

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
MARCH 16, 2015**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 16, 2015, 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 TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE and MCDAVID were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of March 2, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Trapp.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Upon her request, Mr. Trapp made a motion to allow Ms. Nauser to abstain from voting on R46-15 due to a conflict of interest. Ms. Nauser noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that her family business involved alcohol sales. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, including the consent agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions.

CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD

Meyer, Alan, 5200 Rice Road, Ward 3, Term to expire November 1, 2017
Smith, Darryl, 5 Lexibelle Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire November 1, 2017

COLUMBIA LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD

Markie, Kathleen, 316 E. Briarwood Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire June 30, 2017

COMMUNITY TREE TASK FORCE

Behounek, Joshua, 1101 Larail Drive, Ward 5
Cass, Dan, 605 W. Broadway, Ward 1
Koenig, Ann, 2 E. Ridgeley Road, Ward 5
Ott, John, 212 Bingham Road, Ward 5
Ratliff, Scott, 8025 S. High Point Lane, Boone County
Spencer, Pam, 2215 Hillsboro Drive, Ward 2

MAYOR’S COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND HEALTH

Bastida, Annie, 101 W. Green Meadows Road, Apt. 1, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2017

Drury, Chris, 805 Canterbury Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2017

Todd, Marissa, 1604 Hickam Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire November 30, 2017

PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Hoffman, Heather, 1501 W. Ash Street, Apt. A, Ward 1, Term to expire March 1, 2016

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B54-15 Authorizing the replacement and upgrade of a water main along Texas Avenue, between Garth Avenue and Creasy Springs Road; determining that the work shall be done by City employees.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if funding for this project would come from user fees or the capital improvement tax. Mr. Johnsen replied the project would be funded from the last water bond issue so it would be funded with user fees.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he was supportive of this project and was appreciative this water main project would be coordinated with the road overlay project so the newly overlaid roadway would not be torn up for the water main. He was hopeful something could be done with regard to the Texas Avenue dip when the overlay was completed as it was a frequent source of concern.

Mayor McDavid noted this project spoke to the City’s commitment to repair and rehabilitate legacy infrastructure.

B54-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

(A) Construction of the County House Trail Phase 2 project from the intersection of College Park Drive and Stadium Boulevard to Rollins Road.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked why the money for this project could not be used to hire firefighters. Mr. Matthes replied this project would be funded with a federal grant that could not be used for any other purpose. Mayor McDavid understood the Council could approve this project and Options 1 and 3 associated with the next project, and asked how those projects would be managed if there was not enough funding for all of them. Mr. Glascock replied staff would determine how much money was available in the Parks and Recreation

Department budget and the Public Works Department budget for these types of projects, and if there was not enough funding, staff would ask Council to prioritize the projects. Mr. Matthes explained the Council needed to decide the alignments tonight and staff would then come forward with a funding plan.

Mayor McDavid commented that he had to be convinced this project was doable without a lot of switchbacks as there was a 20-30 foot drop-off from Rollins Road. Mr. Glascock explained there were switchbacks on other trails, and provided the trails at Greenbriar and Old 63 near the bridge as examples. He pointed out they needed to know the preferred alignments of Council tonight and noted staff would bring forward an ordinance with the needed easements at a future date. Mayor McDavid understood the Council would have the opportunity to be critical of the grades and locations of the switchbacks at that time if they authorized proceeding with plans tonight. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Matthes noted Council would have the opportunity to reprioritize as well.

Mr. Skala asked what was envisioned in terms of connectivity on the north side if this project was constructed. Mr. Nichols replied there were various conceptual alignments with the goal of connecting the Twin Lakes Recreation Area to the Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area. Another GetAbout project involved a sidewalk on Manor Drive so Manor Drive was a connection that would cross Broadway and continue north.

Ms. Hoppe understood the stormwater pipe under Rollins Road needed to be replaced and that the project might include a box culvert, and asked if staff had looked at the possibility of enlarging or deepening that culvert so the trail could go through there. She wondered if it could be similar to what was at Providence. Mr. Nichols replied staff had not looked at going through the box culvert, but agreed it might help with grade changes if stormwater funds were available for it. Ms. Hoppe thought going through the box culvert might be a possible solution as it would not encroach on the property owners. Mr. Nichols stated a more in-depth study would be required to determine if that was possible.

Mr. Skala understood the money for the trail project and the money for the stormwater project were segregated, and that they were two separate projects. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Mr. Skala understood the stormwater project was an anticipated project. Mr. Glascock explained it was something that needed to be looked into when they moved forward in terms of cost-effectiveness. Mr. Nichols understood that pipe would need attention sometime soon.

Ms. Hoppe asked if staff had looked at a connection east and south of Russell Boulevard Elementary School, so not as much of the hill would need to be climbed. Mr. Bitterman replied that had been brought up at the interested parties meeting, but it was not an alignment staff had reviewed in 2007. He commented that anything had the potential to be feasible, but it was not an alignment they had reviewed. Mr. Nichols thought staff had been provided direction to study this particular alignment, and not one east toward the school.

Mr. Thomas asked if there would be a pedestrian activated crosswalk across College Park Drive to get from where the trail came out at the box culvert under Stadium Boulevard to the west side. Mr. Bitterman replied yes.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, explained she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition and voiced its support for the proposed County House Trail Phase 2 project. The existing County House Trail connected many neighborhoods located to the north of the MKT Trail to the MKT Trail, and from the MKT Trail people could travel to many of the community's major destinations. Phase 2 of the County House Trail project would further extend this opportunity for non-motorized transportation to the neighborhoods north of Stadium Boulevard. She believed this trail extension was an important step toward the goal of expanding the trail system to serve more of the community and toward the ultimate goal of encouraging mode shift to non-motorized travel. She understood there had been concern with regard to the grade of the hill as it intersected Rollins Road and noted best practice was to follow creeks where the land was the flattest so the majority of the route was easy to travel. She stated there would always be a climb out of the valley, but the route would be most usable, appealing, and convenient for transportation when it followed the level land near the creek. She pointed out the County House Trail had been in the City's trail plans since 2002 and had been approved by Council in 2013 as one of the remaining priority projects with GetAbout funds. She asked the Council to approve this trail tonight to complete the long awaited project.

Glenn Chambers, 807 Cornell, stated he and his wife, Jeannie, had worked hard for their home, which would be impacted by this trail, and noted they were not willing sellers. He commented that he had moved to Columbia in 1958 to complete his Masters in Wildlife Management at the University of Missouri and had worked for the Department of Conservation for 25 years, Ducks Unlimited for 10 years, and National Geographic Television for 5 years. He explained they had owned property in three different locations in Columbia, and had moved to 807 Cornell in 1990 for a more quiet, pristine, and scenic area. He stated he was an advocate for wildlife habitat and listed some of the critters that had disappeared since the previous easement had been established because the old growth had been removed. He provided a handout as well.

Janelle Patterson, 1917 Vassar, commented that removing the trees and pouring concrete in this area would make it more prone to flooding. She noted they had been told this money could not be used for sidewalks during the interested parties meetings, but understood sidewalks would be placed on Manor Drive. She pointed out the sidewalks on College Park Drive needed to be replaced as they were in horrible condition, and asked for clarification as to why these funds could not be used to address those sidewalk needs. She wondered how many people whose land this trail would affect wanted the trail as she did not believe there were many. She thought the City needed to consider what the neighbors wanted and look at other options.

Sara Loe, 1900 Vassar, stated she fully supported the bike trail system, but had concerns regarding the degree of study that had gone into this proposal. After taking steps to restrict the amount of impervious paving in a new development to reduce the impact of runoff in an adjacent natural area, she believed it was hypocritical to support the installation of impervious paving in a natural watershed in an existing neighborhood without a comment on the environmental or ecological impact or without a proposal of alternative methods or means, such as pervious concrete. The current and continued use of this right-of-way would

be for a utility access road, so the pavement would need to meet minimum standards for utility roads. She explained an adequate gravel base would be required in addition to the minimum six-inches of concrete and an area to turnaround. While the need for the route to act as a utility road was noted in some of the memos, there seemed to be a tendency to describe the project only as a trail. She stated she wanted to confirm the use and construction of the route as a utility road would not jeopardize the use of non-motorized transportation pilot program funds causing the need for the City to fund this project by other means later. She asked that adequate studies be performed and for alternates to be considered prior to approving this project.

Steve Windmoeller, 705 E. Rockcreek Drive, commented that there had been a traffic calming initiative in the College Park area because vehicles traveled at a high rate of speed on College Park Drive making it unsafe for kids on bikes. He noted there was a sidewalk on only one side of College Park Drive, and it was in pretty bad shape. It was also difficult for people to ride or walk up College Park Drive. He felt this proposed trail project would be helpful as it would provide a flat connector. He stated his home was the second house to the north of the current metal culvert that went under Rollins Road, and in 2010, that culvert collapsed and flooded his basement with three feet of water. He believed this trail route would actually help any flooding problems if done in conjunction with the installation of the box culvert that would go under Rollins Road, and asked the Council to support the project.

Tate Windmoeller, 705 E. Rockcreek Drive, stated he had lived in this area his entire life and felt this was a great opportunity to build a trail in a beautiful area. He noted it would give young children and families a place to walk and enjoy, and thought it would be sad for that opportunity to not exist or be provided. He explained the flood in 2010 had been devastating as his family had lost a lot, and believed an improvement to the box culvert would be beneficial as well.

Gregory Heifner, 1914 Dartmouth, explained he had lived at this location for the last 35 years and had built there for privacy reasons. He noted he had 30 feet across the front of his property to the cul-de-sac, and that 250 feet of property along the back side of his home would be affected by this trail proposal. He stated children traveled up and down the hills on sidewalks in the area even with very little lighting, and a path existed that the City had not maintained in a decent manner. He thought it was capricious and did not make sense for the City to take his property for a road for public use.

Jeannie Chambers, 807 Cornell, commented that she was concerned about habitat destruction and loss. She understood the development of walking and biking trails was important and noted she and her husband, Glenn, were supportive of those types of exercises, but noted they did not feel this would meet the needs of children. She pointed out her lot was one of two lots that would be affected, and 22-23 percent of their lot would be taken from them. She noted they were not willing sellers. She stated another concern was that this would be a trail to nowhere as it ended at Rollins Road and there was no way to go across or up Rockcreek Drive. She asked the Council to ensure consideration of all options, and to research all avenues before making a decision.

Scott Lincoln stated he was an avid trail user and a property owner whose property would be taken to complete the County House Trail extension, and he was supportive of this

action. He explained he could not imagine an argument either for or against this extension of the trail system that had not been made previously. He believed this extension was a part of a larger picture of smiles, waves, and nods and stops to enjoy nature, to include a red tail hawk resting in a sycamore as he had seen this past week. He noted a few of his friends had moved to Columbia or planned to Columbia after nationwide searches of communities with trails. He felt this was a small and important part of the trail system, and asked the Council to vote in favor of the extension.

Wendy Lister, 1906 Princeton Drive, commented that her home would back up to the alley that would make the trail, and asked Council for its support as she believed this was a great trail project.

Dan Harder, 1803 Bluff Pointe Drive, stated he lived on the east side of town, but noted he had grown up a block or two from the Southwest Swim Club, and many people in the area either walked or rode their bicycles there. He thought he would have definitely taken advantage of a trail such as this when he lived in the area, and believed this trail extension would be an improvement to the City.

Michelle Windmoeller, 705 Rockcreek Drive, stated she and her neighbors currently had access to the County House Trail Phase 1, but a giant hill made it difficult for them to get to it. This proposed trail connector would help them get to that trail, the MKT, the Katy Trail, and the rest of Columbia, which she thought was important for the many kids that lived in the neighborhood.

Lawrence Simonson, 2706 Hillshire Drive, stated he was in favor of the County House Trail Phase 2 project as he and his son used Phase 1 quite frequently. He noted he thought this proposed extension would be well-used by those in the neighborhood as had been shown historically with trails. He understood some people were fearful of change, but knew this change would be positive in the end. He also understood not wanting too many switchbacks, but pointed out switchbacks were necessary from time to time because the alternative to switchbacks in a beautifully wooded area was to go up College Park Drive, which was a very busy road with high speeds. He explained he preferred to coach his four year old son through switchback in a wooded area without any motor vehicle traffic than coaching him down a high speed straight and wide road. He urged the Council to vote in favor of the County House Trail Phase 2 project.

Dee Dee Strnad, 803 Cornell, commented that she lived at the corner of Rollins Road and Cornell and felt this would be a trail to nowhere as it would end at Rollins Road. She noted bicycle routes were painted on College Park Drive, and felt the police should ticket those that sped as they had done in the past. She did not believe this was a good proposal at this time.

Joe Silsby, 1105 S. Glenwood Avenue, stated he was an independent contractor with the GetAbout program and oftentimes spoke with people that did not realize the shortcuts to trails or where certain trails were located. He believed people sometimes did not realize the benefits of trails until those trails were constructed. He commented that he was thankful to the Council that generally voted in favor of trails for the greater good of the community.

Cora Windmoeller, 705 E. Rockcreek Drive, stated she thought this trail was important for families with kids as it would provide a safe way to get around Columbia.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluffdale Drive, stated she was a federal taxpayer that also paid federal flood insurance premiums. She commented that per TranSystems, an engineering firm, the City's flood models were not up to date, and therefore, she did not believe any construction should be allowed in floodplains until those models were updated because any error in engineering would put homes, such as hers, in danger. She explained executive orders were tied to Federal Highway Administration funds, and referred to some involving environmental stewardship, transportation infrastructure project reviews, floodplain management, wetlands protection, etc. She did not believe there had been an adequate review of the provisions of the GetAbout Columbia grant funds in terms of federal rules and regulations. In addition, she believed the Federal Highway Administration frowned upon eminent domain unless it was for a very necessary project, such as a major highway. She did not feel trail projects benefited enough people to use eminent domain.

Kristin Kopp, 1001 Rollingwood Drive, commented that she was supportive of trails and noted she benefited from the Greenbriar connector that had recently been built. She explained she used to have to go down Forum Boulevard, which was horrible, during her commute to the University of Missouri campus, and pointed out she loved the switchbacks she utilized from the Greenbriar connector to get to work. She noted she also liked the fact she saw so many of her neighbors during her commute, and hoped this same opportunity could be extended to others.

Darwin Hindman, 1223 Frances Drive, commented that one of the goals for the City's wonderful trail system was to interconnect it to neighborhoods, and that had been accomplished with Phase 1 of the County House Branch Trail. This proposal would extend those same benefits to a significant number of new neighborhoods. He pointed out the City owned a street right-of-way that would be used for nearly the entire route of this project, and noted he believed extending this wonderful trail system to these neighborhoods was the highest and best use of the funds.

Dierik Leonhard, 204 E. Parkway Drive, stated he would love for a trail to be located on his street as he was a firm believer in trails. He felt the policies of Columbia were wonderful in terms of compact development, efficient trail systems and roadway, dealing with problems when necessary, etc. He thought wildlife sanctuaries should be located outside of the compact city, and felt in 20 years everyone would be happy this trail was in their backyards.

Judy Lincoln, 811 Cornell, commented that her home was next door to Mr. and Mrs. Chambers and Ms. Strnad, and explained she had seen many birds hit by cars due to being forced to hunt on the side of the road instead of in their natural environment. She stated Rollins Road was much steeper than College Park Drive, so kids would have problems there as well. She asked the Council to consider water mitigation and traffic calming instead and noted she loved walking on gravel trails, but preferred walking on streets instead of concrete trails.

Paul Love, 100 Sondra Avenue, commented that he would benefit if the transit system and trails were extended to the north, but did not believe property for public use should be taken without a great deal of thought. He felt the Council should consider whether it was a need that could otherwise not be met. He agreed this trail would benefit some people, but

people's properties were the crowning achievements of their lives so he felt they needed to ensure this need could not otherwise be met first.

John Riddick, 602 Rollins Court, stated he was in support of this trail. He understood some felt this was a trail to nowhere, but pointed out there was mostly a gentle slope from Rollins Road to Broadway. He believed both the Rollins Road and College Park Drive hills could be avoided by this connector.

Ellen Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, stated the MKT Trail was in her backyard and she and her family used it daily. She had heard concerns for the impacts on wildlife and noted here backyard was full of wildlife. She explained she was an expert birder and had seen more than 60 species of birds including a bald eagle near Twin Lakes a couple of weeks ago. She stated she had also seen many mammals, amphibians, and reptiles. She noted she had commuted on the MKT for over a decade and saw an increase in number of adults and children accessing the trail each time there was a new connection. As a pediatrician, she had seen many children on medication to treat the complications of sedentary lifestyles, and thought the community would be better off by providing children easier and safer ways to be active. She asked the Council to support this addition to the wonderful trail system.

Mihail Popescu, 705 Bluffdale Drive, commented that he could not believe the lack of respect for private property. He stated he moved to the United States to fulfill the American Dream and purchased his property for the beautiful view. He thought the Council should consider the people that had invested their lives and hopes into their homes.

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

Ms. Hoppe noted some speakers had expressed concerns about water due to additional pavement in the area. She understood changes had been made since the Moon Valley project and asked staff to explain how the hydrological effects of the trail were examined and what could be done in terms of mitigation so it was the same after construction as it was prior to construction of the trail. Mr. Glascock replied the City was obligated to follow and meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for these projects, and MoDOT and the Federal Highway Administration had to approve the projects. He explained wetlands and ponding would occur with a stream like the Hinkson Creek as that was part of the stream. He stated he was not sure of the characteristics of this particular stream, but thought it was likely steeper than the Hinkson Creek so it would likely not pond, but areas might need to be filled and reseeded later to ensure there was not standing water that would impact the neighbors.

Mr. Thomas thought there had been a change in practices after the Moon Valley Trail and before the Katy connector behind the movie theater on Forum Boulevard as the walk-through allowed the opportunity to look at the detailed alignment and show how the route was selected for the least amount of environmental impact. Mr. Glascock explained that due the number of years between when projects were initially discussed and set to be constructed, people tended to forget the details, so after the Moon Valley Trail project was completed, staff began staking routes so everyone had the opportunity to walk it. Mr. Thomas stated the Forum/Katy connection was a beautiful trail with trees very close to the trail, and understood it had not had a dramatic impact on the area. Mr. Glascock pointed out staff was trying to

stay in the public right-of-way for the proposed County House Trail Phase 2 project to lessen the impact on private property.

Mr. Skala asked how many people would be impacted by this proposed trail and how many of those were in favor of the trail. Mr. Nichols replied eight easements would be needed, but he was not sure how many were in favor or opposed to providing the easement. Mr. Glascock explained some of those easements would permanent while others would be temporary easements, but it was hard to specify until the detail design was completed. He noted an easement ordinance would come before Council in the future. Mr. Skala understood the bulk of this was a utility easement. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser understood the trail, which followed the sewer line, would be paved, and asked what would happen if heavy equipment needed to travel the route. She wondered if the trail would hold the weight of the equipment. Mr. Glascock replied it would, and explained six inches of concrete would hold most anything as long as it was not being used as a road. Mr. Nichols pointed out the City's residential streets were six-inch non-reinforced streets. Mr. Glascock stated he expected the Sewer Division to ensure nothing needed to be done prior to the construction of the trail as well.

Mayor McDavid stated he was a big fan of trails and would support the approval of County House Trail Phase 2, but thought they needed to understand how this fit into the larger picture. He pointed out the City was nearing the end of the non-motorized transportation grant so approval tonight did not necessarily mean this trail would be built. If the necessary money was not available, the Council would have to prioritize trail projects and decide which trails to fund assuming a future parks sales tax was passed. He pointed out his approval of this project was contingent upon design because he believed the intrusion into the backyards of private property needed to be as minimal as possible.

Mr. Thomas agreed they should value those that chose where to live based upon the environment and the desire for quiet and privacy, but noted the Council also had to consider the entire City, and this connection was a part of the entire system of trails that would allow more people to enjoy the trails. He stated hundreds of homes north of Rollins Road and west of this trail on the other side of Stadium Boulevard would be within one-quarter of a mile from this trailhead, and he was certain this trail would be designed beautifully and similarly to the Forum/Katy connector, which had not damaged the environment. He pointed out the proposed trail would eliminate the need to ride a bike or walk on College Park Drive, which was very steep. In addition, the point where College Park Drive met Rollins Road was much higher than where this trail would come out, and building in the creek corridor would allow for the least amount of gradient possible. He stated they had heard from neighbors that wanted this trail connection, to include some whose property would be impacted by the current proposed design, and explained there were usually concerns by people prior to the building of the trail, but many came to love them afterwards when those concerns did not come to fruition. He pointed out people were moving to Columbia due to the trail system, and this would continue as they provided access to the trail system to more people. He understood staff had made a number of changes to the original alignment in response to concerns, to include concerns of the Southwest Swim Club, who would benefit in terms of young people being able to access their facility by the trail, which would reduce the pressures on their

parking area. He asked staff to look at the possibility of placing the trail under Rollins Road if the culvert would be rebuilt as it would greatly reduce the height that had to be gained on the south side and allow the trail to connect to the north side of Rollins Road, and to consider alternatives that would minimize the impact on private property owners. He commented that he did not believe a 10-foot wide stripe would significantly impact stormwater runoff, and noted a gentle sideways slope to the trail would allow water to slide to the side and soak into the ground. He pointed out that as they built the trail system and encouraged more non-motorized transportation, they would reduce the impacts of wide roads and parking areas, which really caused the stormwater problems. He believed there would be very little if any negative impact on animal life in the area as he saw animals close to trails all of the time. He also thought future generations would grow up to love and preserve the environment if they opened these natural areas to children to experience.

Mr. Skala commented that they had improved the treatment of the natural environment over time in terms of the types of bridges, the clearing of trees, and the preservation of dead trees that might be habitats for some animals. He explained he had evolved to believing the trail system was generally good, but noted there were still some issues, such as the connotation of certain easements and private property rights. In this particular instance, he believed staff had done a lot of work to take advantage of existing city easements and to minimize the amount of impact to private properties. He agreed property values tended to increase near trails and that there was an aesthetic component to this, which might result in more people appreciating the habitat that existed since people would typically not be able to view it otherwise. In addition, he believed public safety benefited by more people walking or biking through neighborhoods and trails. He commented that he was interested in the issue raised by Mayor McDavid in terms of priorities as he was mindful of the budgetary issues as there was a limit to these segregated funds, but noted he was prepared to support this trail project at this point in terms of moving forward with plans and specifications.

Ms. Nauser stated this project would be funded with GetAbout funds and was a transportation project. The purpose of this project was to change the transportation mode people used in getting from Point A to Point B, and although recreation was a component, it was not the goal of this project. She reiterated the primary purpose of these funds was to get people to use alternative transportation from their homes to work, school, a park, etc. She noted automobiles caused far more environmental damage than trails due to the amount of concrete, excavation, etc. needed. In addition, she saw many dead animals on the road due collisions with cars and was not aware of as many of these types of incidents with bicycles. She stated she took property rights very seriously and understood staff would design the trail so it was the least invasive possible. She believed this proposal fit the objectives of the federal funds accepted by the City and as a result would support it. She also pointed out many people had contacted her when the Greenbriar Trail was proposed with many similar concerns, but many of those people that had been opposed to it had told her they loved it at the ribbon cutting event. She thought there would be a similar reaction here. She reiterated she would support this project because it would fulfil the obligation made when the City accepted those federal funds.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she believed those that lived close to but outside of this area were generally very supportive of this project as they could avoid the steepness of the College Park Drive hill while being in a natural area, and the people that lived in the area were also generally supportive with the exception of those who owned property that would be most intensely impacted. She encouraged staff to look at ways in designing this trail so it would have the least impact possible to private property owners. She also thought they might want to consider spending more money on the segments that would impact property owners the most to make the trail better in those areas. She suggested staff consider the box culvert or a raised and straighter area, similar to what had been done for the Audubon Society. She commented that she was not sure how the appraised value of the easements were determined, but felt the property value should increase the closer to the home the trail was located since they would lose more. She explained staff had made improvements since the Moon Valley Trail project so less tree were now removed, and noted scientists involved with the Hinkson Creek Collaborative Adaptive Management group had provided her examples of how to mitigate erosion and water control problems, which she hoped would be considered by staff. Although she would not be on the Council when this came back to them, she hoped staff would continue to improve trail projects using best practices so it was better for the property owners and the environment.

Mr. Trapp stated he was supportive of trying to minimize impacts to the private property owners through the design of the trail, and understood this route had been selected because it ran through City-owned easements so there had already been an attempt to limit the negative involvement on people who preferred not to have the trail on their property. He agreed with Ms. Nauser in that these were funds for a transportation modal shift, and believed this project met the standard for the overall community good, which was not different than when eminent domain was used for streets and sidewalks for the overall community good. He thought this modal shift of moving people from cars to non-motorized transportation would result in less of a negative environmental impact and would ultimately benefit wildlife. He stated he would support the proposal.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for the County House Trail Phase 2 project while exploring all possible ways to minimize the impact to private property in the final design. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(B) Construction of the Shepard to Rollins East-West Connection trail project.

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock indicated John Zimmerman of TranSystems, the City's consultant to this project, would provide the staff report. Mr. Zimmerman provided the staff report.

Mr. Skala stated he assumed Options 1, 2 and 3 all involved high water bridges to cross the creek, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Zimmerman replied that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe understood representatives from certain neighborhoods had selected Option 2 as it would be along the gas easement and fewer trees would be removed, and that this option had been re-routed to provide for a gradual five percent slope and had not been

studied to go along the gas easement even though it could have followed it in some locations, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Zimmerman replied the alignment could be moved a bit to the north to go along the gas easement, but would result in steeper grades. As a result, they went with the alignment that was included in the report.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was surprised to hear some of the mode shift information as she understood people in the Shepard Boulevard neighborhood were interested in walking to East Campus. Mr. Zimmerman commented that he understood the pilot program had indicated the average trip was three-quarters of a mile in terms of walking and seven miles for biking.

Mr. Thomas asked if the future connection of the Grindstone Trail had been considered in calculating the mode shift of Option 3. Mr. Zimmerman replied yes. He explained they considered all existing and proposed alignments.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted to remove the sidewalk as a bike lane on Southwood Drive and a part of Bluffdale Drive. She noted this was a quiet neighborhood, and many of the homes on Southwood Drive had very short yards with mature trees. She read a letter from an elderly lady on Southwood Drive, which indicated she would lose several items that had meaning for her that could not be replaced. She understood the consultant had indicated bike lanes without sidewalks could work well and would be safe, and pointed out Shepard Boulevard, which had heavier traffic, had a bike lane.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to remove the sidewalk as a bike lane on Southwood Drive and part of Bluffdale Drive from Option 1. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas noted Southwood Drive, Bluffdale Drive, and Woodlea Drive were all contained streets without any through-traffic. The only automobile traffic was traveling to homes, so he did not believe a sidewalk was necessary on those streets. In addition, the City would save about \$140,000 by not building the sidewalks.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Thomas to remove the sidewalk as a bike lane on Southwood Drive and part of Bluffdale Drive from Option 1 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Ryan Quade, 4308 Savannah Court, commented that as an Eagle Scout that studied trees as part of his final project, he supported Alignment 4 because Alignments 1, 2 and 3 each had the potential to harm Hinkson Creek and only a handful of bikers would benefit from the use of the trail. In addition, the other alignments would cost significantly more than Alignment 4. He believed bikers were typically middle or high income individuals so this would not benefit low income people that could not afford bikes, and noted this had been proven in Minnesota where their federal money had been used to purchase and loan bikes to the underprivileged. As a result, he felt only Alignment 4 would support the underprivileged. He stated studies had also shown most bikers were between ages 5 and 15 so he wondered who would use this alignment to the University. In looking at the demographics of the neighborhoods, he did not believe they would support Alignments 1, 2 and 3. He noted alignment 4 would be used by students, had a low cost with great benefits, and could be used by pedestrians and bikers, whereas the other alignments benefited bikers specifically. He explained he traveled this route every Tuesday and Thursday, and saw both bikers and

pedestrians using the existing pedway. The safety improvements proposed for Alignment 4 would allow both bikers and pedestrians a great route to the University and the downtown. He reiterated he believed Alignment 4 was the best option if the targeted audience was students, and noted a lot of skill was not needed to traverse that alignment since it had been identified as a low risk transport in the GetAbout pamphlet.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition and explained they were in strong favor of the Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street trail project and specifically Options 1 and 3. She displayed a diagram showing the existing trail system along with areas of the City that were within a half of a mile of the trail, and noted the Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street trail project would address a hole in the system. She commented that this trail was one of the most important connectors for the entire trail system as it would bridge the gap between all of the trails that converged near this area but were not connected, and listed those trails. This trail would provide critical connectivity to the University of Missouri campus and the downtown area. She pointed out the hill on Old 63 was a major barrier to mode shift and non-motorized transportation, and noted mode shift was a requirement for the use of the GetAbout funds proposed to pay for this project. She displayed a diagram showing elevations to include the hill at Old 63, which was over 110 feet tall and mammoth compared to other elevation changes along the trail route, and explained this could be a safety issue for people moving slowly on a bike or wheelchair on the upward climb and in controlling speed during the descent. The engineering study showed Options 1 and 3 provided the flattest grade while Option 4 was the steepest. Similarly, Options 1 and 3 would serve the highest number of people and had the highest potential for mode shift. Option 4 would have a negligible effect on mode shift for people walking or biking. She understood some opponents of the trail believed the trail would destroy a pristine nature area, and noted that was not correct as areas for Options 1 and 3 had already been cleared for gas and sewer trunk lines decades ago so a trail was essentially already there. It was just not accessible by the rest of the trail system. She stated there was wide community support for Options 1 and 3 as indicated by over 75 percent of the over 200 comments received at the interested parties meeting. She pointed out the Disabilities Commission, the Public Transit Advisory Commission, the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission, and the Board of Health had all supported Options 1 and 3. She noted over 75 percent of Columbia households used the trails and this was not a fringe project that would benefit a small number of people. She stated the PedNet Coalition believed the best route for this trail was the package of Options 1 and 3 as it would provide the most mode shift, service the greatest population, provide the most ease of use, and follow existing utility lines. She urged the Council to approve Options 1 and 3 and to direct staff to determine the best funding source or combination of funding sources to fully fund those routes.

Troy Balthazor, 3615 Chatham Drive, explained he was member of the PedNet Coalition and was with the University of Missouri – College of Human Environmental Sciences. He commented that it was interesting to hear the concern for people with disabilities when the current network would require traversing the highest hill in the network on Old 63. The top three considerations for those in wheelchairs and those aging were the

minimization of slopes when possible, separation and safety in terms of getting people out of and away from the streets, and program accessibility by thinking about accessibility in terms of what was best for the community and based on best practices. He believed Options 1 and 3 clearly met the most of these items when looking at the four proposed options.

Badger Johnson, 105 Third Avenue, suggested the Council not vote on this issue tonight so neither side would become embittered, and to allow time to come up with a solution that was a win-win for both the PedNet Coalition and the It's Our Wild Nature Community Association. He commented that he was concerned the social capital available to future community organizers on ecologically-related issues would be depleted by the weakening of the ecologically-minded constituency if that constituency became estranged from one another. He believed it was possible for all stakeholders to work to make this right with each other as they were all pro-tree and urban ecosystem services and pro-bicycles and bicyclists. Framing this as nature versus bicyclists or bicyclists as merely an economic development strategy was not holistic. He thought they could all agree with the pressing need to make streets hospitable to cyclists and preventing the need to build more costly roads that would result in the loss of urban ecosystem services. He was not 100 percent sold on Option 4 although he favored it over the other options because bike commuters preferred not to be on highway if possible. He suggested they use the GetAbout funds earmarked for concrete to build parking lots and driveways for people that wanted them in the neighborhood instead of constructing more bike trails through the woods as it might reduce the need for on-street parking and provide one side of the street for bikes. He asked that the existing infrastructure be utilized intelligently.

Elijah Gersky, 109 Westridge Drive, stated he was in favor of Option 4 as he was worried Options 1 and 3 would cause erosion. Option 4 did not cause as much disruption and erosion as the other options. He noted he loved trails, but was worried about the placement of the other options. He reiterated he thought Option 4 would do the job well.

Pat Holt, 3705 Monterey Drive, commented that nature sanctuaries and safer biking routes would improve the quality of life in Columbia, and believed there was a better way to do both with Option 4. She displayed a video of images from the Hinkson Creek Valley.

Charlie Nilon, 1303 Parkridge Drive, explained he was a wildlife biologist at the University of Missouri and stated he was in favor of Option 4. He noted the site involved a relatively intact growth forest with fairly large trees that provided habitat for a variety of birds, reptiles, amphibians, small mammals, etc. He pointed out biodiversity management did not include only the areas in the Natural Resources Inventory as it also included places that were imbedded in neighborhoods. He stated he was concerned about the dialogue involving trails in Columbia as they tended to indicate there were no impacts to nature, and noted a number of species responded to trails and construction. As a result, he recommended Option 4.

John Stansfield, 1852 Cliff Drive, explained he was a professor at the University of Missouri and the faculty sponsor for the Mizzou Race Team, whose cycle park was on the University side of the Hinkson Creek. Anytime a hole was dug in the area, he was reminded they were on top of a landfill. He pointed out this land had been used before and was not pristine nature. He noted the Mizzou Race Team supported Options 3 and 1, and an alternative that could be considered for Option 1 would be to remain on the west side of the

Hinkson Creek instead of routing through the neighborhood as most of that area was flat and buildable. He thought a better alternative to Option 4 was to go south along the Hinkson Creek to the old antique bridge, which needed a new deck, as it would be more pleasurable to ride along than Stadium Boulevard to get to the big hill. He reiterated he preferred Options 3 and 1.

Jason Potry, 2800 Pepper Tree Lane, commented that he and his wife recently moved to Columbia from the Washington D.C. area, and one of the reasons they chose Columbia was due to the extensive trail network and the support the City had shown for it. He stated he was supportive of Options 1 and 3 as they best addressed the gap in the trail network to allow for transportation and mode shift. He believed the hill on Old 63 was a barrier to bicycle commuting and thought they needed to remove barriers in promoting shifts in behavior. He encouraged the Council to support Options 1 and 3.

Gerald Neuffer stated he was a professor at the University of Missouri and explained that when he built his home, which looked over this entire area, 58 years ago, all that could be seen was pasture and trees in the valley, and now all one could see were the trees. He believed it would be best to place a trail in this area as that would prevent apartments from being built. He noted he was in favor of Options 1 and 3, and hoped the City did not damage anyone's property in constructing Option 1. He commented that he thought Option 2 should be constructed as well because it would then be complete. He reiterated he was in favor of Options 1, 2 and 3, and stated he was not in favor of Option 4.

Seth Smith, 108 N. Greenwood Avenue, noted he supported Options 1 and 3 and explained he had seen incredible improvements in cycling and pedestrian infrastructure since he had moved to Columbia 15 years ago thanks to the City Council, the PedNet Coalition, and GetAbout Columbia. He stated he had been an avid cyclist and bike commuter for nearly 30 years, and had used the current trail and bikeway infrastructure extensively. He commented that he felt these links would allow safer transportation opportunities for Columbia residents and assist bike commuters heading to various areas of town. Currently cyclists had to travel up the large hill on Old 63, which was too much for most adults and children. He encouraged the Council to move forward in completing this vital Grindstone Nature Area to Stephens Lake Park trail link.

Barbie Reid, 104 W. Lathrop, stated she lived in the second home from the Garth Trail connector and the same concerns she was hearing now had been expressed when that connector had been proposed. She noted her neighborhood had worked to make it a better plan similar to the people in these neighborhoods. She understood the funding available for Options 1 and 3 could only be used for paved trails, so that money could not be used to fund other services. She also understood the sidewalks were removed from Option 1, which would save money. She explained parking had been a concern of her neighborhood because they lived close to the University of Missouri, but they had not seen an increase. In addition, she believed the increase in usage by pedestrians and bicyclists had actually increased the safety of the neighborhood since more people were outside and looking out for each other, the neighborhood, and the corridor. She stated they were working to remove invasive plants and were planting native plants. She noted the result was a beautiful environment even with the paved trail.

David Neuffer, 2003 Valley View Road, explained his family had moved into that home in 1957, and at that time, there were probably only 15 houses between Old 63, Stadium Boulevard, Ashland Road, and Broadway. The field behind them to the Hinkson Creek was mostly farmland then as well. He believed the people that lived on Shepard Boulevard deserved an access to come across the Hinkson Creek to Rollins Street with a bridge. He recalled crossing the creek when riding his bicycle to deliver newspapers and walking to University High School and Hickman High School. He stated the environment in that area had changed, and believed trails were good as they allowed people to see the environment. He noted he thought the trail needed to be constructed without negatively impacting the quality of life of people that had spent their hard earned money for property in the area. He explained he was opposed to constructing the trail on Bluffdale Drive, which was included in Option 1. He thought Options 2 and 3 would allow those in the Shepard Boulevard neighborhood to avoid the hill on Old 63. He stated he was in favor of Options 3 and 2, and the portion of Option 1 that would not negatively impact the people on Bluffdale Drive.

Jeanine Pagan, 711 Bluffdale Drive, stated she was in favor of hill on Old 63, and noted it had not killed anyone in the past. The City had improved it immensely as well, and there were bike lanes on both sides and a concrete pedway, which connected Broadway to the Grindstone Nature Area. It was used by many people to include students, people going to work, runners, walkers, etc. She noted the Roots N' Blues half-marathon had incorporated the hill this past year and felt a lot of people appreciated the hill. She thought cyclists could learn how to ride a hill properly and safely and could utilize the pedway so they were not in the street with children. She reiterated the hill had not killed anyone in the past.

Dan Harder, 1803 Bluff Pointe Drive, explained he wanted the City to make the best use of the money it had and did not believe people from the south would go up the hill. He thought they would bypass it when possible. He suggested they choose the option that would get the most use, and was uncertain Option 4 would accomplish that goal. He stated he saw people using the old Ashland Road bridge coming from the south to the Stadium Boulevard and Old 63 intersection, and believed people would bypass Option 4 even after completion. He felt people would utilize Options 1 and 3 because they would bypass a lot of campus to Rollins Street.

Kelly Richter, 1301 Old Highway 63 South, commented that the trail system was her favorite thing about Columbia, and she currently walked up the hill because non-motorized transportation was important to her. She explained the issue of separation was key to her as cars were currently less than an arms-length away from her, which was unsettling. She stated she was in favor of Option 3 and would utilize it to get to campus if it was approved. She understood wildlife responded to trails, but noted she saw a lot of wildlife when she was on the trails. In addition, she preferred a trail in that location as opposed to a student housing development. She reiterated she was in favor of Option 3.

Charlotte St. John, 280 S. Rangleline Road, explained her concern with regard to Options 1, 2 and 3 was the impact to the Hinkson Creek. She referred to a February 4 article in the Columbia Daily Tribune indicating the Department of Natural Resources had concluded the Hinkson Creek was still impaired. She understood the Clean Water Act stated every water body should be swimmable and fishable. She pointed out a Hinkson Creek

stakeholder group had been created as part of the Collaborative Adaptive Management process to allow for the improvement of the Hinkson Creek without utilizing drastic and expensive pollution control measures, and believed these trail projects went against those efforts. Trail planners appeared to be ignoring the Hinkson Creek's critical condition, and any additional runoff caused by impervious concrete surfaces would only carry additional damaging pollutants into the creek. She understood trails were commonly built along the creeks, but did not feel that made it right. She commented that cement, which was mostly commonly composed of calcium silicates, required heating limestone and other ingredients to 2,640 degrees by burning fossil fuels and was the third largest source of greenhouse gas pollution in the United States, so one ton of cement resulted in the emission of one ton of carbon dioxide. She supported people biking and walking and the efforts to improve the Hinkson Creek, and for those reasons, she recommended Option 4.

Darcy Higgins, 105 Third Avenue, commented that she had biked to the Bluffdale neighborhood on Fridays for much of the fall and winter to lead a group of children in an outdoor class. She felt it was tempting in the discussion of this trail to characterize it as having the same old arguments of every other trail in terms of concerns regarding the environment, etc., but noted the area around the Hinkson Creek was different as it was one of the largest remaining wild spaces in the City. She agreed it was not perfect, pristine land, but ecologically speaking it was not useless and having a larger segment of undeveloped land was significant. She stated she had been able to find many thriving ecosystems and it was an important perch for wildlife within the City. She acknowledged the limitations of Option 4 as it would not address all of the hopes for infrastructure, but pointed out there were already many accessible trails in that area by foot. She hoped interaction continued with the engaged groups regardless of the option chosen when the trail was constructed and afterwards because she believed people were now willing to put in the time to improve the space and remove the invasive plants. She pointed out people were already accessing the space and a concrete path was not necessary for a connection with a space.

Katie Noah, 4926 Bethel Street, stated she was in support of Options 1 and 3 and encouraged the Council to direct staff to determine the best funding source for the trails.

Ellen Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, explained she was bicycle commuter and her route was 7.5 miles if she took the shortest and most road-oriented route, but noted she often chose the 10 mile route because it was oftentimes more pleasant. She pointed out this commute involved the hill on Old 63. She stated she had not always been a confident bicycle commuter, and when she began commuting, she would bike to the Grindstone Nature Area and catch the bus to get over the hill. She believed many people today were like she was 15 years ago. In addition, her experience in riding with her children was that riding on steep hills next to traffic was frightening, and many parents would likely not do it with their children. She explained she did not always choose to come home utilizing the Old 63 hill even though she was capable of maneuvering it because it was not fun and because it was very hot during the summer. She pointed out trails were generally more shady and pleasant, and encouraged people to be out even in more challenging weather. She stated she was in favor of preserving nature within the City, but wondered how people that did not live in the neighborhood could access the nature sanctuary except by driving cars if there was not a trail

access. She thought that would likely be more disruptive than people riding their bikes or walking to get to the attractive natural area.

Beth Cunningham stated she was the Secretary for the Shepard Boulevard Neighborhood Association, and noted the neighborhood was in favor of getting to campus from this trail. Nearly everyone she had spoken with in the neighborhood was in favor of Options 1 and 3, Options 2 and 3, or Options 1, 2 and 3, depending on the funding available, but none were in favor of Option 4 as they did not feel they could really utilize it because it was not as safe for children. She noted they were excited about the trail and felt it was a long time coming. She asked for Option 2 to be considered along with Options 1 and 3 if money was available because it would help them get to campus.

Brad Luecke, 1118 Falcon Drive, stated he was one of the people that actually walked and noted he hated walking up Stadium Boulevard. He did not feel adding a sidewalk along Stadium Boulevard would make it any better. He commented that proceeding with Option 4 would not improve the walkability for anyone to get anywhere. He was concerned that if the Council approved Option 4, the City would not have the opportunity in the future to do Options 1 and 3. He urged the Council to approve Options 1 and 3.

Michelle Johnstone, 711 Bluffdale Drive, thanked the Council for removing the potential of a sidewalk in her front yard. She commented that the Hinkson Creek rose 18 feet up the bank and 18 feet east toward her back door when it flooded, and as a result, she was concerned with flooding during and after the construction of the path along the creek for Option 3. She asked the Council to keep that in mind if they chose to move forward with options to construct a path along the creek. She noted the area would continue to flood and City staff would likely have to clear the trail after a flood event to make the pathways walkable again.

Brian Johnstone, 711 Bluffdale Drive, commented that his favorite thing about Columbia was looking at his backyard from his deck. He recommended having money available for the maintenance of the concrete trail if Options 1, 3 or 2 were approved because of flooding. He noted one event had brought the floodwaters to within 20 feet of his backdoor, and felt this flooding would undercut any heavy objects place on the soil. He explained he liked walking with his dogs in the nature area and would likely have to have them on a leash if this trail was approved due to trail regulations, which he stated was an issue for him. He noted he was also concerned about safety issues in terms of switchbacks, etc. for any safety vehicle to maneuver.

Tom Lindberg, 606 Bluffdale Drive, commented that he and his wife had dreamt about a trail connection to campus since they had moved to this location. He explained he biked to the University on a somewhat regular basis and the hill on Old 63 was a tough ride. He stated he was in favor of Option 1 as it was least expensive and the least impactful. He noted he was also supportive of Option 4 for the future, but not at the expense of the other options.

Christine Doerr, 2510 Brookside Court, explained she was just off of the Hinkson Creek and had biked since she was five years old. She noted she had been waiting a long time for this trail as the hill on Old 63 had stopped her from getting to the other side. She agreed the nature area was beautiful and thought it was a shame the community could not

embrace the opportunity for everyone to enjoy the area. She believed this trail was desperately needed to help with childhood nature deficit and other issues. She stated the world was changing and there had to be some give and take, and felt a little concrete now would save more in the long run. She pointed out the honeysuckle in the riparian areas of the Hinkson Creek was the cause of erosion and needed to be addressed. She reiterated give and take was needed in terms of this trail.

John Riddick, 602 Rollins Court, encouraged the Council to vote in favor of Options 1 and 3 and noted they were important because of how they would connect everything else from the east to the west and the north to the south. These little portions made the rest of the trail system so much more valuable. He commented that not everyone was a dedicated walker or biker, but believed adding fun to the trip would make a big difference in whether someone traveled in that manner. He thought the City had the opportunity to join other communities as a premier trail city in the United States, and reiterated the importance of moving forward with both Options 1 and 3.

Jake Giessman, 1500 Audubon Drive, stated he and his family were in favor of Options 1 and 3 as they felt those would impact them the most in terms of how they made their trips to the center of town with their 8-year old son. They would not feel safe utilizing Option 4, and Option 2 was cost prohibitive.

Scott Butler, 1408 Audubon Drive, stated he and his family would utilize Options 1 and 3 to get to the downtown. He noted he was a property manager of 72 units and believed those options would go a long way in closing the gap to the tenants of those units.

Alvin Sweezer, 13770 N. Old Number 7, explained he commuted to Columbia a lot and was hopeful all of the trails would be connected. He believed Options 1 and 3 would be nice as the hill could be avoided.

Mihail Popescu, 705 Bluffdale Drive, thanked the Council for removing the sidewalks on Bluffdale and asked everyone to remember the purpose of this was transportation and not recreation, so kids were likely not taken to work. He understood the main concern was for people from the Shepard Boulevard neighborhood getting to campus, and he was not sure how Options 1 and 3 would facilitate that goal as they would have to go down Bluffdale Drive to take a connector to Rollins Street, and he did not see that connector. He thought Option 2 was better even though it might be too steep. He did not understand why they would want Option 3 as it would involve two bridges and people having to travel on Ashland Road to get to the campus.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluffdale Drive, stated she was in favor of Option 4. She commented that there were a lot of rules connected to the non-motorized transportation pilot program since they were Federal Highway Administration funds. She understood one rule was that surface transportation program projects could not be undertaken on roads functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors unless the roads were on a federal aid highway system, and felt this rule would be violated. She stated Bluffdale Drive, Southwood Drive, and Woodlea Drive were all cul-de-sac streets and those there purchased or rented their property with the expectation of not living on a through-street. She believed those landowner expectations should be honored. She read from the August 19, 2013 Council Meeting minutes whereby Ms. Hoppe had indicated she thought consideration should be

given to trails depending on new areas versus existing neighborhoods, especially when there might be reasonable alternatives, and that neighbors had a reasonable expectation of privacy when they purchased their homes. Ms. Wren felt Option 4 was an alternative and that the funds should be used as intended, which was to make safe walking areas along a major road.

Mary Foutz, 2102 Southwood Drive, understood the sidewalks were removed from Option 1 so eight feet would no longer be taken from the south side of Southwood Drive, and felt that was good. She commented that Southwood Drive had a hill, and oftentimes when they had a major snow they could not get up the street. In addition, when going south off of Southwood Drive, people would still have to go up part of the Old 63 hill to get to their destination, and when going north, there was even more of a hill to get to Southwood Drive and Option 1. She stated she was opposed to Option 1 and in favor of Option 4.

Jim Foutz, 2102 Southwood Drive, stated he was a native Columbian and his bike was his transportation as a kid. He noted he had also lived on Southwood Drive since 1973 and prior to his retirement he rode his bike to work at the UPS facility, which meant he traveled Old 63, Paris Road, and Vandiver Drive. He commented that he still rode his bike and took Old 63 to the Grindstone Trail, Katy Trail, etc., and noted he had not been injured traveling along roads during his 74 years. He thought the best solution was Option 4.

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated she knew in her heart that there was a way to make all these people happy, and that it would come with time.

Sutu Forte, 627 Bluffdale Drive, commented that she had a vision for Columbia and had planned to live in this home for the remainder of her life. She hoped decisions would not be made due to urgency or money. The Its Our Wild Nature Community Association was concerned about this natural environment as there were many beautiful areas in the forest and along the creek. She felt a concrete trail would be hard and result in more noise, and although the wildlife would try to come back, it would not be same. She pointed out the former Community Association President, Jerry Wade, and invented Option 4. She stated she had assumed a retaining wall with fenced railing would be constructed as part of Option 4 so pedestrians and cyclists were well protected, and was sad that Option 4 had been downplayed and ignored. She stated the Association believed Option 4 was the solution. She commented that they had spent three years collecting signatures and opinions from those on Bluffdale Drive in preference of keeping their neighborhood quiet, and felt the hill on Old 63 was a doable hill. She stated it was sad that people would not go outside unless there was concrete as a grass path was better for both people and animals. She asked those in support of Option 4 to stand, and approximately 20 people stood.

John Nichols, 511 Hickman Avenue, commented that so much of the debate tonight had been on the environment in terms of the destruction of a pristine environment, significant impacts to water, or flooding, and believed the environmental impact section was one of the deficiencies of the TranSystems plan. It was very short and dealt with only generalities. It did not include facts or figures like the mode shift section. He believed the City tended to not take seriously the quantifying environmental impacts prior to making development decisions. He suggested the vote on this issue be tabled until facts and figures were presented, so they could then debate that information instead of emotional pleas and antidotes. If the Council

chose to move forward, he suggested mandating best management practices, such as the use of pervious pavement, stormwater retention basins, rain gardens, etc. that would hopefully neutralize stormwater issues. Options 1 and 3 would involve about 1.3 acres of pavement, which was similar in size to a city block so there would be an impact that needed to be considered. He suggested an environmental mitigation project, such as finding another piece of undeveloped land to preserve or converting an impermeable surface to a natural system.

Jeanne Szkolka, 6150 N. Oakland Gravel Road, stated the trail system, which was loved by the citizens of Columbia, was one of the best in the nation, and had been a forward thinking idea when created. She explained she embraced the mission of continuing to develop the trail system, and her research and investigation led her to believe Option 4 was the best choice as it provided the needed link in the system in an environmentally responsible way and allowed them to leave the Hinkson Creek bottom intact. Given the current global, national, and local challenges in environmental stewardship, she thought areas like these 35 acres as a wilderness corridor might be the next important thing for cities. She understood Options 1 and 3 did not create any potential for pedestrian mode shift and would not connect to campus without additional trails. They also did not serve the Shepard Boulevard neighborhood as well as Option 2, which was the most costly option. She pointed out none of the options eliminated hills. She felt making this a “not in my backyard” issue was just a way to get away from the real issues. Options 1, 2 and 3 would cause damage to the already impaired Hinkson Creek, which the City, County, and University were already working to improve. She thought it was counterproductive to create concrete trails that would increase the amount of impervious surface and create stormwater runoff. Option 1 would not connect to anything as the additional needed connection to Rollins Street did not exist, and it would take out an acre of forested land. Option 4 could provide a clear connection that could be accomplished quicker with no damage to the environment and an easy connection to Rollins Street. Additional challenges with Options 1, 2 and 3 included the acquisition of land. Option 4 would provide the desired trail connection in a responsible, safe, and quick manner, and allowed for a nature sanctuary. She asked to Council to look at the Hinkson Creek as an important urban wilderness that should be preserved.

Jonathon Sessions, 115 Aldeah Avenue, stated he was a lifelong resident of Columbia and a member of the Collaborative Adaptive Management group for the Hinkson Creek Watershed representing the Columbia Public School District. Through his role on that group, he had seen how a trail, water retention, and water management solution could work hand in hand, and referred to the area behind Forum Boulevard as an example. He commented that the two things that prevented people from using the trails was connectivity and accessibility, and Options 1 and 3 were the best when considering connectivity with the greatest accessibility. He asked the Council to support Options 1 and 3.

Carrie Gartner, 115 Aldeah Avenue, explained her home was on a Bike Boulevard and she was very excited to see bikes rolling past her house. She stated she was supportive of Options 1 and 3 as she believed trails were only useful if they went where people needed to be. The goal of the non-motorized transportation program was to make the connections between where people lived and where they needed to go, and those places were the central

city area, campus, hospitals and the downtown. This would provide an easier link to those key areas, and had many associated benefits. More people biking and walking meant fewer parking garages and building in general. In addition, studies had shown bicyclists were more likely to shop locally.

Lawrence Simonson, 2706 Hillshire Drive, urged the Council to support Options 1 and 3 as the best routes for the Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street connector, and to support staff in determining the best funding source to fund those routes.

Marie Ballard, 512 Rockhill Road, stated she was opposed to putting cement on greenspaces anywhere. She understood old hazmat was used to power the kilns to make the cement clinker in Missouri, and noted she was told they did not know there would not be hazmat fumes in the cement. She commented that she hoped the City obtained its cement from a company that powered its kilns from electricity so the hazmat issue was not a concern. She also asked that the City be careful when using heavy machinery so as to not run over tree roots as that tended to injure trees causing them to die. She noted that tearing down trees also tore down a neurological resource because trees were heavy metal sinks.

Antionette Gray, 715 Bluffdale Drive, explained she was a Columbia native, the mother of three, and her house sat in the roadway that led to the cul-de-sac. She noted she had invested completely in her home, the neighborhood, the Hinkson Creek Valley, and the City. She stated her and her older kids, ages 14 and 12, ran and rode up Old 63 with little effort. She asked the Council to choose a system that was compassionate to the ones it would directly impact while allowing access to this pristine neighborhood, and a trail placement that possessed the least environmental impact on the watershed.

Rick Shanker, 1829 Cliff Drive, asked for the cost of any easements needed.

Dierik Leonhard, 204 E. Parkway Drive, stated he supported Options 1 and 3 and asked the Council to not be swayed by emotions and to instead be swayed by the facts. He did not believe the amount of stormwater runoff from this additional concrete would be enough to erode the Hinkson Creek as the erosion was created from the upstream watershed.

Brian Keeney, 2112 Southwood Drive, commented that he had lived at this location for 18 years and noted he was in favor of Option 4 with a sidewalk/pedway along Stadium Boulevard from Ashland Road to Old 63 as it would connect the new sidewalk and bike lanes on Ashland Road to the current sidewalk at the northwest corner of Old 63 and Stadium Boulevard. He understood the State of Missouri was planning to improve the Stadium Boulevard and Old 63 intersection, and thought the City could combine forces with the State on that project or ask the State to pay for all or most of the modifications along this route. His second choice would be to extend Rollins Street to the Hinkson Creek, following it south to connect to the sidewalk under the bridge on Stadium Boulevard. He explained he was unsure of Option 2 as it meandered through the Hinkson Creek Valley southward and toward Old 63. He noted he was adamantly opposed to Option 1 as the Bluffdale and Valley View Subdivisions had not been designed for sidewalks, and pointed out pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists had been coexisting in these neighborhoods for 50 years. He asked the Council to vote against this proposal until a more complete study that included more input from the citizens it actually impacted could be done. He stated the elevation where Southwood Drive

connected to Old 63 was 25-30 feet higher than where Bluffdale Drive connected to Old 63. In addition, Southwood Drive was only 25 feet wide while Bluffdale Drive was 30 feet wide. As a result, he believed a bike trail would be more appropriate on Bluffdale Drive.

Darwin Hindman, 1223 Frances Drive, understood previous speakers had indicated this was something that could not be passed up, it was a place for kids to get out in nature, the trails needed to be placed where useful, it was place where all of the trails were hooked together, and it was a value added to the trail system, and he believed those comments summed up the situation. He asked those in favor of Options 1 and 3 to stand, and approximately 35 people stood.

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

Mayor McDavid commented that he was a big fan of Options 1 and 3. He thanked staff for the detailed analysis, Ms. Triplett for her excellent presentation, and former Mayor Darwin Hindman for the legacy he had given to Columbia.

Ms. Hoppe commented that many years ago a basic option had been rejected in part due to low water bridges, a concern for trails by the Hinkson Creek, and concerns from the Shepard Boulevard and the East Campus neighborhoods for a better east-west connection. After that trail had been rejected, representatives of the East Campus, Shepard Boulevard and Hinkson Creek Valley neighborhoods along with representatives of other nearby areas had walked nine different options to find a connection that could serve everyone, was cheaper, would not create flooding concerns in terms of low water bridges, and would not involve a paved trail going through the Clyde Wilson Park. She stated those in the Shepard Boulevard area along with many in the East Campus neighborhood would be happy with Option 2 and satisfied with Option 1. She understood Option 1 did not eliminate the Old 63 hill as a portion of it would be utilized to get to Southwood Drive or Bluffdale Drive. She commented that she had biked to work once a week when she worked at Buttonwood Drive and Providence Road and Nifong Boulevard and Forum Boulevard, and agreed it was tough riding up Old 63. She also agreed that there was an advantage to flatter trails. Most of the general community and those in the Shepard Boulevard area did not like Option 4 as they did not want to walk or bike close to Stadium Boulevard since it was busy with traffic and hot. In terms of the natural area, it was privately owned and zoned R-1 so the property owner had the right to develop it and that would include the construction of roads, driveways, homes, etc. The amount of pavement for the trail was minor in comparison to what the property owner could do with the property. Since this area was valuable to the Hinkson Creek and as a stormwater natural area, she believed it would be good for the City to acquire as part of its parks program for a natural area park. She thought a trail was the best thing that could be done to preserve the area and to meet the identified travel needs. She commented that she was disappointed that Option 2 was different and more expensive than anticipated, and noted she would love to see a non-paved walking trail from Old 63 to the bridge if the City could acquire the property as it would be useful to the Shepard Boulevard neighborhood and would be similar to some of the non-paved walking trails in the Clyde Wilson Park. She thought the area could also be improved by removing the invasive plants and installing more natural plantings. She explained she would likely make a motion for Option 2 if she was just considering the Sixth Ward, but given the cost and because many were still supportive of

Option 1, she was satisfied with voting for Option 1 with the hope her larger vision could be accomplished. She stated she could definitely see how the connection involving Option 3 would be beneficial so people did not have to go up Old 63 from Stephens Lake Park or the Hominy Trail. People in the north had the right to and would likely go down Bluffdale Drive, but it was closer and better for those in the Shepard Boulevard area to go down Southwood Drive. She thought they needed to look at the big picture and to try to maximize this opportunity for the entire community. She commented that she had walked this area, but could only walk it in the winter because she would otherwise be covered with ticks and chiggers, and a paved trail would make it accessible to her and others. She reiterated she hoped they could acquire the privately-owned property as it was beautiful and valuable to the community.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for Option 1, as amended to not include sidewalks on Southwood Drive and parts of Bluffdale Drive, and Option 3. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Mr. Trapp stated there was no mode shift that would come with Option 4 so even though it was lower in cost, it did not achieve what they were trying to do with the GetAbout funds. He noted Options 1 and 3 would increase connectivity in terms of that final piece, and looked forward to seeing what they could do with the available funds.

Mr. Skala stated he was inclined to support Option 4. He explained, at the Retreat, they had discussed the fact some areas of the City were neglected in a variety of ways to include public safety and roads, and it appeared the dividing line was north of I-70. In terms of trails, only the Bear Creek Trail was in the north and it did not connect to anything else. He noted in 2007 when they were discussing how to spend the \$13 million in GetAbout funds, they had discussed a trail along the railroad which would not require any trees to be removed and would connect Paris Road from the center of the City to the Bear Creek Trail. He believed Option 4 was a viable route and did not feel anything would be lost by proceeding with it.

Mr. Skala asked if the \$1.7 million involved only GetAbout funds or if it included any extra public funds. Mr. Glascock replied the \$1.7 million included only GetAbout funds. Mr. Skala understood the \$1.7 million was the estimated cost. Mr. Glascock clarified the \$1.7 million was the estimated cost for Option 1 only. Mr. Skala asked about Option 3. Mr. Glascock replied the total for the two options was estimated to be \$2.5 or \$2.6 million. Mr. Thomas understood \$1.7 million had been allocated in the budget and the estimated costs were about \$700,000 for Option 1 and \$2.2 million for Option 3. Mr. Skala stated he wanted to know if this would be funded entirely from GetAbout funds or if there would be other funds involved. Mr. Glascock replied it currently involved only GetAbout funds, but staff planned to determine whether there were any parks funds that could go toward the project.

Mr. Skala understood Options 1, 2 and 3 all required high water bridges and thought they had decided to avoid high water bridges when discussing the Grindstone Trail. He noted the high water bridges were an issue for him. He felt if they decided to go with Option 4, more money would potentially be available to address the needs in the northeast, and stated he would support Option 4.

Ms. Nauser stated she did not feel she needed to add anything to the comments made during the discussion of the previous trail project and noted she planned to support the trail options. She commented that she was impressed by the number of young people that had come to the Council Meeting tonight to exercise their rights as citizens to say what was on their minds, and hoped to see more of that in the future.

Mr. Thomas commented that he wanted to acknowledge the concerns of the residents of the particular area where the project might impact them, and noted he felt it was important for elected officials to weigh those concerns versus the concerns and benefits of the entire community. He stated he thought that had been done over the many years of looking at this project. He explained this project was originally designed to go right along the Hinkson Creek through the backyards of houses on Bluffdale Drive, and in response to the concern of the residents, the plan was changed for the bike lane to be on the streets. In addition, there was no eminent domain involved for this part of the trail. He stated he thought Option 4 was an important project to complete at some point because it was miserable walking or riding a bike over the Hinkson Creek bridge on Stadium Boulevard, but he believed it was a lower priority than some of the other options. He thought they needed to look at the whole system with a long term view, and this was a missing piece. A trail between the Grindstone Nature Area and Stephens Lake Park and along the low lying valley would connect the entire system. It would also connect to the north and east to other trails that reached the Third Ward, and would allow connections to trails to the south. He believed Options 1 and 3 would connect everything and the mode shift would be substantial. He thought they should be thoughtful about the flooding issue through appropriate studies, but was unsure how a 10-foot wide strip of impervious surface would have a significant impact on the whole area. He understood how parking lots, large flat-roofed buildings, and driveways and roads 30-50 feet wide could create an impact as they tended to catch a lot of the water and pollutants that created erosion, but was uncertain as to how a 10-foot wide bicycle path with no appreciable pollutants would be substantially damaging to the area. He stated he would support Options 1 and 3, but would also support a lot of the vision of the It's Our Wild Nature Community Association. There was a tremendous opportunity to preserve land and restore it to its natural state with more natural plantings and to create an educational exhibit for children, students, and community members to learn about the natural ecology of the area. He believed the walking and biking path along the creek would actually open it up to more people, which would allow more people to gain an understanding and support of these environments.

Mr. Thomas stated he would like for staff to provide funding options since the \$1.74 million was not sufficient for Options 1 and 3. Mayor McDavid thought that was understood, and noted he anticipated staff coming back to Council with a list of possibilities if there was not sufficient funding, which might involve prioritization. Mr. Thomas stated he would also like staff to determine if there was a possibility to move the section from Rollins Street on the west side of the creek further south so one of the high water bridges could be eliminated. Mr. Glascock commented that staff had not yet looked at the west side. Mr. Thomas understood the University of Missouri might have changed its position from a few years ago. Mr. Glascock pointed out that going too far south might involve a steep bluff.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Ms. Hoppe directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for Option 1, as amended to not include sidewalks on Southwood Drive and parts of Bluffdale Drive, and Option 3 was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Skala voting against it.

(C) Construction of pavement improvements along Broadway, between Providence Road and Hitt Street, including the reconstruction of some curb ramps to meet ADA requirements.

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Bitterman provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid thought there might be an issue if this project was not done by the fall, and asked if it might be worth waiting a year to get it done before school started. Mr. Bitterman stated a lot of the work would be done at night, to include the major portions that would disrupt traffic. He noted they also wanted to get the sidewalk ramps done as soon as possible, but would stage it so all four corners of an intersection would not be done at the same time.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to move forward with the Broadway pavement improvement project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(D) Voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of Battle Avenue and north side of St. Charles Road.

Item D was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

(E) Voluntary annexation of City-owned property located on the east side of Battle Avenue, north of St. Charles Road.

Item E was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

R50-15 Approving the FY 2014 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER); and authorizing the City Manager to submit the document to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy and Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked if staff was expecting proposals for the homeless day center. Mr. Cole replied they were, and noted he had spoken with two different agencies that had expressed interest and had received one letter of intent to apply for funding.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

The vote on R50-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R51-15 Approving an amendment to the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and FY 2015 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds; and authorizing the City Manager to submit the document to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy and Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

The vote on R51-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B1-15 Authorizing the issuance of Sewerage System Revenue Bonds, Series 2015.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Blattel provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood the interest rate was 2.98 percent, and asked what the interest rate was when this was tabled. Mr. Blattel replied it was 2.67 percent. Mayor McDavid understood it could have gone the other way too. Mr. Blattel agreed and pointed out it was 2.9 percent in December, February, and today. January just happened to be a favorable month.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B1-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Thompson clarified the motion was for the amendment sheet provided via e-mail today, and not the amendment sheet that had been included in the packet.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend B1-15 per the amendment sheet was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B1-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B60-15 Accepting the 2015 Public Health Volunteer Program Award from the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services – Office of Emergency Coordination for the Medical Reserve Corps program; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Browning provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend B60-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B60-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. 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.

- B52-15** Rezoning property located east of the intersection of Scott Boulevard and Southview Drive from District PUD-7 to District PUD-7.2; approving a revised statement of intent; approving a revision to the planned unit development plan for Kochtanek PUD.
- B53-15** Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on a portion of both sides of Worley Street near Park De Ville Drive.
- B55-15** Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B56-15** Authorizing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for STD testing and treatment services.
- B57-15** Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for public health services.
- B58-15** Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for animal control services.
- B59-15** Authorizing an agreement with the National Association of County and City Health Officials for the Medical Reserve Corps program; appropriating funds.
- R43-15** Setting a public hearing: construction of accessible parking improvements on the northeast corner of Broadway and Eighth Street, the northwest corner of Broadway and Tenth Street and on the south side of Broadway adjacent to the alley between Hitt Street and Waugh Street.
- R44-15** Setting a public hearing: consider the establishment of the Business Loop Community Improvement District.
- R45-15** Setting a public hearing: consider the Water and Light 2015 Renewable Energy Report.
- R46-15** Granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages for a Ninth Street SummerFest concert.
- R47-15** Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Black & Veatch Corporation for condition assessment of the McBaine Water Treatment Plant and West Ash Pump Station.
- R48-15** Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement for professional engineering services with TranSystems Corporation for design of the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard project.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER (except for R46-15 on which she abstained), HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

R49-15 Authorizing the Purchasing Agent to request proposals for consulting services for a complete operations review and market analysis of the COMO Connect system.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that this was a pretty big range, and asked if staff just did not know the market rate for this service. Mr. Brooks replied staff did not as there were only a few of these types of consultants. He noted they had spoken to a few consultants and they had provided different pricings for each of the deliverables, which were wide in range.

Mr. Skala understood some of these deliverables might be more desirable than others depending upon the cost. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He explained once a consultant was selected, staff would negotiate a price and bring that information back to the Council to determine what portions to move forward.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend R49-15 per the amendment sheet.

Mr. Thomas explained this would add a human impact study and economic impact study of future scenarios of the bus system to the scope of services. Mayor McDavid asked how much those additions would cost. Mr. Thomas replied he did not know, and explained those would optional items.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas to amend R49-15 per the amendment sheet was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Syed Ejaz, 3312 Crabapple Lane, stated he was the Chair of the Campus and Community Relations Committee of the Missouri Student Association, and explained they had worked closely over the past few months with City and University officials on transit issues. He noted they were in favor of this request for proposals process because they believed it was a unique opportunity for the community to become involved in the transit discussion. He explained a number of students had expressed dissatisfaction with COMO Connect, especially in light of some of the recent changes on campus. He reiterated they believed this would allow the opportunity for students and the community to become involved with the transit discussion, and were therefore, in favor of this request for proposal process.

Cheryl Price, 511 Parkade Boulevard, provided a handout and explained she was the Vice Chair of the Public Transit Advisory Commission (PTAC). She stated the PTAC wanted to reiterate its support of the transit staff as they did and continued to do a great job with the current transit system. She noted the PTAC also wanted to lend its support to this resolution for the authorization to request proposals for a consultant to perform a complete analysis of the current transit system, which would include short and medium range transit plans, a long term plan, and a funding sustainability report, and hoped the City would proceed as quickly as possible. She thanked the City for including the PTAC, the PedNet Coalition, and Columbians for Modern, Efficient Transit (CoMET) to be a part of the steering committee, and for including someone for the business community and the University of Missouri as well. She stated the PTAC really wanted to be involved in this process from the beginning to the end.

Mayor McDavid commented that he believed this was a great opportunity to obtain student and University engagement as this needed to be a collaborative effort. He stated he was looking forward to the findings of the consultant.

Mr. Thomas thought a consultant could provide some immediate optimization improvements with the current system, but a long term goal of a well-functioning transit system that served all segments of the community would require the kind of engagement process that could only be done well by an outside consultant that knew the best practices, up to date data, etc. The process of bringing together different sectors, such as students, the University of Missouri administration, the business community, schools, social service sectors, and the City, would lead to a long range plan to help move the transit system forward like other college towns.

Mr. Skala commented that this reminded him of the discussion at a session at the Smart Growth Conference in Kansas City with regard to the transit system in the Kansas City area, which involved two communities and two states. He understood that outcome had been positive, and expected this process to benefit Columbia as well.

Ms. Hoppe stated she thought the scope of work including short, medium, and long term plans would be very valuable, along with the inclusion of all of these stakeholders.

The vote on R49-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B61-15** Voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of Battle Avenue and on the north side of St. Charles Road; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.
- B62-15** Voluntary annexation of City-owned property located on the east side of Battle Avenue and north of St. Charles Road; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.
- B63-15** Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Philip D. Gresham for property located at 208 Ridgeway Avenue.
- B64-15** Authorizing an STP-Urban Program supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Broadway pavement improvement project from Providence Road to Hitt Street.
- B65-15** Authorizing a right of use permit with Elke Boyd for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of an inlet modification within a portion of the North Parklawn Court right-of-way (2004 North Parklawn Court).
- B66-15** Accepting a conveyance for utility purposes.
- B67-15** Authorizing an agreement for donation of property interests with MDS Real Estate Association, LLC as it relates to Phase I construction of the Grindstone Creek Trail.

- B68-15** Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Public School District for FY 2015 playground improvement projects at New Haven Elementary School and Russell Boulevard Elementary School.
- B69-15** Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget to add and delete a position in the Fire Department.
- B70-15** Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families America program; appropriating funds.
- B71-15** Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with Columbia Public Schools to develop standards to be recognized as a Missouri Breastfeeding Friendly Worksite.
- B72-15** Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Corrections to provide tuberculosis screening and testing services.
- B73-15** Appropriating funds for Share the Light Program.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP37-15 Correspondence from Water and Light Advisory Board regarding Goals for Energy Demand Reduction.

Mayor McDavid thought these were some interesting goals. Mr. Matthes pointed out staff believed there were some issues with these goals. Mayor McDavid understood the Council could still accept the report as that action was not binding. Mr. Matthes agreed they would not be bound by accepting the report. There could be issues if the Council decided to set these goals. He stated in his mind this was just an informational report.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to accept the report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP38-15 Off-Campus Students and Residents: Relationship Building Tools from Other College Towns and Columbia.

Mayor McDavid commented that there were some interesting approaches brought forth in this report. He pointed the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs at the University of Missouri, Gary Ward, had reached out to the Council, which he thought was good since they had not previously had a good sense of what the University was thinking about at the highest level in terms of how it might impact the community.

Mr. Skala stated he thought it was worthwhile to cultivate their relationship with the University. He commented that he had the handouts from the session involving this issue from the National League of Cities Conference, which he would be happy to share. Mayor McDavid suggested a copy be provided to Gary Ward as well so he would know they were looking at this issue. Mr. Skala stated he would provide it to Ms. Amin to forward to the Council, and he would send it to Gary Ward as well.

Ms. Nauser stated she did not believe they would have a successful outcome if they tried to do this through a student-based process because it was too dislocated and there was too much turnover. She noted she liked the Fort Collins model of having a permanent liaison because there were so many issues. She did not believe they would be able to achieve

much through individual meetings of Council Members with a University of Missouri representative. She thought they needed someone to deal with the issues on an on-going basis to improve the relationship between the City and the University, and to also improve the perception of the University by community members as that had been strained with the many student housing developments.

Mayor McDavid asked Ms. Nauser if she was proposing a paid staff position. Ms. Nauser replied yes. Mr. Skala thought that was something that should be discussed. He believed the issues involved the City, the University, and the private sector, and understood there was a development representative as well. The liaison in Fort Collins was with the University and the City, but the development representative had also been involved in the planning. Mayor McDavid suggested the University be approached regarding their thoughts and for a response. Ms. Nauser stated she would discuss it with Mr. Ward when she met with him.

REP39-15 Utilizing Student Volunteers in the Fire Department.

Chief White and Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

REP40-15 Human Rights Commission 2014 Annual Report.

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

REP41-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Ms. Hoppe commented that she had notified staff of illegal dumping that appeared to be occurring at 2811 Rock Quarry Road, and asked for a status report. Mr. Matthes replied he would check with staff and get back to Ms. Hoppe.

Mr. Trapp understood there would be a Senate Hearing on SB455 tomorrow at 1:00 p.m. that would overturn Columbia's Ban the Box ordinance that had been unanimously passed. He noted he and Ms. Nauser had held a press conference regarding the issue this afternoon in an effort to defend the City's rights to govern its own community.

Mayor McDavid asked how the press conference went. Mr. Trapp replied he thought it went well.

The meeting adjourned at 11:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk