from the new development would show up when the plan was reviewed. Mr. Teddy replied if there was documentation of a downstream problem, it would be reported to the plan reviewer and appropriate remedial action would be recommended. Mr. Glascock explained he did not know exactly where this development would hook into the sanitary sewer, and noted the City had two manholes upstream toward the creek that had overflowed. He assumed they would connect to the line that ran through the valley, which was downstream from the manhole that overflowed. Mr. Thomas understood if volume was added, regardless of whether it was downstream, it could back up. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood this was not a valid consideration in the review of plat. Ms. Thompson stated no.

Ms. Chadwick asked when the preliminary plat had been approved by Council. Mr. Teddy replied the single lot was approved by Council in October, and it consolidated three lots. He did not know when those lots had been created. They were now dividing it back into two lots for internal financial reasons. It would be a single unified development. He noted the site plan was for the entire site and showed the buildings would be a part of a senior living center with shared parking facilities.

Mr. Glascock pointed out a project was identified in the CIP to fix the sewer downstream. Mr. Thomas asked for the timeframe of that project. Mr. Glascock replied he believed it was in the 6-10 year category.

Ms. Hoppe asked how long the property had been zoned R-3. Mr. Teddy replied it had been zoned R-3 for a long time. He understood the property had been annexed in 1964, but was not sure whether R-3 was the original zoning on the property. Ms. Hoppe understood blasting could occur with proper approval on R-3 zoned property. Mr. Teddy replied everything had been in order when reviewed by the Fire Department, and there had been no issues to date.

Kim Kraus, 2304 Ridgefield Road, provided a handout and stated she was representing members of the Ridgefield Park Association. She explained the Ridgefield Park Association was formed over 40 years ago in order to purchase and maintain 7.5 acres of land as greenspace, east of Chapel Hill Road along the County House Branch Creek, which was one of many creeks in the Hinkson Creek watershed. A few years ago, an easement had been granted to the City for an extension of the MKT Trail along the south side of the

park and the County House Branch Creek. The park had been impacted by sewer overflows from several manholes, and sewage pooled in the park, on the trail, and backed up into people's homes. In the last five years, they had seen substantial increases in sewage eruptions due to additional uphill sewer connections. Recently the City had been spreading what they assumed was lime on the sewage and had posted health hazard warning signs. She pointed out multiple requests had been made over the years for the City to rectify the problem that was causing the overflows. She commented that the sewage infringed on their private property rights, created significant property damage to their homes, and presented a health hazard to people living in their homes, to children, people, and pets using the park, and to people using the new trail extension. Three weeks ago, bulldozers began clearing the wooded hillside above the County House Branch Creek. She understood a 90-unit assisted living facility would be developed, and that another 60-unit facility would be added in the future. She stated the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the plat on May 8, 2014 as no one from the public had spoken on the topic, but pointed out they had been given notice or been invited to speak, which was why they were speaking tonight. Although the proposed project was noble, they were puzzled and outraged due to the unaddressed sewer concerns as the developments would impact the already overburdened sewer lines. She believed that allowing unabated hook-ups to a system in crisis was negligent and a serious public health issue, and wondered why new projects were getting resources when they had been waiting for relief for years. She stated she was dismayed by the lack of decisive initiative in this matter as she felt it was within the ability of Council to affect what happened in the town. She commented that citizens expected priority in meeting current needs and addressing problems before continuing growth and expansion. She noted blasting began today, shook her entire house, and scared her. She explained they were requesting measures be taken or put in place before the units became operable to ensure they were not inflicted further harm, and that the second project be deferred until the sewer crisis was corrected. She understood the R-3 zoned assisted living facility could proceed if the land was at least ten acres, and asked if it would be less than ten acres if the lot was divided into two lots. Mr. Teddy replied the developer was using the whole site for the facility and only wanted separate lots for financial reasons. He explained the ordinance read "site." It was not specifically a platted lot had to be the ten acres.

Mayor McDavid asked what the City's plans were to deal with the sewer here. Mr. Glascock replied a project was in the CIP Plan to build a relief sewer, much like what was done on Cowan Drive. The County House Branch was next on the list to control the inflow and infiltration, once staff was done with the Flat Branch inflow and infiltration and lining of sewers. Ms. Hoppe asked when the Flat Branch projects would be completed. Mr. Glascock replied they were probably at least two years away.

Mr. Skala asked when would be the appropriate time to address the possibility that this might negatively impact people as it was not in the platting process. He wondered if it would be during the building process or occupancy permit process. Mr. Glascock explained there was an inflow and infiltration problem throughout the City. Flat Branch and County House Branch were two of the oldest watersheds in the City and even the others were not immune to the problem. Mr. Skala stated they were talking about developing a piece of property that

was going to have a real impact on a system that was already underachieving. He understood the inflow and infiltration improvements would improve the overall system, but would not provide a lot of relief for people who were already overburdened.

Mr. Thomas thought the City needed to look at how much was spent on expanding the infrastructure to accommodate new development, which took away from what could be spent on repairing and maintaining what the City had, and whether the hook-up fees assessed against new development as a contribution to the system were adequate. The analysis he had done showed that since 2005, the fees collected by the sewer utility covered about 20 percent of the infrastructure expansion costs for additional users on the system.

Ms. Chadwick agreed they needed to know when the right time was to address these types of issues, and noted she had asked for information regarding a sufficiency of resources ordinance at the end of the last Council Meeting so they had the opportunity to determine whether they had sufficient resources at some point in the process.

Mr. Skala commented that it seemed disingenuous allow people to get started, and to later exert authority in the building permit or the occupancy permit process, which was toward the end when something was already on the ground. He felt they needed to address the problem of relieving the overburdened systems before they became more overburdened.

Mr. Matthes explained normally the maximum leverage the Council had was with the zoning decision. Mr. Thomas understood Council had no leverage at the occupancy permit point because it was administrative. Mr. Skala pointed out it was a public health issue. Ms. Hoppe agreed it was a public health issue, and it seemed irresponsible to add new development to a system that was failing until the City had the means to fix and improve the system. Ms. Nauser commented that by that argument it would be a decade before anything new was built in the community because it would take that long to catch up regardless of the funding stream, and she could not imagine new development coming to a halt.

John McLeod, 2307 Ridgefield Road, commented that 90 and 60 unit developments would connect to a facility that was put into place before 1966, and this did not work. He asked why the developer did not connect to the facility that went toward Twin Lakes versus the facility that went toward their park. It was a private park where children played. He believed the City needed to do something. He pointed out the sewage that came from Ridgefield Road did not go to the park. He understood that sewage came from Cowan Drive, and had been told a larger, newer pipe was connected to a smaller, older pipe, which created pressure and caused problems in basements. He stated he was upset and asked why the City would allow additions to the system.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, commented that the City had a very old sewage system that was being held together with band-aids. He asked everyone to become educated on this issue and felt construction needed to come to a halt.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of the People's Visioning and reminded the Council that many people in the community felt it was time to move quickly in terms of updating the zoning codes and increasing development fees. She felt an improvement to the rate structures would allow them to address problems more quickly and in a fair manner. She thought this would solve a lot of problems.

Mayor McDavid understood there was an inadequate sewer, but the approval of a final plat was a ministerial action, and asked for the recommendation of staff. Mr. Matthes replied staff recommended approval of the plat, but noted they could provide Council with more information regarding the sewer problem in that area.

Ms. Hoppe asked at what point in this process could the City have stopped this 90-unit development. Mr. Matthes replied he was not sure. He understood property rights generally outweighed community concern. Ms. Hoppe stated she would like a legal analysis with regard to the point at which a concern for public safety could delay or stop a new development. She explained she was familiar with a Lake Tahoe case, in which there was a moratorium on development around Lake Tahoe because of concerns of pollution in Lake Tahoe. Ms. Thompson stated the Council could enact an administrative delay for an area in which there was a public health, safety, and welfare concern, but it would apply to every single building permit and piece of property in that area. It could not be applied to only a few developments or be applied parcel by parcel. Ms. Hoppe asked if it could apply to certain areas that fed into a certain drainage network. Ms. Thompson replied it would need to be a watershed area, etc., and had to be done on a non-discriminatory and impartial basis, so it would involve 100 percent of the building permits for that area. Ms. Hoppe stated she would like to be provided this type of written opinion with the cases cited.

Mr. Thomas commented that this was a Citywide endemic problem, and if the City had money in the sewer utility, they could construct the extra relief sewers to alleviate the problems. This particular situation could be addressed by a project on the 6-10 year CIP Plan, and they would need a bond to pass in order to have the money in that timeframe.

Ms. Hoppe stated she would like to develop a plan with a financial program that could address the problems.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she felt the sufficiency of resources ordinance might assist because at some point they would need to say there was not enough resources in a particular area, and apply that across the board and not just to certain developments.

Mr. Skala stated he thought it behooved the Council to get this legal information so they understood it, and were able to explain the problem and potential solutions to the public. He asked that they be informed of any restrictions on them and any options they might have to alleviate the problem. Mr. Matthes stated he would provide a Citywide view so they could compare basins.

Mr. Skala stated he thought this was the same kind of issue in terms of sewer capacity that they had in the downtown whereby they had to find solutions prior to allowing development to continue.

Mr. Trapp commented that the earlier annexation would pay a connection fee to attach to the sewer and sewer fees would pay for the ongoing treatment of that waste. He noted the two quarries in Columbia were in his ward, so he had met with blasting engineers, and understood the shockwaves they felt moved through the air so it did not damage the foundation. He had been told it was worse for trucks to drive in front of a house in terms of damage to the house. In addition, if there were concerns about blasting, the Fire Marshal would come out with a Richter scale reader to ensure blasts were not moving through the ground.

Mr. Thomas asked how many dwelling units were involved in this development. Mr. Teddy replied he thought there would be 150 rooms. The set of plans he had seen indicated Building 1 would be 35,000 square feet. He only had a sketch plan of Building 2. He stated he had heard 90 and 60 units at one time. Mr. Thomas understood that would be 150 units and each unit would pay \$800 to hook-up to the sewer. Mr. Teddy replied he was not sure as a congregate living facility might be based on the size of the sewer. Mr. Thomas asked if there was a connection fee of \$800 per unit. Mr. Teddy replied there was a large connection fee, but he was not sure of the amount. If it was an apartment, it would be \$800 per apartment, but these were rooms and not necessarily self-contained living units. He noted he could pull the permit and provide the fee calculation, but did not have that information with him tonight.

Ms. Chadwick understood hotels and retirement community rooms were different than apartments, and were not charged the same fee. Mr. Teddy stated he would need to review the fee schedule ordinances. Mr. Thomas thought the fee would likely be less than \$120,000.

B139-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B135-14 Rezoning property located at the western terminus of Smiley Lane (415 West Smiley Lane) from District R-1 to District A-1.**

- B137-14 Approving the Final Plat of Creeks Edge Clubhouse located on the north side of Sawgrass Drive and west of Scott Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract.**

- B138-14 Approving the Final Plat of The Gates Plat No. 1 – Rearrangement, a major Replat of The Gates, Plat No. 1, located on the south side of Old Plank Road and west of Sinclair Road; authorizing a performance contract.**

- B140-14 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for tuberculosis diagnostic screening services.**

- B141-14 Amending the FY 2014 Classification and Pay Plan by reassigning the assistant to the city manager position in the City Manager’s Office.**

- B142-14 Amending the FY 2014 Annual Budget by adding two energy technician positions in the Water and Light Department; appropriating funds.**

- B143-14 Authorizing a right of use permit with Kim and Steve Stonecipher-Fisher to allow construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a retaining wall within a portion of the drainage easement on Lot 131 of Westcliff Plat 1 located on the north side of Surrey Court.**

- R102-14 Setting a public hearing: extension of an electric distribution circuit from the Rebel Hill Substation located on St. Charles Road to provide additional load serving capacity to the downtown area.**

- R103-14 Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements at Woodridge Park to include an ADA accessible playground, concrete walking trail, trail connectors to existing walkways, a council ring and a one-table shelter.
- R104-14 Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements at Norma Sutherland Smith Park – Phase I to include a large shelter, restroom, fitness trail, wetland ponds and a 60-car parking lot.
- R105-14 Setting a public hearing: determining if the Tiger Hotel tax increment financing redevelopment project is making satisfactory progress under the proposed time schedule contained within the approved plans for completion of such project.
- R106-14 Authorizing an agreement with Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri for the provision of Title X family planning services.
- R107-14 Transferring funds to allow members of the Citizens Police Review Board to attend the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) conference.
- R108-14 Authorizing the temporary closure of a portion of the westbound driving lane and sidewalk on the north side of Rollins Street, west of the Rollins Street and College Avenue intersection, to allow for the replacement of steam and condensate lines.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER (except for R106-14 on which she voted no), HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

None.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B144-14 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code as it relates to occupancy classifications, frost-protected shallow foundations and limiting the time for filing an appeal for building construction code violations.
- B145-14 Approving the Final Plat of Parkside Estates, Plat No. 1 located on the east side of Route K and adjacent to Southbrook Court; authorizing a performance contract.
- B146-14 Approving the Final Plat of Joann Subdivision Plat 1 located on the northeast corner of Joann Street and Mills Drive; authorizing a performance contract.
- B147-14 Approving the Final Plat of Farley's, Plat No. 4, a Replat of Part of Lots "O" and "P" of Farley's Second Addition, located on the west side of Sexton Road and north of Mikel Street (7080 W. Sexton Road); authorizing a performance contract.
- B148-14 Authorizing an administrative services agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for administrative and grant coordination services.

- B149-14 Authorizing extension of an electric distribution circuit from the Rebel Hill Substation located on St. Charles Road to provide additional load serving capacity to the downtown area.
- B150-14 Approving the transfer of customers and sale of facilities from Boone Electric Cooperative to the City of Columbia under the territorial agreement with Boone Electric Cooperative; authorizing a Customer Exchange Agreement with Boone Electric Cooperative; authorizing a Contract for Purchase and Sale of Distribution Facilities with Boone Electric Cooperative; authorizing the City Manager to make joint application to the public service commission and to take any other required actions with Boone Electric Cooperative for the exchange of customers.
- B151-14 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code to establish a non-standard electric meter option.
- B152-14 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B153-14 Authorizing the construction of improvements at Woodridge Park to include an ADA accessible playground, concrete walking trail, trail connectors to existing walkways, a council ring and a one-table shelter; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; authorizing a Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant Agreement with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources; appropriating funds.
- B154-14 Approving the Norma Sutherland Smith Park Master Plan; authorizing the construction of improvements at Norma Sutherland Smith Park – Phase I to include a large shelter, restroom, fitness trail, wetland ponds and a 60-car parking lot; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B155-14 Authorizing a license agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Grindstone Creek Trail connection under U.S. Route 63.
- B156-14 Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Public School District to substitute a playground improvement project at David H. Hickman High School in place of the New Haven Elementary School, Parkade Elementary School, Fairview Elementary School and Russell Boulevard Elementary School playground improvement projects.
- B157-14 Authorizing an internship program agreement with the Society of Municipal Arborists to sponsor an urban/community forestry intern at the Parks and Recreation Department; appropriating funds.
- B158-14 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code to change the membership requirement for the Board of Plumbing Examiners.
- B159-14 Authorizing Amendment No. 5 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for Maternal Child Health Services.
- B160-14 Amending the FY 2014 Annual Budget to add a 0.10 FTE health educator position in the Department of Public Health and Human Services.
- B161-14 Amending the FY 2014 Annual Budget to add a 0.75 FTE assistant city counselor position in the Law Department; appropriating funds.
- B162-14 Authorizing the repeal of Ordinance No. 022010 which approved a development agreement with Opus Development Company, L.L.C.
- B163-14 Calling a special election in the City of Columbia, Missouri, to be held on Tuesday, November 4, 2014, for the purpose of approving or rejecting Ordinance No. 022010 which authorized the City Manager to execute a

development agreement with Opus Development Company, L.L.C. as it relates to property located on the north side of Locust Street, between Seventh Street and Eighth Street.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP53-14 Ban the Box Recommendation from the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence.

Mayor McDavid asked if this would apply to the University of Missouri. Mr. Matthes replied he believed it would apply to everyone within the City. Mr. Trapp stated he had broached this matter with Gary Ward today, and although he did not take a stand on it, he had indicated he was interested in the City's experiences since the City had not included that question on its application since 2012.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to bring forward a Ban the Box ordinance for Council consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the work on this. He recalled recommending someone that had a felony that was more than ten years old to be on the Citizen Police Oversight Committee, which eventually recommended the establishment of the Citizens Police Review Board, because he felt he would be a valuable addition to the committee, and he ultimately had to withdraw his name due to the public outcry. He thought this was long in coming and was a reasonable approach to take.

Mayor McDavid stated this would be vetted by the community, and they would have the benefit of public debate and analysis.

Ms. Hoppe commented that Columbia was a large re-entry area and this would go a long way to help people show their ability to create a new life and help their families.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Trapp directing staff to bring forward a Ban the Box ordinance for Council consideration was approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP54-14 Smart Grid Study.

Mayor McDavid commented that this was an evolving technology that would likely grow to become the de-facto standard for the way utilities were monitored. It had certain advantages related to productivity for the utility and in terms of energy usage and conservation for the customer.

Mr. Johnsen stated there were many tools in terms of a smart grid or communications grid, and there would be longer discussions as staff brought associated items forward. He pointed out staff did not plan to bring forward anything right away. A pilot project could be brought forward in 2-3 years for a narrow geographic area. They were looking at the technology and back office support at this time as that was needed for it to work.

Ms. Nauser asked that staff not only look at the great attributes of the system, but also the lawsuits and whether the benefits and savings to the customer were real. Mr. Johnsen explained part of the reason they had not moved forward was because more experience was needed. He noted one of the reports included had been generated by the Missouri Public Service Commission, which he found to be interesting, and encouraged the Council to read it.

Mr. Trapp understood the City was not a big enough utility to have the economy of scale to make the investment worthwhile at this time, and asked there was a possibility of joining a consortium or group of utilities. Mr. Johnsen replied he was not sure as the economies of the scale were tied to technology and the cost of technology. He thought it was dependent on where one was from a metering and system configuration perspective. The City had already engaged in automatic meter reads (AMRs), so they already had people drive around with handheld devices to collect meter data on a once a month. In order to use the existing meter infrastructure, they would need to have a collection system and they were not ready for that as they did not have all of the back office data to support it. The available technology needed to be fitted to the community.

Mayor McDavid commented that as they moved toward 1-gigabyte fiber service to the home in whatever format, this would catalyze the City's ability to move to this technology. Mr. Johnsen stated there were many options engaged in the collection system, and was one reason for a pilot.

REP55-14 Columbia Transit Rebranding as COMO Connect.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that he had asked for a report, but since many of these initiatives would begin in August, he thought it would be more appropriate to receive the report after June 30. It could then be used as the ongoing metric.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the brand, the colors, the design, all of the information on the bus stops, etc. He understood "COMO Connect" would be on the buses, the booklet, etc., and COMO Connect would be the transit system. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala commented that he had never been a huge fan of referring to Columbia as COMO, but would support this.

Mayor McDavid commented that it was about customer service, and he was waiting for the ability of tickets to be purchased on smartphones.

Ms. Chadwick assumed the color palette choices were the colors of the bus routes. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. Ms. Chadwick noted many colors were similar, and thought the purple was hard to identify as purple. Mr. Brooks stated it was probably due to the nature of the printout. He explained staff would have to use different colors for all kinds of different formats. He noted the colors tended to blend on iPads due to the retina display so they were finding colors in print formats were different in other formats. He pointed out they were trying to use high school colors, but found they were very close when placed beside each other so they had to tweak it. Ms. Chadwick stated she thought the design was really great overall.

REP56-14 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

REP57-14 Certification regarding the "Petition to Repeal Improperly Enacted Downtown Development Bill" after Submittal of a Supplementary Petition.

Mr. Matthes explained the decision-making point on a lot of this would be at the next Council Meeting, to include a report with preliminary thoughts in terms of funding the downtown sewer problem and items related to Opus.

Ms. Hoppe asked how the ordinances with the option to repeal the first Opus agreement or send it to a public ballot would work with the new Opus agreement. Ms. Thompson replied staff would know more and be able to answer more question at the next meeting. She explained a contingent repeal of Ordinance No. 022010 was done with the amended and restated development agreement with Opus that provided for modification of the plan in terms of active living spaces along the Avenue of the Columns, and that contingent repeal expired June 9, 2014 so they would know more then. The ordinances under the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda were to repeal Ordinance No. 022010 and to submit the repeal of that ordinance to the voters.

Ms. Nauser understood there were other options as well. Ms. Thompson stated there might be other options. Mr. Matthes thought every scenario would be on the table at the next meeting. Ms. Nauser understood this report only certified the petition.

Ms. Hoppe asked what was happening with the Opus project in the meantime. She wondered whether any permits had or would be issued. Ms. Chadwick understood there was not a stay in terms of permits at this time, and asked if that was correct. Ms. Thompson replied the City was under an administrative stay due to the petition and was not taking any additional action on the development agreement until it was determined whether or not it would be repealed or the second agreement would go into effect.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Kelly Pascucci, 1107 Merrill Court, stated she was opposed to smart grids and the rumors of a proposed ordinance. She thought it was arrogant of Columbia Water and Light to assume smart grid and smart meters were safe, and understood they had not taken into account the findings of 29 doctors from ten countries, who were experts on biological effects of radiofrequency and whose findings were reported in the Bioinitiative Report. She stated radiofrequency radiation was real, and noted she had a radiofrequency meter that made the invisible visible. Evidence showed health damages were being perpetrated upon residents in her house and all around neighborhood. She explained cell phones were not like smart meters as they were used voluntarily, had on/off switches, and could be put on airplane mode to eliminate exposure. She thought it was inconsistent to add a building code to require a passive system that would cost \$150-\$300 for new construction to divert radon gas from a home, while exposing homes to radiofrequency radiation from smart meters, smart appliances and thermostats as they would be required for the utility to get its money's worth from the entire network. She commented that there was a tradeoff between efficiency and privacy. She stated mainstream media, such as Forbes, Time, Consumer Digest, and Smart Grid News, had admitted to the fact a smart meter was a peeping tom. The granular data collected was unreasonable and an invasion of privacy as smart meters gathered and disseminated personal information and put everyone at risk while in their homes.

Hal Williams, 208 W. Sexton Road, commented that when he purchased his home, he had complained to the Health Department regarding the overgrowth, old shack fencing, tires, etc. on the properties located at 106, 108, 110 Sexton Road and the lots immediately to the south of those lots, and last year he had complained to the Office of Neighborhood Services. He understood the Columbia Housing Authority owned these lots, and the tires were still there and were a breeding ground for mosquitos. In addition, the vegetation included invasive species. He thought it was time the City took care of the problem, and asked that something be done by next week. He noted if this was on his property, he would get cited. Mayor McDavid asked Mr. Williams to e-mail him and Ms. Chadwick so they could refer the issue to staff. Mr. Williams replied he would do that.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, understood the government had chosen to raise the radiation standard, and asked the City to follow the news. He commented that a former homeless person was now making more than \$20 per hour in Columbia, Missouri, and he hoped there would be more situations like this in the future. He explained the shelter on Wilkes needed \$50,000 to stay open from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday – Friday, and hoped the City could assist with this situation.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, commented that a constitutional amendment known as the “Right to Farm” would be on the August ballot, and explained Missouri family farmers were currently protected from foreign corporations owning extensive farmland and operating ranches within the State, but that amendment, Amendment 1, would take that protection away. If “Right to Farm” became law, most local governments would lose their ability to stop foreign agricultural corporations from polluting and contaminating the State as they had done in their own countries. Over 40 percent of the land in China had been degraded, and 20 percent was considered fully polluted. She felt property values would sharply decline in areas where concentrated animal feeding operations currently existed or would exist in the future. She believed Missouri legislators and voters could have a healthy debate on whether or not foreign corporations and large multi-national corporations should be able to own farmland, but did not think it should be written into the State constitution. This was a radical step that prevented legislators and voters from having any say on issues relating to farmland, animal welfare, and the environment. The State constitution was written to protect citizens, not foreign corporations. She stated “Right to Farm” would take away local control, so she wanted the Council to know about it.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she had a request for bus passes from a constituent of the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association as they would tour the Family Impact Center on June 7, and asked if providing bus passes was possible. Mr. Matthes replied bus passes were for sale. If they were asking for free passes, it was the decision of Council.

Ms. Nauser stated she did not think the Council should provide free bus passes on a regular basis.

Ms. Chadwick made a motion directing staff to issue 10 bus passes for the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association to travel to the Family Impact Center.

Mr. Matthes assumed this would take place during the day. Ms. Chadwick stated the meeting was Saturday, June 7, 2104, but did not know the exact time.

Mr. Thomas thought the Council should think about the issue of setting a precedent.

The motion made Ms. Chadwick directing staff to issue 10 bus passes for the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association to travel to the Family Impact Center was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala stated he was sympathetic to the idea of subsidizing transit with regard to a pseudo-civic organization for a civic exercise, but was uncomfortable with the idea of providing a subsidy to a neighborhood association to attend a meeting. He thought they needed a policy versus allowing this on an ad-hoc basis.

Mr. Matthes pointed out there were limits on what the City was allowed to do since they accepted federal money.

Ms. Chadwick asked if this had ever been done before. Ms. Hoppe replied it had not been done before.

Mr. Thomas noted the Council had authorized Council reserve funds to pay for travel to the emergency homeless shelters, but in the end that was not used. Ms. Chadwick stated she understood why funds were used for the emergency shelter and did not think this was the same situation.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed the motion of Ms. Chadwick was well-intended, but thought these types of request should be managed by a broader policy, and noted he could not support the motion.

The motion made Ms. Chadwick and seconded by Mr. Trapp directing staff to issue 10 bus passes for the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association to travel to the Family Impact Center was defeated unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Chadwick thanked City staff for getting the baseball fields ready for the big event at Douglass Park. The Police and Fire Departments played each other, and many community members were involved as well.

Ms. Chadwick asked staff to look into the issue of alcohol at Douglass Park, and suggested it be made an alcohol-free park. She also wondered if there was an intoxication ordinance, and if there was not, she wanted staff to look into it because public intoxication was also an issue.

Mr. Griggs stated alcohol was allowed in all City parks. He explained former Council Member Fred Schmidt had asked staff to investigate the alcohol issue in Douglass Park. They participated in many meetings and met with several community leaders, and ultimately the majority felt it was a little too prohibitive to only restrict it at Douglass Park.

Mayor McDavid asked if staff could provide a report with that information. Mr. Griggs replied yes.

Mr. Skala thought this same discussion had occurred in 2007 or 2008 and essentially the same conclusion was reached. Ms. Chadwick commented that there was obviously a concern since this issue continued to come up. Mr. Skala agreed, but pointed out the decision to not restrict it had also been consistent up to this point.

Mr. Griggs commented that if the Council wanted to proceed in that direction again, he would suggest they start the process over in terms of discussions and obtaining input.

Ms. Chadwick asked if there was a drinking issue in any other park. Mr. Griggs replied no. He explained alcohol was allowed in other parks, mainly for family reunions and other activities. He pointed out the City actually sold alcohol in several facilities, such as the golf courses and the athletic fields.

Ms. Hoppe suggested reviewing the documentation from the previous time this was discussed. Mayor McDavid stated he would like to see it as well. Mr. Griggs stated staff could come back with a report. Mayor McDavid asked if it had already been provided as a report. Mr. Griggs thought a formal report had never been provided as Mr. Schmidt decided to not pursue it. Ms. Chadwick understood there had not been the political will to change it at that time, but she had been asked about this by some constituents and had the support of a few other people.

Mr. Griggs thought staff could revisit with the people they had previously met with and report back to Council.

Ms. Chadwick asked for the recommendation of Chief Burton. Mr. Griggs understood Chief Burton supported the idea but had concerns about enforcement.

Ms. Chadwick asked staff to provide a report with regard to the idea of banning alcohol in Douglass Park, and for clarification on any intoxication ordinance the City might have and how it was enforced.

Mr. Trapp noted the Broadway street sign was missing at Broadway and Old 63.

Mr. Trapp stated he had been impressed that the recommendation for the solar project had come from the Water and Light Advisory Board, and an ordinance implementing it had come before the Council only a couple months later. He thanked staff for bringing it forward in a quick manner.

Ms. Hoppe stated she would like staff to look at the possibility of undergrounding the utility lines on Anthony Street through the East Campus Neighborhood as part of the Rebel Hill project that would be discussed at the next Council Meeting. A representative of Boone Hospital had attended the interested parties meeting last week, and had indicated interest in undergrounding the utilities on Ann Street, so she also wanted staff to contact Boone Hospital to determine if they could coordinate and cooperate in that effort by pooling funds.

Ms. Hoppe asked when the permanent improvements at the College Avenue, Ash Street, and Windsor Street intersection would be completed as the yellow plastic delineators had been at that location for years.

Ms. Hoppe noted Mr. Glascock had talked about the need for the pedestrian crossing on Broadway to have flashing lights that were closer together so they were more effective, and asked for the timetable for that improvement.

Ms. Nauser stated the Boys and Girls Club of Columbia had asked the City Council to sign a letter of support for their application for youth opportunity program tax credits so they

could continue to supply tax credits to raise funds to continue their mission of providing services for at-risk youth in the community. In 2009, the Council adopted a policy resolution indicating the City would work to become a youth and family-friendly community based upon five promises. She thought the Council had signed this letter in the two previous years so this would be the third year. She asked her fellow Council Members to sign the letter in support of their efforts to obtain these tax credits.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was agreeable to signing the letter.

Mr. Thomas had wondered if there was a policy resolution so they would know what to do if asked for something similar by another organization.

Mayor McDavid commented that he might overstep his bounds, but he was asked all of the time to write letters of support, and he did. Mr. Thomas asked if he did it on his own account or the City's account. Mayor McDavid replied he was the Mayor. He noted he spoken in favor of public housing tax credits for Columbia. Mr. Thomas thought this program might be competitive between different organizations within Columbia. Mayor McDavid understood.

Mr. Skala pointed out that as an individual, the Mayor or a City Council Member could show support for something. There had been a situation in the past when former Mayor Darwin Hindman implied the Council was on board with something it had not been, but that was generally not the case.

Mr. Skala commented that some constituents had asked about a traffic study in the area of East Walnut Street and Old 63, which was in conjunction with a final plat approval. He asked staff to follow up on the issue.

Mr. Skala understood an ordinance with regard to interim C-2 zoning had been referred to the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the Commission had now tabled the issue twice. He commented that he had read Section 20-40 of the Columbia Code of Ordinances, and although it indicated no zoning ordinance could be finally considered by Council unless the same was first submitted to the Commission for its examination and recommendation, it did not indicate how that recommendation needed to be delivered. He noted they had received recommendations from many groups, and asked for a work session or report that included the current deliberations of the Planning and Zoning Commission along with the recommendations from these other groups so this issue could be moved forward.

Ms. Chadwick stated she was confused as to whether Council had to wait until the Planning and Zoning Commission made a recommendation. Mr. Skala replied he did not believe they did. Ms. Thompson explained that typically the Council would wait until they received a recommendation, but if the Commission was not planning to provide a recommendation, the Council could move forward. It did need to be referred to the Commission for its recommendation. Ms. Chadwick understood it had been referred.

Mayor McDavid asked what meeting the Planning and Zoning Commission would address the issue. Ms. Chadwick replied she thought it was the July 26, 2014 Commission meeting. Ms. Thompson thought the Planning and Zoning Commission was reviewing it, and

noted a formal proposal would need to be provided. She thought they were looking at a work session before they got that point.

Mr. Thomas commented that he would like to make a formal proposal for a systematic policy to provide free bus tickets to all K-12 students in Columbia or kids that were younger. He noted the City already provided free bus travel for children up to five years of age, and at the moment K-12 students paid a half-fare, which was \$0.75 per ride. He asked staff to calculate the cost of this change for the FY 2015 budget. He did not think it would be much since they only paid a half-fare and because not many rode the bus. He thought it would be an incredible promotion for the bus system if they could announce youth rode free and promote it through schools and other youth organizations. He pointed out a tremendous proportion of graduating high school students in Columbia attended Mizzou, so this could begin to change the culture of students at Mizzou over a number of years.

Mr. Thomas noted the parking fees in Columbia were low when compared with comparable cities. The City had raised the monthly permit fee in the parking garages last year, and suggested they look at meter fees this year, particularly those close to the University where the Council really wanted to see more turnover and wanted to discourage students from parking. He noted the gold and black bus routes were specifically designed to go through campus to serve students and thought that effort could be augmented by raising meter fees close to campus.

Mayor McDavid suggested they involve the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council as the topic had been contentious when they previously raised rates. Mr. Thomas stated he did not recall doing this when the garage rates were raised a year ago. Mr. Matthes thought staff notified groups and invited them to budget process meetings. Mr. Thomas suggested doing that in order to get a sense of any concerns early in the process. Mr. Matthes stated they could send them a letter.

Mr. Thomas reiterated Council first needed to know how much needed to be recouped to pay for lost revenue from kids up to the age 18 riding for free, and he also thought they needed to come up with a strategy for enforcing payment for those over the age of 18. He wondered if they could ask for a student ID card.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to use Council reserve funds to provide free bus tickets to all people in Columbia attending K-12 education or those of a younger age from August 5, 2014 when the COMO Connect routes were implemented to September 30, 2014. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid commented that a couple of years ago the Council had been surprised to find out how many people were not paying parking tickets. He thought their names were published in the paper in order to shame them into paying. He asked for a report with the number of parking tickets issued and a status as to whether the fines were being paid.

Mayor McDavid noted he had come across an International City/County Management Association (ICMA) white paper regarding police department staffing, which was based upon

work load, and wanted to know where the City stood in comparison to the table with metrics included in the report. It also recommended conducting an hourly tabulation of peak workload in February and August. He understood zero status, which meant every officer was on a call, should not occur. He thought this analysis would provide a framework of the workload demanded of police officers, and believed it would show the workload was too high.

Mr. Skala felt that was an excellent idea so the Council knew the baseline. He suggested it be layered with what they saw in the future as he understood community policing created a much greater load.

Mayor McDavid commented that the point was that an officer that was on a call for service or doing administrative work for a previous call for service was not available for community policing. He understood there was a law of sixty in that 60 percent or less of their time should be on those items so they had 40 percent discretionary time to do community policing. He hoped benchmarks could be constructed and defined. Mr. Thomas stated he liked that because it put some real data behind it.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the number of officers responding to an incident was also measured. Mayor McDavid replied this metric showed the average number of responding units to a call for service, total service time for a call for service, workload percentage, and average response time. He thought it was a metric they could use to compare. Ms. Hoppe noted she wanted data to ensure a good use of officer time. She explained she thought a bicyclist had been hit at Old 63 and Broadway, and that bicyclist was sitting on the curb with a community service person and five police cars came to the incident while she was in the area even though the incident happened 20-30 minutes earlier. She wondered if the number of officers who responded to an incident was being monitored and whether the City was ensuring it was appropriate. She thought that was an important part of the analysis. Mayor McDavid understood the mean was 1.2 responding units to a call for service. He thought they should be able to get that information.

Mayor McDavid made a motion for the City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri, to hold a closed meeting on Monday, June 16, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1A/1B of City Hall, 701 E. Broadway, Columbia, Missouri to discuss legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives and its attorneys, as authorized by Section 610.021(1) of the Revised Statutes of Missouri. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp, and the vote was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

Mr. Thomas noted he was going to be unable to attend the June 16, 2014 Council Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:08 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk