

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
DECEMBER 21, 2015**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, December 21, 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 PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS and NAUSER were present. The City Manager, Deputy 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 December 7, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nauser.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Upon his request, Mayor McDavid made a motion to allow Mr. Trapp to abstain from voting on R195-15 due to a conflict of interest. Mr. Trapp noted on the Disclosure of Interest form he was employed by Phoenix Programs, which would receive a renewal of social services funding. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

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

Henson, Renee, 4101 Red Fox Court, Ward 3, Term to expire November 1, 2017

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Gardi, Lisa, 2261 Concordia Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2018

COMMISSION ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Sleadd, Michael, 607 Bluffdale Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire October 31, 2018

HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION

Ford, Stacy, 2701 Andy Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire December 31, 2018

Schattgen, Sharon, 2200 Topaz Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire December 31, 2018

MAYOR’S COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND HEALTH

Gale, Jamie, 2607 Pine Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire November 30, 2018

Shaffer, Amanda, 2517B S. Providence Road, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2018

POLICE RETIREMENT BOARD

Pitzer, Matthew, 3402 Cross Timber Court, Ward 5, Term to expire December 31, 2017

SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PLAN TASK FORCE

Merritt, Terry, 308 Bay Pointe Lane, Ward 3

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Annette Triplett – Introductory information on Vision Zero policies.

Ms. Triplett had rescheduled her request to speak to the January 4, 2015 Council Meeting.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp – End of year comments from Race Matters related to the Mayor’s Task Force on Community Violence and Community Oriented Policing.

Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp stated she was with Race Matters and the group had been coming to council meetings over the last year to talk about implicit bias, cultural competency, systemic and structural racism and the Mayor’s Task Force on Community Violence recommendations. She noted they were concerned the recommendations had been written in race neutral language and believed a conversation regarding race was needed. She thought they needed to understand barriers and how systemic barriers kept people from getting an education and kept people in poverty. She believed tools for City employees needed to be developed to interact with the communities identified for implementing the strategic plan in order to help solve problems. She felt they had a systemic problem that needed system policies recognized in ordinance. She wanted to know how the City would train its officers so they had the requisite skills to work in those communities and how the City would show it understood the challenges of the unemployment rate for African-Americans through its own economic development policy. She commented that she believed the City was doing some great things, but felt race was the elephant in the room, and the City, particularly the Police Department, had to learn to acquire the respective skills necessary to discuss race, poverty, class, and their corresponding disparities. They needed to know of the barriers and how to dismantle them. She suggested they do some homework on race to understand how it had systemically affected the community historically because poverty and racism would not go away until that was done.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(A) Construction of irrigation improvements at Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area.

B366-15 Authorizing the construction of irrigation improvements at Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

Item A was read by the Clerk, and B366-15 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he liked the fact the irrigation would be done with non-potable water as it would not involve extra chemicals and it made good use of resources. He noted this appeared to be a good improvement to an already good practice.

B366-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

(B) Construction of improvements to the archery range at American Legion Park. B367-15 Authorizing the construction of improvements to the archery range at American Legion Park; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.

Item B was read by the Clerk, and B367-15 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if the costs of targets, which he assumed had to be replaced, had been considered in terms of maintenance and construction. Mr. Griggs replied the Missouri Department of Conservation provided the targets annually.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor McDavid stated he appreciated the fact they were able to receive grant funding from an archery advocacy group to help pay for this, and that the previous item had been funded entirely by user fees. He thanked staff for its wise and prudent use of limited resources.

B367-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B347-15 Approving the Preliminary Plat of The Vineyards, Plat No. 2 located southwest of the intersection of Route WW and Rolling Hills Road; authorizing a development agreement with Columbia School District No. 93 and Vineyards Columbia, LLC; setting forth a condition for approval.

B348-15 Approving the Final Plat of The Vineyards, Plat No. 4 located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Columbia Gorge Parkway and Howell Mountain Drive, west of Rolling Hills Road; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction subject to a condition.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if those were 161kV lines. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know the voltage, but understood they were major transmission line.

Ms. Peters understood people were not happy about Columbia Gorge Parkway being the primary entrance to the school, and asked if the primary entrance would now be Oakville Ranch Drive. Mr. Teddy replied that was proposed as the secondary access. The major intersection would be Rolling Hills Road and Columbia Gorge Parkway. Oakville Ranch Drive was the required secondary access for public safety purposes. He noted it would get a lot of use due to the orientation of the school with the large parking area that had access off of Howell Mountain Drive.

Ms. Peters understood the school and the neighborhood association had met, and asked if they were now okay with using Columbia Gorge Parkway as the primary street with the accommodations of the left hand turn lanes, etc. Mr. Teddy replied yes. He explained there would be a widening of the pavement from what was there now, a dedicated right hand turn, a dedicated left turn lane, and a receiving lane for vehicles with eastbound and northbound movements out of the subdivision. The capacity of the intersection would be expanded.

Mr. Thomas commented that there appeared to be a road on the plat near the northeast corner of the park area, and asked if that road would connect to Highway WW. Mr. Teddy replied that road connected to a public street and a signal. Mr. Thomas asked if the roadway in the County was currently in existence. Mr. Teddy replied yes. Mr. Thomas asked if that road could provide access to the school if it traveled over the Grindstone Creek, and whether that had been discussed. Mr. Teddy replied a bridge was not part of this package of approvals, but generally the road could provide access with some engineering. Mr. Thomas understood the road would provide some access to the park from the north, and asked how people from the newly platted lots would access the park. He thought there had been discussion of one lot being donated by the developer to the City, and asked where that lot would be located. Mr. Teddy replied it would be a lot that was abutting the park site and northeast of the powerlines per the agreement. In addition, the lot had to be fairly flat and good for facility access. He understood that would be worked out as part of the final plat design. He noted another street would be extended from the north area of the Vineyards to the west to the appropriate range of lots.

Mr. Thomas understood the creek traveled east/west across this plat and that there would not be any roads crossing the creek. He asked if there would be any pedestrian connection between the northern and southern parts of this neighborhood. Mr. Teddy replied nothing was proposed at this time, but it was a possibility since there were north and south sections of the Vineyards that had not yet been platted. It could be included the final design if strongly desired, but it was not being presented tonight. Mr. Thomas commented that there were likely more than 100 residential lots north of the creek and he wondered how they would get to school. The trail would go alongside the creek, but they would not be able to cross the creek. Mr. Teddy stated he thought they would travel by car to school. Mr. Thomas asked for the route if traveling by car. Mr. Teddy replied they would have to use the Highway WW and Rolling Hills Road street system. Mr. Thomas stated he hoped they could avoid that because it was a short distance.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had seen a public easement connecting the street to public property on the older plat, but noted he had not seen anything similar on the four new cul-de-sacs. Mr. Teddy stated this was a schematic. If the City wanted maintenance access or trail access, they would have to coordinate it with the facilities available. Mr. Thomas asked if that would happen with the final plat. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and pointed out it would involve a pretty severe slope, so there would be some challenges with pedestrian access.

Ms. Peters asked if there was any interest in placing a light at Rolling Hills Road and Highway WW or at New Haven Road. She also asked if Rolling Hills Road was a County road. Mr. Nichols replied no, and explained it had all been transferred to the City. He stated

there was a proposal for intersection improvements at Highway WW and Rolling Hills Road as part of the Old Hawthorne development. He understood the developer was working through some design options at this time with regard to whether there would be a signal or round-a-bout at that intersection. Ms. Peters asked if he meant the developer of Old Hawthorne. Mr. Nichols replied yes. Ms. Peters asked if Rolling Hills Road would continue to be a two lane road or if there was an expectation to widen it to four lanes. Mr. Nichols replied it had been laid out as a four lane section from New Haven Road to Highway WW by the County as part of the CATSO Major Thoroughfare Plan. The section from Highway WW to Richland Road had been built as a two lane road with the capacity to expand to four lanes.

Tom Smith, 2401 Bernadette Drive, Suite 117, provided a handout and explained he was an attorney with Missouri EdCounsel, which was the firm representing the Columbia Public Schools.

Charles Oestreich stated he was the Director of Facilities and Construction Services for the Columbia Public Schools, and explained the construction of an east elementary school had been associated with the 2014 bond issue. This process began a little over a year ago when the School Board authorized staff to begin a site search, and the engineering firm hired had initially identified 24 possible sites. Using a set of criteria, they were able to narrow the number of sites to five, and after a public meeting, the number of sites was reduced to three. Those three sites were then ranked and more exploratory investigations were done on those sites. He commented that City staff did not want driveways backing out onto Columbia Gorge Parkway, so they replatted the property creating the lollipop streets mentioned previously by Mr. Thomas. They also created a “U” to help discourage traffic from using Columbia Gorge Parkway and traveling through the Woodlands Subdivision. He displayed other options considered. He commented that the neighbors wanted a way to go back up and turn left on Rolling Hills Road. As a result, they extended the road to connect to the round-a-bout, which would allow traffic to go back out to Columbia Gorge Parkway and turn north onto Rolling Hills Road.

Linda Quinley, 1818 W. Worley Street, stated she was the Chief Financial and Operations Officer for the Columbia Public School District, and displayed a timeline for this project. She explained they did not know the results of traffic studies, etc. when selecting a site so the entire process was based upon working collectively with the parties at the table. Those parties included City staff, the neighborhoods, those living in the area, fire and safety service providers, legal counsel, and the seller of the property in this instance. She noted the most significant work and the item that took the most time was the traffic study, and they had changed their plans as a result of the study.

Chris Davis explained he was with PW Architects and displayed an image of how the new elementary school would look. It was similar to the prototypes of Elliot Battle Elementary and Beulah Ralph Elementary. This building would be sized for 650 students, and the District expected 5-6 regular sized school buses to serve the facility. The expectation was that once this school opened in 2016, Cedar Ridge Elementary would no longer function as a traditional elementary school. The trailers would be removed and Cedar Ridge Elementary would be repurposed.

Tom Trabue, 1901 Pennsylvania Drive, stated he was with THHinc, the engineering consultant working on behalf of the Columbia Public Schools, and over the last several months, they had worked through many concerns of the homeowners associations and City staff. The Woodlands Homeowners Association had one primary concern and the Vineyards Homeowners Association had three primary concerns. The first was the emergency connection at the end of Raccoon Ridge Drive in the Woodlands Subdivision. He noted the original concept plan for the school included the extension of Columbia Gorge Parkway west to connect to Raccoon Ridge Drive to provide a secondary emergency access for the school, and although that had changed, they still had to readdress this future connection and its status as a through street or emergency access street due to the updating of the preliminary plat. As staff had indicated, this had been approved as a gated access by the Council when the preliminary plat had been approved in 2005. The Planning and Zoning Commission had reaffirmed this in their recommendation of plat approval on November 19, 2015. He explained this connectivity from a traffic and emergency access point of view did not directly impact the Columbia Public Schools, so they were somewhat neutral on this issue. They believed, however, full pedestrian and cyclist connectivity was important to address school aged children that might use this future street as access to the school. The first issue of the Vineyards Homeowners Association was with regard to temporary traffic control. He noted there was concern with all of the traffic being directed to Columbia Gorge Parkway, primarily because a number of homes had direct driveway access onto Columbia Gorge Parkway. As a result, they had readdressed the original concept by adding Pride Mountain Drive and Oakville Ranch Drive roads, and had identified the primary entrance for parent drop offs to be directly opposite to Pride Mountain Drive to encourage people to use it as an access. The Columbia Public Schools had also agreed in concept to providing some temporary traffic control at Howell Mountain Drive during the morning drop off and afternoon pick up times. This was generally handled by the principles and school staff through the training of the new parents at the beginning of the school year and could be continued as deemed necessary. He noted any temporary traffic control on public roadways would be coordinated with the City. The site plan provided for a bus lane and staff parking on the north side of the school that would be accessed off of Columbia Gorge Parkway, and they anticipated 5-8 full sized buses to serve the school. He pointed out they had separated the bus traffic from the parent drop off traffic on purpose so there would not be any parent drop off traffic on Columbia Gorge Parkway. It would be on Oakville Ranch Drive and the Pride Mountain Drive connection. An additional item, the Vineyards Homeowners Association had asked for was an advisory sign on Rolling Hills Road identifying Oakville Ranch Drive as the primary access to the school. He stated the Columbia Public Schools were committed to working with the City for the appropriate advisory sign and the location of that sign. He commented that most people were in favor of schools in their neighborhoods, but were concerned about the traffic generated, and the Columbia Public Schools had commissioned a traffic study to evaluate the traffic impacts of placing an elementary school at this site. The traffic study was prepared in June and July of this year, prior to the City's transportation tax ballot in August. He explained an item on the ballot was to provide funding for road construction at Discovery Ridge Parkway, and that roadway would have a long term impact on the traffic on Rolling

Hills Road. They had worked with City staff in providing some safety and sensitivity analysis as a result. He stated the traffic study completed for the Columbia Public Schools had identified the proposed road improvements at Rolling Hills Road and Columbia Gorge Parkway were sufficient to meet the projected traffic demands, and the City's expanded study also found the proposed intersection to be sufficient to handle the projected traffic in a safe manner and at an acceptable level of service. The Columbia Public Schools traffic study counted on all traffic from the development and the school utilizing Columbia Gorge Parkway, and had not considered Pride Mountain Drive and Oakville Ranch Drive as relief for the school. He explained they would construct Pride Mountain Drive and Oakville Ranch Drive as part of the school construction in order to remove any uncertainty of City staff and the Homeowners Association, and to provide an immediate relief valve for any traffic. He reiterated the intersection of Columbia Gorge Parkway and Rolling Hills Road was sufficient to handle projected traffic in a safe manner at an acceptable level of service, and this had been verified and accepted by the City's traffic engineers. The proposed improvements at the intersection consisted of a northbound left turn lane off of Rolling Hills Road onto Columbia Gorge Parkway and eastbound right and left turn lanes off of Columbia Gorge Parkway going north and south on Rolling Hills Road. He commented that they were always concerned about the safety of left turn lanes crossing traffic and the exposure of that turning movement on through traffic, and as a result, the proposed arrangement of the left turn onto Rolling Hills Road north provided for a dedicated left turn receiving lane and a separate north bound through lane so people were not turning directly in front of cars moving northward. He noted the Columbia Public Schools would be responsible for all costs associated with the improvements to the intersection. He pointed out the intersection of Oakville Ranch Drive and Rolling Hills Road was still a source of contention with the Vineyards Homeowners Association as the intersection was proposed to be a three-quarter access intersection with a right in, a right out, and a left in. Due to its close proximity to Columbia Gorge Parkway, the northbound left turn onto Rolling Hills Road would be restricted in the final intersection configuration. He stated they understood restricting the northbound left turn would require all northbound traffic to utilize the Columbia Gorge Parkway intersection, and to address that in part, the Columbia Public Schools had agreed with the Homeowners Association to extend Pride Mountain Drive past its intersection with Oakville Ranch Drive and connect to the current round-a-bout on Columbia Gorge Parkway as it would facilitate northbound traffic without placing it directly in front of the residences that were further west on Columbia Gorge Parkway. He noted they had reviewed this with the City traffic engineers, who had concurred this configuration of streets, intersections, and traffic control was the safest solution to address the traffic generated at this site. He commented that eventually, with future development, they anticipated that Howell Mountain Drive, which was on the east side of the school building site, would eventually be extended south and back to Rolling Hills Road, and this would provide sufficient distance from Columbia Gorge Parkway for another full non-restricted intersection in addition to Highway WW and Columbia Gorge Parkway. He pointed out Columbia Public Schools was agreeing through the development agreement that the Oakville Ranch Drive connection would be designated as the temporary construction access for the school to keep all school related construction traffic off of Columbia Gorge Parkway.

He stated he believed the collaboration with the City, the Vineyard Homeowners Association, and the Woodlands Homeowners Association had been fruitful in developing a plan that would meet the requirements of the school and be satisfactory to the property owner, the City, and the adjacent neighborhoods.

Mr. Thomas understood the entrance to school property for the parent drop off location would be aligned with Pride Mountain Drive. Mr. Trabue displayed a diagram showing the location of Pride Mountain Drive and the parent drop off, which was the major parking lot in the front, and noted it was directly aligned. He explained it was also designed to ensure there was sufficient stacking distance on the school property so parents did not remain on the public roadway. He showed how the cars would circulate utilizing the diagram, and pointed out it encouraged parents to leave utilizing Pride Mountain Drive. Mr. Thomas understood parking for buses would be in the lot on the north side of the building. Mr. Trabue stated that was correct and explained the route the buses would travel. He noted that lot would also provide parking for staff, and they anticipated about 55-60 staff members. There would be some overlap with parent drop offs in the morning, but very little overlap in the afternoon with parents picking up children. Mr. Thomas asked for the purpose of the parking on the east side. Mr. Trabue replied the parents of some of the younger kids did not participate in the drop off, and parked and walked their kids into the building. In addition, the extra parking would assist with parking for parents when they held evening events.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification about the traffic control measures Mr. Trabue had previously mentioned at the northeast corner of the school property so only buses and residents were allowed through. Mr. Trabue replied there was a proposal to barricade the intersection of Howell Mountain Drive and Columbia Gorge Parkway with cones or some other measure so no traffic traveled to the parent drop off from there. He suspected anyone coming from the north would turn down Columbia Gorge Parkway because it was the first entrance, and they would then immediately hit the traffic circle and could go around it to Pride Mountain Drive. Mr. Thomas thought it would be important to place signage there for parent drop offs. Mr. Trabue agreed, and pointed out the parents would likely be trained after the first few weeks. He noted Columbia Public Schools would provide parents with maps showing the best way to get in and out of the school. Mr. Thomas understood this suited the residents. Mr. Trabue stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked if the traffic study had reviewed the impact to the Woodlands Subdivision of people traveling on Columbia Gorge Parkway. She wondered if the gate was warranted. Mr. Trabue replied the traffic consultant had indicated that he did not feel many people would take the Woodlands route because it was windy and an unimproved 22-24 foot wide asphalt roadway.

Mr. Skala commented that construction traffic almost always deteriorated some of the existing roads in the construction process, and asked if this concern had been raised and if the Columbia Public Schools had accommodated the concern in terms of any repairs that might be necessary. Mr. Trabue replied it had come up, and they had made a commitment in the development agreement for school construction traffic access to be completely off of existing public streets. It would be on the rights-of-way. He noted the contractor was responsible for building the school and the roadways, and he suspected the contractor would

grade the roadways to a rock base and treat them as a rock construction road during the primary construction of the school. He thought the contractor would wait to pave the roads until the end of the process. Mr. Skala understood it was not anticipated that the existing roads would be impacted. Mr. Trabue stated that was correct.

Tom Smith, the attorney representing the Columbia Public Schools, explained their objective was to build a school and educate children. They had listened to City staff and the residents, and had worked with the City and the current property in coming up with best value for the dollars of the School District. He noted they were not the only ones that had put a lot of work in this as City staff had as well, and they were not the only ones that had made concessions as the property owner had also made some concessions. He asked the Council to approve the revised preliminary plat and the final plat, and to authorize the City Manager to enter into the development agreement.

Phebe La Mar, 111 S. Ninth Street, stated she was representing the owners of the property at issue and explained her clients would continue to own the majority of the area that surrounded the school even after the sale with Columbia Public Schools was complete. In addition to the donation of a park, which had been previously agreed to, her clients had continued to work with the City with regard to transferring additional parkland and the lake. In order to make the plan work for the Columbia Public Schools and the neighbors, they had made other concessions to include a substantial reduction in the purchase price, agreeing to make a donation to the construction of a playground on school property, agreeing to construct the connection between Pride Mountain Drive and Columbia Gorge Parkway before the school opened, transferring a lot for park access at a substantially reduced price, granting the rights-of-way for the expansion of roads, and removing all driveways from Columbia Gorge Parkway. She pointed out note #14 on the preliminary plat provided for a trail easement which would allow for pedestrian connectivity within the subdivision and to the trail. This would allow kids on the other side of the subdivision to get across the subdivision to the school. She noted her clients had been consistently asked about their stance with regard to the emergency access into the Woodlands Subdivision and the access point onto Rolling Hills Road, and neither request was anything her clients could control so they were never in a position to take a stance nor did they have any objection. She stated it was not their fight and they would be happy with whatever the Council decided with regard to those issues. She commented that her clients felt the placement of a school in this location would be beneficial to the community, both within and outside of the Vineyards, and asked the Council to approve the proposed ordinances.

Dale Parker, 4675 Raccoon Ridge Drive, commented that he was speaking on behalf of the Woodlands, which was a Boone County subdivision, and noted they supported the November 19, 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission vote and recommendation. They also supported the supplemental information submitted by the City late last week. That recommendation included an amendment for the connection of the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision at Raccoon Ridge Drive to be gated to allow for only emergency access as well as pedestrian and bicycle access. This would preclude through traffic between the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision. He stated they did not oppose the location of the school, and noted their primary issue had been the street

configuration, which had called for a full connection between the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision as that would cause significant pedestrian safety issues and degradation of quality of life to both subdivisions, and would be inconsistent with and counterproductive to the goals of the Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety. No parent would allow a child to walk or bike to school with a full connection because Winding Trail Drive was a narrow road with no sidewalks and no street lights. He commented that residents of both the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision did not want through traffic, and they opposed the connection except as emergency access only. If limited to emergency access only, parents and children could travel down Winding Trail Drive and cross over the pedestrian/bicycle entrance to the Vineyard Subdivision to access the school using the sidewalks in the Vineyards. He reiterated that 100 percent of the residents opposed through traffic with the connection. He commented that the Planning and Zoning Commission had approved the amended plat by a 5 to 3 vote, and the three no votes had expressed strong support for emergency access only and had voted no for other reasons. He noted this same issue had come before the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council in 2005, and both bodies had approved the proposal of the Woodlands Subdivision for an emergency access only connection by unanimous votes at that time. He explained the verbiage the Woodlands Subdivision had provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission in November had been embodied in their vote to approve the revised plat, but the proposed ordinance submitted to the City Council had different verbiage. As a result, they had worked with the Law Department to come up with a reasonable compromise, and that verbiage was reflected in the amendment sheet. He stated Raccoon Ridge Drive connected to Winding Trail Drive, which ran a mile to the south through curves and hills to New Haven Road and handled the traffic of over 110 homes in the Woodlands Subdivision. It was built to County standards in the mid-1990s. If the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision were directly connected to allow through traffic, Raccoon Ridge Drive, which was 23 feet wide, and Winding Trail Drive, which was 24 feet wide, would function as collector roads. Collector roads constructed in the County today were required to be 38 feet wide. He noted the south half of Winding Trail Drive was currently carrying over 1,000 average daily traffic trips even though it was designed to carry less than 750 daily trips. Any additional traffic was an issue for the Woodlands Subdivision, and they were supportive of the amendment for gated emergency access only.

John Anderson, 4525 E. Raccoon Ridge Drive, stated the leadership of Columbia Public Schools was supportive of the position of the Woodlands Subdivision for emergency access only as was evidenced by an e-mail received from Superintendent Peter Stiepleman, which indicated they would continue to be a supporter with regard to an emergency entrance only connection. The e-mail had also indicated Dr. Stiepleman had driven the neighborhood again and understood how even marginal traffic would markedly change the current situation. Mr. Anderson displayed a few pictures of various roadways, to include the roadways in the Woodlands Subdivision, which were too narrow for two vehicles and pedestrians to travel together, and explained they opposed through traffic and a direct connection. He noted a direct connection would achieve the reverse of what was intended with regard to school walkability. He pointed out the widening of Raccoon Ridge Drive and Winding Trail Drive to

38 feet was not an economically viable option either as it would involve the relocation of underground utilities and sewers and would require major drainage work and cost over \$4 million. It was also not desired by those living in the Woodlands Subdivision due to the disruption to the community. He asked the Council to support the City's amendment for gated emergency access only.

Chris Kiley, 4650 E. Raccoon Ridge Drive, commented that schools generated a significant amount of traffic in addition to when the drop offs and pick ups occurred as there were visitors, vendors, workmen, delivery drivers, etc. coming and going at all times. Also, some non-school through traffic would occur if there was a connection. The potential of adding through traffic in the Woodlands Subdivision had generated a great deal of passion, and the reason for that passion was that this project had a significant potential impact on where they lived, their homes, the neighborhood, and their families. Subdivisions in most cases, and specifically in the case of the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision, were designed to safeguard tranquility, peaceful use of property, and the safety of residents. Adding through traffic would destroy the peace, tranquility, and safety of the neighborhood regardless of the volume because that through traffic did not show the same respect for speed limits or courtesy for pedestrians as exhibited by residents. She understood City planners had indicated a connection between the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision was partly needed to protect future purchasers of the homes that might desire the direct connection, but she did not feel there was any evidence to support this speculation and believed the opposite to be true. The Woodlands Subdivision attracted residents that valued space, limited traffic, low noise, etc. She commented that of the 78 homes that had accessed Winding Trail Drive ten years ago, approximately 30 had new owners. She noted a phase of 29 new owners had been added since 2005, and they all desired emergency access only, and not a through connection through the Vineyards Subdivision. She believed future owners would want that same emergency access only as well. Due to the second connection to Rolling Hills Road to the school, she did not feel there was a need for a through traffic connection between the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision in order to route traffic to and from the new school. She reiterated a through traffic connection was opposed by residents of both subdivisions, and asked the Council to approve the amendment for the gated emergency access only.

Rich Harding, 4367 E. Ravens Ridge Drive, understood the original justification for connecting the two neighborhoods was to permit children to walk or ride their bicycles through the Woodlands Subdivision to and from the new school, and asked the Council to carefully consider the child safety risk inherent in encouraging young children to ride bicycles or walk to school on Winding Trail Drive to Raccoon Ridge Drive and down an open connecting road to the new school. He noted they would face a heavy volume of automobile traffic and pointed out Winding Trail Drive was already over capacity. An open connected road would encourage through traffic having nothing to do with reaching the school. He commented that the roads in the Woodlands Subdivision were narrow and were without sidewalks and street lights. They also curved through wooded areas and hills making early detection of pedestrians, especially children, challenging even for the best of motorists. Encouraging young children to ride their bicycles or to walk on a narrow road congested with

traffic failed to protect the safety of children. He did not believe any child should be injured or killed in the name of neighborhood connectivity. He reiterated a dangerous situation would be created if the roads between the Woodlands Subdivision and the Vineyards Subdivision were connected and open for public use. He noted the proposed emergency access only connection would provide a third access point into both neighborhoods for fire, police, and emergency services without adding through traffic. It also allowed for pedestrian and bicycle traffic between the two neighborhoods without increasing automobile traffic. He asked the Council to approve the amendment prepared by the City for gated emergency access only.

Kristina Gaddy, 1806 Moss Creek Court, commented that she was the President of the Vineyards Homeowners Association and noted they supported the new elementary school, but felt the proper roads needed to be built when building the school. The majority of traffic would need to travel north, but there was only one way out of the subdivision. She stated their only concerns were traffic flow and the safety of the residents and those using the school in the future. Allowing for a second north access from Oakville Ranch Drive would enhance the flow of traffic out from the school and the neighborhood. She understood controlling parent and bus traffic as a way to minimize the effect of increased traffic and walkability of the residents had been proposed, but noted they had not seen anything indicating this would actually happen. She hoped the Council would understand and agree that their points and concerns made sense.

Lisa Pryor, 5100 Columbia Gorge Parkway, stated her home was at the corner of Howell Mountain Drive and Columbia Gorge Parkway and explained she was concerned about traffic. The current proposal would allow traffic to enter on Columbia Gorge Parkway, which was the only neighborhood access entrance, and Oakville Ranch Drive, which would be a new road, but traffic would only be able to turn left out of Columbia Gorge Parkway. She pointed out the vast majority of traffic for the school would come from Highway WW, which was to the north, and New Haven Road would pick up the traffic to the south, and noted the school had indicated over 400 cars would enter and exit the neighborhood in the morning and afternoon. This meant 400 cars would likely turn left out of Columbia Gorge Parkway. She stated the current plan would hinder residents from safely leaving their neighborhood twice a day, and suggested allowing a left turn out of Oakville Ranch Drive as it would provide two streets where someone could turn left. She understood the Columbia Public Schools would not take a position on that suggestion, which, she felt, meant they were not opposed to it. It was only an issue for City staff. She also understood the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) called for 1,000 feet between left turns, but did not mandate it, and the distance would be about 800 feet if this other left turn was allowed. She believed there had been many instances where a variance had been granted to the practice of a distance of 1,000 feet, and noted there were not any other nearby intersections that would add to this issue. She commented that one example of an exception allowed that was nearby involved Pergola Drive and Morning Dove Drive on Rolling Hills Road, and both were entrances to Old Hawthorne with commercial and residential uses. This was similar to Columbia Gorge Parkway and Oakville Ranch Drive, as they were less than 800 feet apart and allowed left turns.

Kim Goldberg, 2109 August Briggs Drive, explained her home was at the corner of August Briggs Drive and Columbia Gorge Parkway and stated their most basic request was to avoid excess school traffic through the round-a-bout in the Vineyards Subdivision for those traveling to Columbia Gorge Parkway as it was the only entrance to the neighborhood and the only way they could get to their homes. She commented that the Vineyards Subdivision was a very social community, and they understood what the morning and afternoon rushes entailed when dropping kids off and picking them up. She did not feel they should incur any risk of accidents at the round-a-bout and noted it had been designed for residential traffic. She also asked for signage designating the entrance for the school at Oakville Ranch Drive.

Beth Riggert, 1605 Ballentine Lane, understood this was one of the southernmost sites that had been considered by the Columbia Public Schools and that boundaries had not yet been drawn so they did not know where the children would be traveling from, but some would likely come from the north side of the Vineyards Subdivision, and there was currently no way for those children to get to the school site other than from Highway WW and Rolling Hills Road. She thought children would also be coming from the Old Hawthorne area and accessing Highway WW. She noted that intersection was dangerous as there had been an injury accident on Friday night and a fatality in March, so the concern regarding traffic was not unwarranted. She stated the traffic study had indicated this was sufficient with a D rating, and she did not feel that should be considered sufficient. She commented that they were concerned about the immediate and the long term effects for safety given the D rating. She noted the intersection of Oakville Ranch Drive and Rolling Hills Road was flatter and allowed for better sight lines with regard to traffic coming from the south. The intersection of Columbia Gorge Parkway and Rolling Hills Road was just past the crest of the hill creating a disadvantage for someone coming from the south to the north. She believed allowing the left at Columbia Gorge Parkway was more dangerous than if a left were allowed at Oakville Ranch Drive given the sight lines. She understood there had been discussion with regard to a traffic signal, which might alleviate some of the concerns, but that was not in front of the Council at this time. As a result, she did not agree with Mr. Trabue in terms of his comment of Oakville Ranch Drive being an immediate relief valve for people turning north. She asked the Council to consider an amendment allowing left turns out of both Columbia Gorge Parkway and Oakville Ranch Drive because Oakville Ranch Drive was the safer option. She commented that they appreciated the considerations the Columbia Public Schools had given the community over the last few month, especially with regard to signage in an attempt to control traffic within the subdivision, and noted they looked forward to working with them in the future in that regard. She reiterated her request for the Council to amend the proposal by requiring a full access and north turn out of Oakville Ranch Drive. She understood the contractors would be able to turn left from there during construction, but parents would not.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought it was a good idea to have a dedicated left turn lane and a straight through lane as well, and asked if this was a possibility for the other access. Mr. Nichols replied staff had concerns with regard to weaving between the two drives due to the closeness of the two intersections because it was not as safe. Mr. Skala understood it was less than 1,000 feet between the two intersections, and the previous

speaker had mentioned there was a sight distance issue. Mr. Nichols reiterated it was the opinion of staff that it was not as safe.

Ms. Peters suggested they look at traffic patterns after the school was built, and that they look at another left turn or a light if too many people were turning north off of Columbia Gorge Parkway. Mr. Nichols stated staff always evaluated traffic concerns, and explained a light would not work with regard to flow since Rolling Hills Road was designated as a minor arterial. If the development to the south occurred, a signal would be placed there as it was a midpoint between Highway WW and New Haven Road. As they moved forward with Rolling Hills Road in the future, all of the intersections would be evaluated, and appropriate treatment would be analyzed and engineered at that time.

Ms. Nauser asked if there would be an evaluation of the intersection at Highway WW and Rolling Hills Road as she did not feel the intersection was adequate. Mr. Nichols replied improvements to the intersection of Highway WW and Rolling Hills Road had been included in the development agreement for Old Hawthorne. Staff had seen plans for a signal and a round-a-bout at that location. He understood the developer was working toward one of those solutions, but he did not know the timing of when that work would be completed. Ms. Nauser asked if it would be done in the next several years. She hoped it would not take ten years to complete. Mr. Nichols replied he thought MoDOT had approved plans and issued a permit for the signal several years ago. Afterward, there had been discussion regarding a round-a-bout, and he believed plans for the round-a-bout had been approved by MoDOT as well. Ms. Nauser asked if the City had indicated it needed to be done by a certain date. Mr. Nichols replied no, and explained they were encouraging the developer to move faster on the improvements at that intersection.

Ms. Peters asked if the round-a-bout on Columbia Gorge Parkway was large enough to accommodate buses. Mr. Nichols replied he was not certain, but thought it would have a truck apron that was mountable. It would likely not track the same as a car, but would be able get around due to the mountable curve that would track the back tire.

Ms. Peters made a motion to amend B347-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Peters stated she believed the gated access amendment would be good since no one wanted vehicle through traffic at that location, and because children would still be able to walk or bike via that route.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been on the Planning and Zoning Commission in 2005 when this was first proposed, and noted he, like many others, was a proponent of connectivity between neighborhoods, but there were issues associated with these neighborhoods as the development would involve a school and the school associated traffic considerations. Access would still be provided for emergency vehicles and to children by foot or bicycle. He thought this was reasonable, especially since there was a consensus of the neighborhoods, and he was happy to support it.

Mr. Thomas stated he was supportive as well. He understood the value of street connectivity in general, but traffic levels were at a point where it would place an unsafe and extreme burden on the streets in the Woodlands Subdivision. He commented that he was encouraged by the conversation since there was a strong focus to enable children that lived

within a mile to walk or bike to school. He encouraged the school, neighborhood associations, and families to find ways to enhance and promote it. He suggested the emergency access be aesthetically pleasing so it was a welcoming bicycle and pedestrian connection while still incorporating the technical components to allow emergency vehicles to travel through it. He hoped this school would have a high proportion of kids walking and biking to it.

The motion made by Ms. Peters and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend B347-15 per the amendment sheet was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas commented that he wanted to discuss a possible change to the access at Oakville Ranch Drive and Rolling Hills Road so it was a full access intersection. Mr. Teddy stated Section 3A of the development agreement indicated it would become a three-quarter access intersection once the school opened. It would allow a left turn in, but not a left turn out. Mr. Thomas understood if the bills were passed as proposed, left turns would not be allowed off of Oakville Ranch Drive. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala asked if they should stipulate the same kind of left turn system with the dedicated receiving turn lane, if they decided Oakville Ranch Drive at Rolling Hills Road would remain a full access intersection, as he thought it would be good. Ms. Peters asked if there would be enough room since the intersections were only 800 feet apart. Mr. Nichols replied it would create a weaving movement. He reiterated staff did not feel it was as safe. He noted it would work in the short term, but they had major concerns for the long term.

Mr. Skala asked if it would be safer for one intersection to not have the receiving lane if the Council decided both left turns were warranted. Mr. Nichols replied he thought Columbia Gorge Parkway needed a left turn movement since it was a collector road. He reiterated the distance was the issue between the two intersections.

Mr. Thomas understood they would want a receiving lane at Oakville Ranch Drive if they decided to allow left turns there. Mr. Nichols stated there would be a conflict with the northbound traffic trying to get onto Columbia Gorge Parkway. Mr. Thomas asked if another option could be to prohibit left turns into Columbia Gorge Parkway, and only allowing left turns into Oakville Ranch Drive. Mr. Nichols replied he was not sure that would be desirable to the residents.

Mr. Thomas understood most of the traffic would be a result of kids living within a mile of the school because those beyond a mile were eligible for bus transportation to school, and asked what was assumed in the traffic study in terms of kids walking and biking to school from these neighborhoods. Mr. Trabue replied they had utilized the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) studies for this type of activity, but they had also looked at what had been experienced in Columbia. He noted Mill Creek Elementary School was one of the most congested schools from the perspective of parent drop offs and pick ups. It was almost 30 percent above what was recognized by the ITE, so they had utilized that information for traffic projections. The traffic study indicated they would have 225 additional cars entering in the morning peak hour and the afternoon peak hour. There would also be another 165 cars leaving since there were about 60 staff vehicles, which would not leave again, and that got them to the 400 number. Mr. Thomas understood about 160 vehicles would be trying to turn left off of Columbia Gorge Parkway within a 15-20 minute timespan. Mr. Trabue stated it was

actually a 30-40 minute timespan. The morning was a bit tighter, but the afternoons were more protracted. He noted it was difficult to identify the exact mix of traffic traveling north and south. He explained the counts were based on existing traffic patterns, but that could change. The anecdotal evidence indicated many people would actually be traveling south. Mr. Thomas understood those people could utilize Oakville Ranch Drive. Mr. Trabue stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked if it was a possibility to not make a decision with regard to Oakville Ranch Drive until the new school boundaries were drawn so they had a better idea of the traffic patterns. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and noted the Council could always change how traffic moved. He pointed out they would need to know whether they wanted to add a lane now. Mr. Thomas understood someone would have to pay for the intersection improvements if they wanted to allow left turns out of Oakville Ranch Drive and asked who would pay for it. Mr. Matthes replied he did not believe the number of cars would warrant an extra lane at this time. In the future, due to growth, it might be needed. Mr. Thomas noted the residents were concerned about being trapped if they had to leave when the parents were leaving. Mr. Matthes stated it was really not a lot of traffic, and pointed out many more cars traveled through most intersections in Columbia every day. He understood it would feel like a big change to the neighborhood, but, empirically, it was not a lot of volume. Mr. Trabue commented that right now 40-45 homes had been constructed in the Vineyards Subdivision, and approximately 140 additional lots could be developed. As a result, traffic would increase by a factor of four or five due to new residents in the neighborhood. He noted there were many neighborhoods with 180, 200, and 300 lots that were served by an intersection such as this. Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Trabue thought this kind of volume could be managed fairly easily by the intersection design. Mr. Trabue stated that was correct as that was what the traffic consultant had indicated. He pointed out the study had been done when they were only looking at one intersection. The second intersection would help, and anyone going south would likely take the southern access.

Mr. Skala understood this issue could be remediated later if there was a problem, and suggested they wait as Mr. Trabue had made a reasonable and compelling argument indicating the traffic could be handled. Mr. Trabue pointed out the traffic projections from the traffic study were for 23 years out, and the City utilized 28-30 years in its projections. Both concluded there was adequate capacity. He noted things could change, but they had factored in a reasonable aggressive growth rate. He explained Rolling Hills Road was four lanes from Highway WW to Columbia Gorge Parkway, and they would make modification to the Columbia Gorge Parkway intersection with the receiving left turn lane, etc. It would be three lanes there. He commented that changing the access at Oakville Ranch Drive to allow left turns in the future if needed was a viable possibility. As Rolling Hill Road was developed as a four lane roadway, all of the intersections would be re-evaluated in terms of what was appropriate. The extension of Howell Mountain Drive through the unplatted property to south and another connection to Rolling Hills Road was compelling as well, but they did not know when it would occur. He noted City staff had become more aggressive with regard to longer term planning, and would likely determine that location when reviewing Rolling Hills Road even if that development had not yet occurred.

Mr. Thomas understood approval of the bills as proposed would not preclude making Oakville Ranch Drive a full access intersection in the future. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

B347-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B348-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B349-15 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with The Housing Authority of the City of Columbia for the purchase of property located at 115 Lynn Street, 107 Lynn Street, 105 Lynn Street, 700 Oak Street and 104 W. Sexton Road; authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with The Columbia Community Housing Trust for the purchase of property located at 106 W. Sexton Road, 108 W. Sexton Road and 110 W. Sexton Road.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked from where the \$100,000 would come. Mr. Cole replied Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) reserve funds. Mayor McDavid understood it would not come from the general fund. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mayor McDavid asked if these lots had been purchased by the Columbia Housing Authority with CDBG funds. Mr. Cole replied no. Mayor McDavid understood this involved dedicated CDBG money for this type of purchase. Mr. Cole stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked if a thought was to vest some or all of these lots into a community land trust, and how that would work if it were to occur. Mr. Cole replied a neighborhood meeting had been held in October to get an idea of what the residents wanted developed there. He thought they wanted to see more affordable housing and owner-occupied housing on Lynn Street, and the land trust idea had come up in that regard. Mr. Thomas asked what steps needed to be taken to create the land trust and how it would operate. Mr. Cole replied they were looking at doing this for the first four properties associated with the Lynn Street PUD, and needed to determine what the entity would look like and what it would be under. He noted this would take a broad community discussion. He thought he would recommend a separate 501(c)(3) served by the City for at least the first three years. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification with regard to the City's involvement. Mr. Cole replied he would suggest they staff it. He pointed out this was his opinion, and there were other ways it could be done. He explained he had met with other communities that had participated in similar efforts and had been involved in a conference call with a national leader on land trusts, and they had recommended separation. Mr. Thomas asked if the land trust would ultimately have an independent board of directors or if they would be appointed by the Council. Mr. Cole replied he would recommend a separate board of directors, and the standard nationwide, which was what he would recommend, was for the board to be represented by people living in the structures and in the neighborhoods surrounding the developments and by people in the private sector, such as a lender, realtor, and a council member or community development

staff person. There were different ways to form the board and there were triggers as to when people living in the homes would be brought to the board. He suggested they get some houses done so they could gain a pool of buyers to help make up the board. Mr. Thomas understood the titles would be owned by the 501(c)(3) and asked how selling the properties would work. Mr. Cole replied it could be done in a variety of ways and would be guided by the by-laws and the specific land leases. Most land trust organizations sold the structures, but maintained ownership of the land. This allowed the land trust entity to address any issues, such as foreclosure or property maintenance, and greatly reduced the price of the home since the buyer would only pay for the structure. He stated some education would be needed, and noted a couple of local banks and developers had indicated interest and support of the concept. He explained the bank would hold a loan like it would on any typical mortgage, and the loans could be sold to Fannie Mae. The trust would guarantee the loans and could assist if there was a foreclosure situation until another buyer was found. Mr. Thomas thought the entity would need staff so some sort of funding stream would be required. Mr. Cole stated that was correct. He noted he was comfortable with the City staffing it had for at least three years, but pointed out that would need to be addressed down the road. Most housing trust houses sold similarly to the market so they changed over about every seven years. The City of Springfield had a land trust that had been operating for close to five years, and they had just had their first resale. He thought Columbia was well positioned in terms of staffing.

Mr. Skala understood discussions were needed and asked for clarification regarding the next steps. Mr. Cole stated he would recommend working with a consultant, such as Burlington Associates, to help set it up as they had templates for strategic plans, by-laws, ground leases, etc. and had helped create trusts in other communities. He thought a public input session was needed and possibly a Council work session. They would want to approach the neighborhoods with these different options and obtain feedback.

Mr. Matthes stated he thought they could build the houses and work on the trust at the same time. He did not believe it was an either/or situation. Mr. Skala thought it would be helpful to have a better understanding since they were going down this road because it would affect future decisions regarding the purchase of properties and what would be done with those properties. He stated he would like to receive more information.

Mayor McDavid asked if the land could be sold to the private sector if they purchased it with CDBG funds. Mr. Cole replied a lot of steps would need to be taken to meet the requirements, so it was possible, but highly unlikely. They had to serve families that were at or below 80 percent of the median income with CDBG funding. He noted they would likely have to pay the money back to HUD, and suggested they not go in that direction. Mr. Teddy asked if it could go to an organization that built affordable housing. Mr. Cole replied it would still need to meet the national objectives of HUD if they were to sell the property to Habitat for Humanity, Job Point, or another similar organization. Mr. Thomas understood those organizations were in that business so they would not be precluded from purchasing the property. Mr. Matthes thought it was unlikely for a for-profit entity to take this on, but organizations in the business of affordable housing could be involved. Mr. Skala understood

it had to remain in the affordable housing stock in one way or another. Mr. Cole pointed out they could work with a private developer on the development of the houses.

Mayor McDavid asked what would happen if they did not purchase the land. Mr. Cole replied it would remain with the Housing Authority, and they would then determine if they would try to do another tax credit project. It would be out of the control of the City so he was unsure as to what would happen.

Mayor McDavid explained he was skeptical of the City's involvement and noted he had more confidence in the Columbia Housing Authority as they were in the business. He understood the City would set up a second infrastructure to manage it. He agreed this might be something staff would do well, but noted there were many things the City did not do well. He stated he would oppose this project.

Mr. Trapp pointed out the Housing Authority had also decided to move forward with a land trust structure because it made sense and because there had been a wide path of success with that route. He pointed out some portion of the affordable housing units they had created through federal pass-through funds, such as CDBG and HOME, were no longer in affordable housing as they were now in rental housing. The land trust model would lock affordable housing into perpetuity, which was good for the future of Columbia. He challenged the comment that the City did not have the capacity as he had watched this division of City government closely and believed Mr. Cole had brought a singular set of expertise. He noted Mr. Cole enjoyed the skills of a home builder while still being academically strong with a powerful sense of analysis. He thought they could see the differences in metrics since Mr. Cole had taken over. He commented that he believed this was within the core competency of City government and within the rubric of what the public expected of City government in terms of affordable housing. Since they had to bring items forward without them being fully formed, it allowed for public scrutiny and the interpretation of the worst possible outcomes. He pointed out the actions to date did not necessarily require them to create a housing trust if they chose not to move forward. He believed this was a good CDBG project, and if they chose not to go through a land trust, they could go through their previous model, which had been successful. It just did not have the insurance of maintaining guaranteed and permanent affordability. He pointed out the Housing Authority was currently using all of its resources toward the redevelopment of the central city and affordable housing through the public housing stock, so they had to decide if they wanted to provide affordable housing within the next couple years or in a couple decades. He reiterated there was a huge need and a public desire for it, and the City had knowledgeable and capable staff that could move this forward in a positive direction. He thought it would be foolish to not vote in favor of purchasing these properties. He agreed they had not been looking to do this, but noted government was often in the place to do those things that others would not do. He stated he did not know of any organization that would build affordable housing in this area, which could really use some nice redevelopment.

Mr. Ruffin stated he agreed with Mr. Trapp. He did not feel this was a controversial issue and believed it would create a great opportunity to do something important in a neighborhood that was already engaged in redevelopment. It would also allow them to do

something more quickly that would have a maximum and visible impact. He thought this would move their relationship with the community in a positive way.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B349-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas agreed with the comments of Mr. Trapp and Mr. Ruffin and noted he was confident in the ability of staff to make good decisions to create permanent affordability. They had studied other communities that had been successful in doing this. He pointed out it would likely not create enough affordable housing, but it would move the needle in the right direction. He stated he would strongly support the purchase of these properties.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought the important part of this was that it would be “in perpetuity” and would diversify the affordable housing stock. He noted the affordable housing initiative had support nationwide and within the community. He believed this was a good step forward.

B349-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: MCDAVID. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B354-15 Authorizing construction of street improvements on Providence Road from Stadium Boulevard to Stewart Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B355-15 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of street improvements on Providence Road from Stadium Boulevard to Stewart Road.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood there would be an increase in costs due to a change in the configuration of the turning lane and the associated easement acquisitions, and asked for clarification. Mr. Nichols replied the design had not changed since 2013, but the value of the land had changed considerably. He commented that it would be good if they could acquire easements sooner than later in terms of costs. Ms. Nauser understood the money they had saved with regard to easements on Turner Avenue was likely all gone due to the increase in these costs. Mr. Nichols explained that once staff had the authority, they would obtain appraisals to determine the amounts to offer for the easements.

Ms. Peters understood this was a MoDOT road, but the City was paying for the improvements to it. Mr. Nichols stated this was a 2005 ballot project to provide access for the Grasslands neighborhood. The concept at that time was a road connecting Burnam Road to the Phi Psi house and Rollins Street, but as the process developed, there was considerable opposition to taking land from the Phi Psi house. As a result, Council asked staff to look at other options to make the corridor and access work, and MoDOT had approved the layout that was currently proposed.

Ms. Peters understood a right hand turn would be able to be made from Burnam Road to Providence Road, and there would be a light at that intersection. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. He explained there would be two left northbound movements out of Burnam Road and the light at Rollins Street would be removed. Ms. Peters asked what would happen at Turner Avenue. Mr. Nichols replied a signal would be placed there. Ms. Peters asked if

anything would be done at Stadium Boulevard and Providence Road. Mr. Nichols replied there would be an extension of the right turn lane, which was a southbound to westbound movement. The current right turn lane was very short. Ms. Peters asked if Providence Road would be widened. Mr. Nichols replied the City would acquire property to assist with the right turn lane. Ms. Peters understood there had been talk about removing houses along Providence Road at one time. Mr. Nichols explained they would not be removing any houses with this plan. Ms. Peters asked where the City would get the land for the right hand turn. Mr. Nichols replied from the adjacent property owner. Mr. Thomas understood the house would not be acquired. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct, and explained only the land needed for the right turn lane would be acquired.

Mr. Thomas understood this project would cost \$3.8 million even though the projection in 2013 was \$2.1 million. He asked if that \$2.1 million figure had included both easement acquisition and construction costs. Mr. Nichols replied it had included both.

Mr. Skala stated he thought some of the original plans, which were rejected for various reasons, were estimated at \$8-\$9 million. Mayor McDavid recalled them being \$6-\$7 million. Ms. Nauser stated that was correct, and noted it was because they would have had to condemn and acquire houses.

Mr. Thomas understood the house at the corner would be very close to the widened lane. Mr. Nichols stated the engineer of that property had access to the City's plan for the intersection prior to building that house. Mr. Thomas understood the City did not have the authority to dictate where that house was built. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if that property would still meet all codes. Mr. Nichols replied he did not believe it would be in conflict with building setback requirements.

B354-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B355-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B356-15 Levying a special assessment and authorizing the issuance of a special tax bill as it relates to the reconstruction of the sidewalk along the south side of Broadway, from Eighth Street to Ninth Street.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid understood there was a request to table this item. Mr. Noce stated that was correct, and noted the request was to table it to the next Council Meeting.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table B356-15 to the January 4, 2016 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B350-15 Authorizing the design and construction of a stormwater quality feature, construction of a sidewalk along a portion of the south side of Nifong Boulevard between the proposed Aurora Drive and Bethel Road, construction of sidewalks along both sides of the proposed Aurora Drive, and the design of a new east-west connector roadway from Peach Tree Drive to the proposed Aurora Drive; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B351-15 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of a stormwater quality feature, construction of a sidewalk along a portion of the south side of Nifong Boulevard between the proposed Aurora Drive and Bethel Road, construction of sidewalks along both sides of the proposed Aurora Drive, and the design of a new east-west connector roadway from Peach Tree Drive to the proposed Aurora Drive.
- B352-15 Authorizing construction of the Clark Lane West Sidewalk and Hinkson Creek Trail Connection Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B353-15 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Clark Lane West Sidewalk and Hinkson Creek Trail Connection Project.
- B357-15 Authorizing a waterline relocation contract with Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Boone County, Missouri relating to the Discovery Drive roadway and sanitary sewer extension project.
- B358-15 Appropriating funds received from the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission as part of a cost apportionment agreement for roadway pavement improvements to Clark Lane between Woodland Springs Court to McKee Street.
- B359-15 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding positions in the Public Works Department and deleting positions in the Public Works Department and Utilities Department; amending the FY 2016 Classification and Pay Plan to add a classification; transferring funds.
- B360-15 Authorizing application to the United States Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration and the Missouri Department of Transportation for airport capital assistance grants.
- B361-15 Authorizing the filing of applications for public transit planning, operating and capital assistance grants with the Federal Transit Administration.
- B362-15 Appropriating grant funds received from the Federal Aviation Administration for the purchase of an Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting (ARFF) vehicle to be used at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B363-15 Appropriating grant funds received from the Federal Aviation Administration for the Runway 13-31 Design and Bid Schedule I Construction Project at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B364-15 Authorizing construction of sanitary sewer improvements along the MKT Trail and Providence Road from Stadium Boulevard to Elm Street, more specifically described as the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 1; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B365-15 Authorizing a Contract of Obligation with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources to satisfy financial assurance requirements for proper closure and post-closure care with respect to a permit for operation of a solid waste disposal area.
- B368-15 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation – Traffic and Highway Safety Division for a DWI enforcement unit; appropriating funds.

- B369-15 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation – Traffic and Highway Safety Division for youth alcohol enforcement; appropriating funds.
- B370-15 Authorizing a sub-recipient monitoring agreement with Boone County, Missouri relating to acceptance of the FY 2015 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award to purchase equipment for the Police Department; appropriating funds.
- B371-15 Authorizing a business associate agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of the Department of Family and Community Medicine, for the provision of physician services.
- B372-15 Authorizing Amendment No. 2 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for HIV prevention.
- R193-15 Setting a public hearing: reconsider the construction of a 161 kV transmission line to the Perche Creek substation and system transmission improvements.
- R194-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements to the Albert-Oakland Family Aquatic Center to include replacement of the bathhouse roof and exterior lighting, installation of a cantilever shade structure on the southeast corner of the pool deck, and replacement of interior bathhouse plumbing, fixtures and lighting.
- R195-15 Authorizing the City Manager to execute agreements with various social service agencies.
- R196-15 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for design phase services for the reconstruction and extension of Runway 13-31 and partial reconstruction of Taxiway B at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R197-15 Authorizing a first addendum to the local site generator agreement with MBS Textbook Exchange, Inc.
- R198-15 Declaring a HOME rehabilitation loan on property located at 904 Sandifer Avenue paid in full; authorizing a deed of release.
- R199-15 Approving certain documents in connection with the City’s HOME funding for renovations to property located at 207, 209 and 211 Hicks Drive and 214A, 214B, 216A and 216B Unity Drive for Stuart Parker Housing Development Group, LP.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP (except for R195-15 on which he abstained), SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

- R200-15 Establishing an Integrated Water Resource Planning Committee.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if the scope of this committee included a funding philosophy for the water utility. Mr. Johnsen replied no. He explained it was aimed at demand side and supply side infrastructure development. The primary goal was to develop a group of projects that

were needed to maintain the supply and keep the water system intact. While it would project costs, it was not a cost of service study analysis, which was a separate process.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, stated the Water and Light Advisory Board was supportive of the formation of this committee as it was the next step that needed to be taken in terms of long range planning. He commented that the future expansion of the treatment plant had been studied in 2010-2011 by Carollo Engineers, the distribution and water storage had been studied by Jacobs Engineering in 2014, and currently Black and Veatch was studying the condition of the components of the water treatment plant. The next step was for the integration of everything. He noted this would be the first hard look at the demand side management practices for water.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Conway if he could explain demand side management practices for the water utility. Mr. Conway replied it would equate to water conservation. He noted they could look at the uses of treated water that could be converted to non-treated water. He commented that a good example was taking water from a pond or hard rock deep well for irrigation.

Ms. Nauser stated she thought one of the next crises the country would face involved clean water. The underground aquifers were diminishing, but they all assumed water was an endless supply. She noted she was fully supportive of anything they could do on demand side to reduce water consumption and to use more gray water to save water today and in the future.

The vote on R200-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B373-15** **Approving the Final Plat of Bear Creek Vistas – Plat 1 located on the east side of Creasy Springs Road and north of Prairie Lane (3628 N. Creasy Springs Road); granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction.**
- B374-15** **Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to off-site parking facilities in C-2 zoning districts and for fraternity and sorority houses.**
- B375-15** **Authorizing construction of upgrades to Boiler 8 at the Municipal Power Plant to reduce nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.**
- B376-15** **Authorizing a joint funding agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.**
- B377-15** **Appropriating funds for integrated water resource planning services.**
- B378-15** **Accepting conveyances for utility, sewer, temporary construction and drainage purposes.**

- B379-15 Authorizing construction of improvements to the Albert-Oakland Family Aquatic Center to include replacement of the bathhouse roof and exterior lighting, installation of a cantilever shade structure on the southeast corner of the pool deck, and replacement of interior bathhouse plumbing, fixtures and lighting; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.
- B380-15 Appropriating funds for parks projects at Atkins Baseball Complex, Douglass Park, Gans Creek Recreation Area, McKee Street Park, Nifong Park and Southeast Regional Park.
- B381-15 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding a cashier position in the Finance Department – Treasury Division; transferring funds.
- B382-15 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for the Live Well Boone County pilot program; amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding positions in the Public Health and Human Services Department; appropriating funds.
- B383-15 Appropriating funds from the 2015 Poster Party for the Arts event.
- B384-15 Accepting a donation from the Missouri Division of Tourism to be used by the Convention and Visitors Bureau to offset expenses associated with travel writers attending the 2016 True/False Film Festival; appropriating funds.
- B385-15 Authorizing a property transfer agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri relating to City-owned property located at the corner of Fifth Street and Locust Street.
- B386-15 Amending Chapter 9 of the City Code as it relates to fire sprinkler systems in fraternity and sorority buildings.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP120-15 Electric Transmission Line Project Public Hearing Communications Plan.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that he did not agree with the citizens that had indicated there had not been adequate input from the community as he had sat through a lot of long hearings and public comments. In addition, there had been a lot of stakeholder meetings. He understood some people felt they had not been informed, but he thought the City had gone out of its way to make the information as available as possible.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not believe it was just the lack of opportunity or awareness of public input as he thought some of the information that had been presented had been misleading, and provided the geometry of the electric pylon poles and matrix process as examples. Mayor McDavid agreed he did not understand the matrix either, which was why he had ignored it. Mr. Thomas stated he had asked about it many times and had yet to receive a satisfactory answer. Mr. Skala commented that the matrix was a model, and noted models tended to have errors. He thought it provided an indication of how the rest of the community felt about the pathways. He stated he did not take this model too seriously and only used it as an indicator of how the community felt in a general sense. He noted he thought it was fair to criticize some of the factors and weights given to items. He believed this reconsideration was to ensure everyone had the opportunity to comment.

Ms. Nauser agreed it had been an open process, but there were some people that had felt they were not notified. She understood they would discuss whether to continue with Option A or one of the other two options at this public hearing, and asked if they would also discuss pole placements at the hearing. Mr. Johnsen replied the primary focus of the public hearing to be held on January 19 was the line routing, which involved Option A, Option B, and Option B-2. Pole placements were a line design issue that would be addressed after the route was decided. He noted they could not discuss pole placements for Options B and B-2, and they could only represent what had been done on Option A thus far. He pointed out they had not done anything with regard to line design since it was decided to reconsider the route. Ms. Nauser asked if it was already designed. Mr. Johnsen replied they were only partially done with the design, and they had put a halt to it after the open house. Mr. Matthes stated he would characterize what the Council had seen thus far as the first draft in terms of the design. Ms. Nauser explained she had been under the impression that both issues might be able to be discussed on the same evening so they did not have another long hearing on this again. Mr. Johnsen stated that if they had proceeded with Option A, the next action would have been to come to Council with the description of easements needing to be acquired based upon the design. He noted that would be the time to discuss the pole placements, and they had a ways to go before they were ready for that meeting.

Mr. Matthes explained the matrix had been one of many indicators, and the Council could disregard it if they felt it was unsatisfactory. It was a model that had been created to try to narrow all of the input. His take away had been that each route was equally unloved. Mayor McDavid thought the problem with the matrix was that it had made so many assumptions that appeared to be subjective and arbitrary. Mr. Johnsen stated they planned to explain the matrix again to the extent the Council wanted.

REP121-15 Columbia Pursuing STAR Communities Certification.

Ms. Buffaloe provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if the Environment and Energy Commission was aware of this. Ms. Buffaloe replied yes, and explained she had presented this information to them at the November meeting. She noted they were excited because they felt this would show opportunities for improvements for a focused effort.

Mr. Thomas thanked Ms. Buffaloe for pushing forward with this because he believed this type of program would target resources most efficiently to achieve the goals that had the best chances for success.

REP122-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the Council for approving B349-15 and noted he thought the third house Habitat for Humanity had built was on Lynn Street. He suggested staff provide monthly reports on the progress of the project on Lynn Street.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, invited the Council and public to participate in Columbia Eve Fest, the community New Year's Eve celebration. Tickets were on sale now at the Missouri Theatre and the United Methodist Church.

Mr. Thomas heard about a new program from the U.S. Department of Energy at the National League of Cities Conference called Solar Powering America by Recognizing Communities (SPARC). It was a national recognition program with no cost technical assistance. He had spoken to Ms. Buffaloe about it and understood it had been presented to the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB). He noted the WLAB had voted to recommend the City apply to this program. Based on the information provided, the City would receive technical assistance in terms of best practices and goals to move towards with regard to locally generated solar energy in the community. He understood Tom O'Connor of the WLAB had essentially completed the application, but staff would need to verify the information. He suggested they instruct staff to apply to the SPARC program. Mayor McDavid understood there was Council consensus for the City to apply to the program.

Mr. Thomas stated his support for the expansion of the police community outreach unit and the process that had led to the selection of the three underserved areas of the community. He understood the Department of Justice had a community oriented policing program, which he believed was the gold standard for community policing training, and asked if staff had looked into it.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought the City should host at least one public forum on race and equity. He noted he had participated in one that had been hosted by Diversity Awareness Partners a couple of weeks ago, and he thought they needed to be a part of the community-wide process that discussed this issue. He felt the City should show leadership by organizing a forum, and look at its own in-house inclusion environment, hiring practices, contracting practices, etc., while allowing the community to critique the City's efforts in race and equity.

Mr. Thomas stated he would miss the February 1, 2016 Council Meeting.

Mr. Skala suggested, at a minimum, a public work session be held to discuss race and equity issues. He noted he had recently distributed some of the resource materials that were associated with the National League of Cities Conference and Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL) Council in Nashville, Tennessee, to the Council and Mr. Matthes, and thought they could be of assistance to the City. He noted Orlando, Florida, had used some of its public projects to engage minority contractors in a real and tangible way, and this information had been distributed as well. He commented that Governing Magazine had been featuring a whole host of articles about community policing, and recommended they review that information also. He reiterated that he believed this should be discussed at a public work session, and it might then morph into a public discussion.

Mr. Skala stated a constituent had contacted him regarding the number of decibels produced at a concert at the Blue Note as it had been in excess of 150 decibels. He believed

this was a public health issue because it would really damage people's ears, but understood there might not be much the City could do other than to appeal to owners of the Blue Note. He asked if anything could be done legally. Mr. Matthes replied it would need to be researched.

Ms. Nauser thought people should take personal responsibility by not attending concerts that were too loud. Mr. Skala commented that he believed public health was a communal responsibility of the government.

Mr. Trapp stated Independence, Missouri had passed Tobacco 21 so there were now 21 million people, including those in Columbia, Missouri, who were protected from the purchase of tobacco. He commented that he had read a recent Columbia Tribune article regarding the lack of enforcement, and thought they should do what they could to make it more meaningful. He believed the vast majority retailers complied with the law, but understood some did not all of the time.

Mr. Trapp noted he had toured the Special Collections and Rare Books room at the University of Missouri today, and the staff there wanted him to convey that these collections and books were a resource for everyone in the community and not just University of Missouri students. He thought it might be a good field trip for the Council and suggested the Historic Preservation Commission communicate with them. He provided a flyer to pass on to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Trapp understood the Human Rights Commission was looking into facilitating conversations regarding race as was the United Way as it was a communitywide and nationwide issue. He thought they wanted good dialogue to move them forward and bring them together as one community.

Mayor McDavid commented that he had spent a lot of time on economic development during his term of office, and noted REDI had been successful in job creation tied to the University of Missouri, but that had generally involved highly technical jobs. He pointed out socio-economic issues were tied to racial issues, and stated he did not believe they had done well in terms of creating jobs for people with a high school degree, a GED, or someone with a criminal background. He understood this was a national problem, but noted it was difficult to try to lure manufacturing companies to town because they wanted incentives. Those jobs tended to go to communities with incentives. Columbia was not competitive in terms of manufacturing jobs. He pointed out the City just lost tax increment financing (TIF) for four years and did not have any enterprise zones. In addition, the City did not participate in some of the State incentives, such as Chapter 100 and Chapter 353. He asked staff to look at the potential of the City embarking on some of the available incentives that were widely used, such as Chapter 100 and Chapter 353, so they had something to offer. He noted it was painful to see a manufacturing company with 400 jobs dismiss the City because it was too expensive to operate here.

The meeting adjourned at 10:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk