

**MINUTES**  
**CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI**  
**APRIL 16, 2007**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 16, 2007, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA and WADE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting of April 2, 2007 and the special meeting of April 9, 2007 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Janku and a second by Ms. Nauser.

**APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA**

At her request, Mr. Janku made the motion that Ms. Nauser be allowed to abstain from voting on the Liquor License Review Board vacancy. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote. Per the Disclosure of Interest form, Ms. Nauser noted that her husband had a liquor license.

The agenda, including the Consent Agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Crayton and a second by Mr. Janku.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Sue Underwood - Presentation of Petition Opposing the Mavericks Baseball Team coming to the American Legion Park.**

Sue Underwood, 711 Rustic Road, presented the Council a petition signed by neighbors of the American Legion Post #202 who were opposed to the proposed Maverick Stadium and facilities. The petition represented over 90 percent of the neighbors, who felt it would be a mistake for the Mavericks to be allowed to take away this valuable City park. She read the petition and stated this would impact, not only the signers of the petition, but many Columbia residents. She understood City staff was in discussion with American Legion and Maverick Baseball representatives and asked the Council to direct City staff to end what she felt was a Maverick land grab.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**(A) Construction of street improvements on Providence Road from its current terminus north of Vandiver Drive to Blue Ridge Road.**

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was the required public hearing for the extension of Providence Road, which was included in the November 2005 ballot issue and had been on the City's Major Roadway Plan for many years. The proposal involved a 460 foot bridge over Bear Creek and Bear Creek Trail and approximately 4,100 feet of road. He noted some federal funding would be used for this project.

Mr. Glascock stated this public hearing was being held in order to receive comments on the proposed Providence Road project, which would potentially be partially funded with Surface Transportation Program funds. Following approval, the City would proceed with project design, right-of-way acquisition and construction. He explained this project was being processed in accordance with federal rules and regulations and the plans would be subject to review by Federal Highway Administration. If federal funds are used for right-of-way acquisition or construction, the percentage of federal funds used would be in accordance with current regulations. The right-of-way acquisition process that would be followed included the right of property owners to obtain their own appraisals. The proposed project was not expected to have a significant impact on the environment and was granted a categorical exclusion from the need to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement by the Federal Highway Administration. He explained a verbatim transcript of this hearing would be submitted to the MoDOT. Interested parties could also submit written comments, evidence or recommendations with respect to the project to the Director of Public Works within the next ten days. He commented that this information would be a part of the transcript. Using the overhead, he described the proposed project. The approximate length was 4,100 feet and the estimated cost was \$4.1 million. He pointed to an area on the overhead and explained a TDD was mention for that area, which was why its cost of about \$2.9 million was not included in the ballot issue. He explained they were working with the developer to get that portion built at their cost. They were also working with them for some earthwork in the area. He stated they would have a development agreement on that portion. He noted they were planning for a four lane right-of-way. They would build two temporary 14.5 foot lanes to be shared by bicycles. Once all four lanes were built, bike lanes would be located on both sides of the road. In addition, there would be a sidewalk and pedway at the right-of-way lines. In regard to the bridge, he commented that they did not know if they had enough funds to build the substructure for all four lanes. He stated he thought it would be best to do it now, so they would not have to go back to get another environmental clearance at a later date.

Mr. Watkins stated they were proposing this be constructed in 2008. If Council wanted to move forward, staff was suggesting they proceed with design. After the design was complete, they would bring it back to Council for approval and direction to bid the project for construction. Tonight, they would be deciding whether to move forward with the design based on the general template Mr. Glascock outlined. The actual plans would be brought back for review in early 2008.

Ms. Nauser asked when construction would begin on 763. Mr. Watkins replied it would be close to the same time as this project.

Mr. Janku commented that over the years there had been questions and concerns from some of the residential property owners to the west of this area. He asked how the design might impact them in regard to traffic. Mr. Glascock asked if he was referring to

Parkade. Mr. Janku replied yes. Mr. Glascock stated they had an interested parties meeting and explained the lights would not be shining directly in the backs of their homes. He believed the road would be at grade or marginally below the houses, so they were hoping the residents were on board. He noted they had not heard any complaints.

Mr. Wade stated the design showed a 13 foot strip between the two and asked if that would be a landscaped strip subject to real trees. Mr. Glascock asked if he meant the median portion. Mr. Wade replied yes. Mr. Glascock stated it would. Mr. Wade asked if 13 feet was wide enough for real trees. Mr. Glascock replied he would have to ask the Arborist, but thought it was wide enough.

Mr. Watkins explained with the ballot issue, where they knew, long term, they would need four lanes, they included funds and were suggesting they acquire right-of-way for all four lanes. They would only build two now and when the demand was there, they would come back and build the remaining two lanes.

Mayor Hindman understood the right-of-way was not yet acquired. Mr. Watkins replied that was correct. Mayor Hindman asked if they were planning to grade for the entire four lanes. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mayor Hindman asked if they would be grading for the sidewalks as well. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mayor Hindman asked if they would be in a position to ask that the sidewalk be built on the west side since the grading would already be done. Mr. Glascock replied yes and noted it would match up with Vanderveen to the north. Mayor Hindman asked about the east side. Mr. Glascock stated the one on the east side could be built at the right-of-way line or it could be brought in until a certain time. He noted they could do something similar to what was discussed with Brown School. Mayor Hindman asked if there was a way to get people on the east side across the bridge. Mr. Glascock replied yes and explained it would look similar to the East Broadway bridge that was built over the Hinkson. Mayor Hindman asked about the interim period when they were waiting for the second set of lanes to be built. Mr. Glascock replied there would be some type of pedestrian facility on each side.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Janku stated the bridge would be an extensive structure and he hoped there would not be a chain link fence on both sides as it went across the creek. He wanted to ensure they found a better way to make it esthetically pleasing.

Mr. Janku made the motion directing staff to proceed with design specifications to include sidewalks on both sides of the street. He felt it would be helpful to have a pedestrian facility on the east side as well as the west side. He commented that when he was first elected to the Council, he did not think this extension was necessary, but today, with the growth of the area, he believed it was appropriate.

The motion made by Mr. Janku was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B119-07 Voluntary annexation of property located at 254 West Old Plank Road; establishing permanent R-3 zoning.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this involved the annexation and zoning of about 1.6 acres in south Columbia. The requested zoning of R-3 was essentially equivalent to the existing County zoning of R-M. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended denial of the zoning by a vote of four to three. He pointed out there had been three prior instances of the City granting R-3 zoning as permanent zoning in conjunction with voluntary annexation requests in this R-1 zoned area since 2004.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor Hindman commented the Council had been following a rule, which he did not like, where they would give the same zoning that was in place in the County. He thought they should take another look at this issue to determine if it would be continued. He noted he felt everything that came in should be planned. In this case, where so much had already been done and with only 1.3 acres, he thought they might want to respect the request. He also felt the Planning & Zoning Commission had a very solid point in regard to this issue.

Mr. Wade stated he did not believe the requirement they grant comparable zoning was in the regulations. He understood it was a recommendation the Council made in order to get support when they were trying to do the involuntary zoning. He thought it should have been left there and noted he believed they had made three incorrect zonings by granting R-3. He thought it was inappropriate for the location as the roads were a catastrophe. He felt they were creating an intense dense residential area in a place where it could not be handled and that they needed zoning that was appropriate land use for the City versus reflecting what the County had done in the past. He commented that he did not believe three prior improper land use decisions made this fourth one proper. If this 1.6 acre property was sold, it could have as many as 27 units on it. The intention, as indicated by the applicant, was to have a house with the possibility of another house. That could be done with R-1 zoning. He stated he would not support R-3.

Ms. Nauser noted in the past she had gone along with the philosophy of giving like for like, but felt this area was becoming overcongested and Old Plank was turning into another road on the “need to fix” list. She commented that since there was a PUD-6 and a PUD-7 in close proximity, she was only willing to give R-1 zoning to this property. She pointed out this was not deterring anyone from asking for additional zoning on this property in the future.

Mr. Janku commented that he did not believe they had a right to equivalent zoning. He explained that if someone was not likely to get the equivalent zoning in the City, they could potentially develop in the County organizing their own sewer treatment facility instead of tying into the City sewer. That facility would discharge into a tributary stream that flowed through the City and would have a negative impact on the community. If they did not allow properties to come into the City to tie into the sewer system, the danger was that they would develop their own sewer treatment facilities under the existing County zoning. He thought that was the challenge. If the City did not accept this zoning, which he agreed was not perfect, he believed they would still see that type of development occurring with adverse environmental impacts.

Ms. Hoppe understood if they approved R-1, the applicant could still hook up to the sewer and at a future time, if the proper infrastructure was there and if it was appropriate for

the area, could apply for R-3. She noted people were concerned with the City allowing development and creating dangerous situations where there was not sufficient infrastructure. She thought they needed to consider that as well.

Mr. Skala stated the problem with the R-3 was the infrastructure. He agreed precedence was important for Council, but believed that was assuming the precedent the County set was the proper land use decision. He was not sure that was the case and did not believe they needed to compound it by continuing to make poor land use decisions. They had to consider infrastructure. There was a way for the applicant to connect to the City sewers and to have a second household. He felt that was a reasonable solution to this issue. He noted he did not intend to continue compounding a land use error.

Mayor Hindman stated he believed Mr. Janku made a significant point in that they already had the zoning, so they could construct it. The Council had to consider what was best for the community. They had to determine if they would allow it with inadequate infrastructure because it was better to hook up to the City sewer and meet City requirements. He did not believe they wanted to say no everywhere the infrastructure was inadequate because the lack of infrastructure did not keep them from building in the County. His point was that they needed to look at these things and not be automatically bound by the existing County zoning.

Ms. Nauser agreed the zoning should not be thought of as an automatic. It should be looked at on a case by case basis and evaluated for its merits at that point and time. Since they were not limiting what the applicant wanted to do and because there were other properties in the vicinity that would want the same zoning, she felt R-1 was appropriate.

Mayor Hindman asked if they could modify the request. Mr. Boeckmann replied they could modify the ordinance to change R-3 to R-1 and hold it over to the next meeting. In the meantime, the applicant could be contacted. He noted it was the applicant's right to withdraw the annexation request if she chose.

Ms. Nauser made the motion to amend B119-07 by changing the zoning from R-3 to R-1. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser made the motion to table B119-07, as amended, to the May 7, 2007 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B120-07 Approving the C-P Development Plan of Paris Road Plaza - Phase 1 located on the east side of Paris Road (State Route B), north of East Brown Station Road.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this involved phase one of the proposed Paris Road Plaza project and was located on the east side of Paris Road, just north of E. Brown Station Road and south of Highway 63. The proposal would allow the development of up to 34,000 square feet of retail/office space on 4.32 acres. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval of the C-P development plan.

Mr. Teddy noted staff found this plan and its development parameters to be in compliance with the C-P ordinance approved for the property last September.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jay Gebhardt, a civil engineer with A Civil Group, 1123 Wilkes Boulevard, stated he was representing Jack Rader, the owner and developer of this property. They were asking for approval of the Phase 1 area. He explained they had worked with the neighbors to address most, if not all, of their concerns. Parking, lighting, landscaping, etc. was in accordance with City standards.

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

B120-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**R102-07 Authorizing application to the Missouri Department of Transportation for Surface Transportation Enhancement funding.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was the public hearing on the City's proposed grant application to MoDOT for Surface Transportation Enhancement funding. The purpose of the hearing was to obtain input for possible grant applications, which were due by May 16, 2007. Staff reviewed a number of projects in the CIP and listed some possibilities. There was about \$2.5 million available for District 5 and there would be a lot of competition for the money. It required a 40 percent match in order to be competitive. The maximum grant per project was \$500,000.

Mr. Teddy explained the purpose of Surface Transportation Enhancement funds was to enhance the conventional transportation system with improvements like sidewalks, trails, scenic roadway corridors, transportation museums and historic preservation projects along roadway corridors. In District 5, they were most commonly sidewalk and trail projects. A little less than \$2.5 million was available this year, the final year under the current transportation legislation. The maximum federal match was \$500,000. Projects could be of any size, but the local match would increase proportionately the further they went above \$500,000. The minimum local match requirement was 20 percent and higher matches were encouraged per the point system used by the evaluation committee. A 60 percent federal share with a 40 percent local match would provide a couple of extra points and could be decisive in determining funding. Staff reviewed projects within the CIP and other City planning documents. They provided, for consideration, four projects they thought would make good applications. Those included the Hominy Branch Trail from Stephens Lake Park to Woodridge Park, the Bear Creek Trail from Blue Ridge Road to Lange Middle School, the Providence Road Pedway, which was submitted last year and involved the construction of a 10 foot pedway from Southampton Drive to Peachtree Drive, and the Hinkson Creek Trail to Rockhill Park. In the report, they also listed the Bear Creek Trail from Lange to the Boone County Fairgrounds and the County House Branch Trail from Twin Lakes to Stadium Boulevard.

Ms. Hoppe asked what communities composed District 5. Mr. Teddy replied it involved 13 counties in central Missouri and included Cole County, Jefferson City and Boone County. Mr. Watkins noted it also included Booneville, Sedalia, part of the Lake area. He noted generally, the City's main competition was Jefferson City, who was very aggressive in

trying to secure funding through the program. Mr. Janku agreed that Jefferson City had some ambitious plans.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the City would be fortunate to receive funding for two projects. She wanted to know what they thought the City would receive. Mr. Watkins replied probably one. Mr. Teddy explained last year there was about \$3 million available with 30 applications being submitted. Fourteen of those applications were funded, which included two from Columbia. There was a range of \$9,000 - \$500,000 per project for the federal share and involved Columbia, Jefferson City, Sedalia and a variety of smaller towns.

Mayor Hindman understood staff provided a list and the Council was being asked to approve or disapprove the list. He asked if they would come back to the Council. He also wondered what the best strategy would be and asked if they should submit four. Mr. Watkins replied there was not enough time to complete the applications and bring them back to the Council. They wanted direction as to which applications the Council wanted staff to submit. Mayor Hindman asked if they wanted approval on all four projects. Mr. Watkins replied that if there was a project they did not like, they should pull it off because otherwise they would have to return the funding received if approved. If there was a project they felt was particularly important, they should make sure it was included. The public also had an opportunity to suggest projects that were not on this list, which was the reason for this public hearing. Mr. Janku understood part of the strategy was including projects that would score well per the point system used.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jeanine Pagan, 701 Bluff Dale Drive, stated she was requesting the Hinkson Creek Trail to Rock Hill Park be removed from this resolution. She suggested adding Twin Lakes to Stadium due to the number of people that currently used the MKT off of Stadium. She did not believe the Hinkson Creek to Rock Hill Park was a good project due to its cost. She noted \$440,000 was a lot of money and thought the park funds could be better used for the purchase of the Crane property. She stated this was a very small stretch of trail for the cost. She understood they wanted to connect the Hinkson Creek Trail from the Grindstone to Rock Hill Park and noted Rock Hill Park had such a steep incline that it could not be biked. She did not think one could go up to Rollins Road and bike down Rock Hill Park. She agreed it could be walked. She understood this was to connect East Campus to the Hinkson Trail system and did not think people would be able to climb the hill without being very tired. She also understood it went to the back of MU's Veterinary School and was not sure the University wanted people back there. She did not think this was a practical mode of transportation as she did not think many would use it. She noted it had too many bridge crossings, which would disturb the endangered Hinkson Creek. She commented that the bridge crossings also added to the expense. In addition, the trail would go through the Altis property and she did not believe Mr. Altis was in favor of the trail easement at this time. She was also concerned about this proposed trail being concrete versus gravel. She reiterated her preference was that this project be removed and they add the Twin Lakes to Stadium Trail or the Bear Creek Trail from Lange to the Boone County Fairgrounds.

Sutu Forte stated she was speaking in regard to the Hinkson Creek Trail and asked the Council to leave the area as it was. She commented it provided a lush quiet buffer from

street and campus noise and activity. It was a purifier of the increasingly polluted air and a respite for stressed out minds. She stated it was a treasure of serenity and communing with nature. It was not an aerobic exercise station or a short cut to campus. She noted the City had a huge exercise park already at Stephens Lake Park. She asked that the Hinkson Creek Valley be an exercise spirit sanctuary, where one bowed to nature versus cutting it up or paving it. She asked them to honor, respect and appreciate this small, but important amenity in the City, which she believed had expanded too fast and was not what the long time residents of Columbia wanted. She was in favor of biking and walking, but not destroying what little nature they still had in Columbia. She stated she talked to ten homeowners on Bluff Dale with one liking the trail, one being undecided and the remaining being strongly against the trail. She felt the project was a waste of taxpayer money. She commented that the tax increase was to improve all of the wards and she felt Ward 6 had enough. She asked the Council to respect the wishes of Mr. Altis and the majority of the neighborhood by leaving the area as it was.

Dorothy Kyger, 611 Bluff Dale Drive, stated this was a beautiful area and agreed with everything Ms. Forte said. She believed this program was very expensive and would only benefit a few people. She asked that the money be spent more wisely.

Bruce Summers, 603 Bluff Dale Drive, stated he was speaking out against the Hinkson Creek Trail project as well. He noted there was already a bike path coming down Old 63 that would run parallel to it a few hundred yards away, so he did not believe this was a wise choice for funding. He understood this was to get people from Shepard Hill across to the University and was concerned in regard to how they would get people across Old 63 because there was no safe crossing point. He reiterated he believed this was a waste of money. He thought it was pork federal funding and wanted to see it spent somewhere else.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluff Dale Drive, stated she was concerned they were spending a million dollars in an area that was less than one mile long and were placing sidewalks in a floodplain and swamp where the floodwater could cause further erosion. She did not think this would benefit many people. She understood only one person in the Hinkson Valley was in favor of the project. It was steep and she believed there had to be some kind of environmental impact by constructing three bridges in a stretch that was less than one mile. She explained the neighbors were currently trying to leave more of the area wild, so there would be more plants to absorb the floodwaters and pollution. She did not believe there was \$1 million worth of benefit in tearing up the area. She noted Stephens Park had a paved trail. She commented that there were sidewalks downtown needing to be repaired and believed the money should go towards that versus building a sidewalk in a swamp and up a mountain. She asked that the project be taken off and the money be spent on better projects.

Fred Schmidt, 1604 Amelia Street, stated he was representing the PedNet Coalition and they believed any and all of these projects were excellent projects as they served areas of town that did not have as much as they could. The Rockbridge sidewalk, Woodridge and Bear Creek extension all served areas that could use it. In regard to the other trail, he commented that it was always hard to identify who the interested parties were for access since the access and people were not there. In support of the Bluff Dale project, he noted

there was quite a bit of high density housing on South Old 63 and there needed to be some way to get those people to campus and downtown.

Steve Kullman, 205 S. Garth, stated he thought County House Branch should be the first one on the list without knowing the scoring criteria. He did not think any one trail should be removed. He noted the Hinkson Creek to Rock Hill Trail was an important part of the future network and should not be written off because one neighborhood did not want it. He explained the waterways had always been natural transportation corridors and believed they needed to preserve and use those natural transportation routes.

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

Mr. Janku understood, in regard to the Providence Pedway, the school was putting in a sidewalk as part of their expansion of the Career Center. Mr. Teddy replied that was correct and noted the City would need to coordinate the idea of the pedway with them. Mr. Glascock stated he was working with the School District and the consultant to get an 8-10 foot pedway along there. They might end up bonding their sidewalk and coming back after the design to build it.

Mr. Janku asked how they decided whether it should be 8 or 10 feet. Mr. Teddy replied 8 feet was the standard in the Subdivision Regulations and 10 feet was probably desired when the conditions were right. Mr. Glascock stated it depended upon the level of service and the anticipated users. If it was more than average, they would want the pedway to be wider.

Mayor Hindman stated he was not familiar with the point system, so he was relying on staff's judgment. He thought they were all good projects. He understood one of the speakers suggested the County House Branch project be included and he was not opposed to that, but thought they needed to rely on staff experience. The proposed Hinkson Creek Trail to Rock Hill Park appeared to be controversial, but he noted they were talking about transportation system. Historically, they had always used the valleys as a source of transportation and noted a 1935 City Plan called for using the Flat Branch Valley for a road. He believed it made sense to make the flat areas pedestrian and bicycle routes where streets had not been placed because that was the natural place for them. He reiterated this was a system and that it should not be broken up. He stated he did not agree with the argument they would be spending money on something that would not be used. He believed that argument was used in connection with the MKT and Katy Trails. When it became part of an interconnected system, he believed it would be used and would be a great asset for Columbia. He felt they had the opportunity to extend the Hinkson Creek Trail so it would go from the Grindstone Nature area, which meant it hooked up with the MKT Trail, to the University and thought they should take it. He stated he did not know about the steep hill, but believed the designers could handle it. He thought they should also check with the University to determine if they would be willing to co-sponsor the application as he understood this trail would be on their Master Plan.

Ms. Nauser asked if they had discussed this with the University. Mr. Hood replied they had been discussing this trail with the University for several years. Initially, they had an alternate route, but due to campus construction, that route did not work out. He noted they

had preliminarily discussed this route with the University and they were interested in the link to campus, but did not know if they had received a final decision.

Ms. Nauser asked if the scoring criteria included the ability to acquire easement right-of-way. Mr. Teddy replied there was a question on the application asking if right-of-way had been acquired. The score sheet asked the raters if the cost estimate was complete and he believed that question was combined with the acquisition piece. He did not think it was a detriment to a project to not have right-of-way cleared, but felt there needed to be a thoughtful, realistic estimate behind it.

Ms. Nauser asked if it would negatively affect the City when applying for projects in the future if they received an award but were not able to acquire easements. Mr. Teddy replied he believed track record was important. He noted this was the last year of SAFETEA-LU, but anticipated the federal government would eventually authorize another grant program.

Mr. Skala asked if the four projects were ranked or equivalent. Mr. Teddy replied they did not rank them. He explained there was a point system, which was not a binding point system, used by the committee for preliminary ranking prior to discussing other merits of each project.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she was familiar with the area involved with the proposed Hinkson Creek Trail to Rock Hill Park project and noted she was in favor of increasing alternate forms of transportation, the network and the system in general as she was a cyclist. She pointed out she had recently taken a wonderful road bike course put on by Fred Schmidt and planned to bike to work more often as a road biker. She stated the neighborhood was told the connection from Stephens Lake to Grindstone would be Old 63 and understood there would be a pedway on the west side of Old 63. She explained the concern was that this would be a connector which was about a half block to a block west of it. In addition, it would almost parallel it, but would be down by the creek. It would also require three bridges to cross the creek, which made it a huge expense. She noted she had walked across the creek to Rock Hill Park and Rollins Road and it was very steep. It was much steeper than going up Old 63 or Broadway. In regard to the University students on Old 63 and Grindstone, there was a bridge behind the Ashland Apartments which could be taken. There were already many people at the Ashland Apartments that crossed Stadium. She believed that would be a less steep and natural crossway to go to the University. Her concern involved whether this was the best use of the funds and having a landowner that was not willing to sell, possibly causing an eminent domain issue. She agreed it would be nice to go down the creek and not go up 63 to get to Grindstone, but it would be at a great expense. She understood they were estimating the cost to be \$1 million, but noted it could be \$2 million after the engineering was complete. She stated she would be asking the resolution to be amended to remove the Hinkson Creek Trail. She believed it would be better to ensure they had winners included.

Mr. Janku understood staff had explored an alternative route with the University which did not work out and asked if the road that went behind the Veterinary School was usable. Mr. Hood replied no and explained he understood the University was constructing a new bio-research type facility, which would not allow anything to be built within so many feet of the facility and eliminated that route as a possibility.

Ms. Crayton commented that she received some phone calls indicating disappointment with the Hinkson Creek Trail. She stated there were many people who did not use or see the need for these trails and believed the \$1 million could be used for other projects and priorities. She noted no one used the bridge over Providence Road, which cost a lot of money and was an eyesore in the middle of the City. She stated she liked the PedNet, sidewalks and parks, but believed when spending this type of money, they needed to ensure they were getting their money's worth.

Mr. Wade noted after talking with many people over the last two months, he sensed a slowly growing opposition to trail investments with other sidewalk and infrastructure needs going unaddressed. He understood these were people who were supportive of the PedNet and the kind of amenity the trails represented. They were concerned the decisions were being made too fast and that the Council might be making some ill-advised decisions regarding infrastructure investments. He believed they needed to be careful in terms of the quality of the projects approved in order to maintain a very strong support for an important community amenity. He understood they were talking about three systems; streets, trails and a third alternative road system. He did not believe a 10-14 foot path through anywhere was a trail. He believed it was a mini-road. He stated they were talking about creating a bicycle road system and its purpose and impact was different than the concept the community held of trails. The concept of trails in this community was recreational, not transportation. He supported the notion of building a bicycle transportation system, but believed they needed to separate their decisions and concepts of that as a third system. He was reluctant in supporting hard surface roads in natural greenbelt areas as roads had a different impact than rock trails. In regard to the Hinkson Creek Trail, he understood the notion of the system, but believed there was an alternative path that maintained the system and better addressed the need for the bike road system. If this project would start at that bridge across the Hinkson and was part of Ashland Road, he thought they would have a better road system for bikes without the ill-effects of the Hinkson Creek Trail going through the bottoms. He explained this would allow a bike path that went from the apartments along Ashland Road and on out to Old 63 where there were a huge numbers of students. It would bring them into the employment center of the University and would be considered part of that system as opposed to the Hinkson Creek Trail. He stated he was very supportive of the Providence Road Pedway and would much rather see the Bear Creek Trail or the County Branch Trail as one of the projects in place of the Hinkson Creek Trail.

Mayor Hindman stated he supported the County Branch Trail. He noted Ashland Gravel was in the Plan and added there was a whole system worked out and the Hinkson Creek Trail was a significant part of the system. He understood the neighbors were afraid they were going to build a behind them. He thought they would likely use Bluff Creek, which was already a place for people to ride their bicycles down to get to this. That would connect the whole east side of town providing a complete system. He pointed out this was a very intricate part of the system and that the system was on the City's web page for review.

Mr. Skala appreciated the comments about this being a system and agreed there were a lot of parts to this system which were integral to making the whole transportation system work. He also believed there were choices to be made. He believed the steepness to the

slope, the engineering not being done, and the potential degradation to the stream by pouring concrete were questions that needed to be asked before making recommendations to these parts of the system. He noted there was citizen opposition to one of the proposals. He was not suggesting it should not be implemented at some point, but felt more public discussion was needed to find out whether this should be one of the four choices recommended.

Ms. Nauser stated she concurred. She understood they were working hard to incorporate a City-wide trail system, but believed sending something that was controversial to the State for grant funding would be counterproductive. She noted it was in the CIP and Parks Master Plan and they were not removing it from those plans. She suggested adding one of the other two proposals or submitting only the three non-controversial projects already listed in the resolution.

Ms. Hoppe made the motion to amend R102-07 by removing the Hinkson Creek Trail from the resolution. The motion was seconded by Ms. Crayton and approved by voice vote with only Mayor Hindman voting no.

Mayor Hindman made a motion to amend R102-07 by adding the County House Branch Trail to the resolution. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R102-07, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**(B) Proposed schedule change for commercial air service at the Columbia Regional Airport.**

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the City had been contacted by the commercial airline serving the Columbia Regional Airport in regard to requesting a change in the service schedule that would eliminate flights to St. Louis Lambert and move all of the flights from Columbia to Kansas City. The airline carrier had an essential air service agreement with the Department of Transportation (DOT) and would require DOT approval to make the changes. As part of the process, the DOT was asking the City for comments. In the past, they had considered what the Columbia City Council and the Jefferson City Council were recommending.

Mr. Glascock stated that in order to keep the \$1 million in entitlement funds received from the government, they had to have 10,000 enplanements per year. With current projections, they would not meet this. If they had two years in a row like that, the City could lose the entitlement funds. He noted proposed schedules were provided. Washington, D.C. was the number one destination for the Airport and the schedule out of St. Louis allowed one to get into Washington, D.C. at about 10:20 a.m. The proposed schedule would get one to Washington D.C. at about 11:00 a.m. He understood many liked to fly out and be back in one day. If there was a way to tweak the schedule to get people out of Kansas City and into Washington, D.C. quicker, he was hopeful Mesa and Air Midwest would accommodate that. He noted those were the issues that needed to be addressed.

Mr. Janku asked how long the current EAS subsidy they were receiving would last. Mr. Glascock replied he believed it was through October, 2008. Mr. Janku asked if it was

renewable or if it went away if they did not provide a certain level of service. Mr. Glascock replied it was bid every two years and thought they would be okay as long as they kept their payments up and were profitable so people would bid on it. Mr. Watkins pointed out that every other year or so, Congress considered eliminating or cutting EAS funding back substantially. He understood the current proposal was to eliminate subsidies for towns closer than 250 miles to a hub airport, which would eliminate Columbia's funding. Mr. Janku understood it was likely, even if the ridership stayed low or went lower, the EAS subsidy might be available for this carrier or another carrier. Mr. Glascock replied it could be, but was hard to say. Mr. Janku asked if this was automatic or if it could be appealed. He wondered if it was capital funds going to the airport, not operational. Mr. Glascock replied he believed they used them as both. Mr. Janku asked if it could be appealed or if they could lobby to keep it. Mr. Glascock replied anything was appealable, but he did not know whether they would listen or not. He stated he did not want to put the City in that position. Mayor Hindman stated they almost lost tower service and used political pressure to retain tower service, but noted they were on thin edge at that point.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Greg Stephens, President of Air Midwest operating as U. S. Airways Express, explained they had seen a decline in passenger traffic since operating in Columbia. He noted they operated to Kansas City and St. Louis and had been having difficulties with their on time performance. They were proposing to eliminate service to St. Louis. This would give them the ability to support a spare aircraft in Kansas City and they had their own facilities and staff. He commented that they had been having difficulties with their partner, U. S. Airways, in St. Louis. He noted they had been working hard with Midwest Airlines and were getting close to announcing they would have an increased codeshare arrangement with Midwest. He stated Midwest was very excited about bringing Columbia into the mix.

Jeffrey Hartz, Manager of Essential Air Service for Mesa Air Group, stated they envisioned the two hub system with a much easier schedule in St. Louis, but when they actually put the schedule in place, they were constrained by U. S. Airways. This greatly reduced their ability to make the proper connections under American in St. Louis. Switching to Kansas City only and having their own station personnel allowed them to schedule as they saw fit in order to connect to the major flights the community needed. He understood important destinations were Washington, D. C., New York and Boston and this new schedule to Kansas City would have connections with Midwest Airlines to Washington, D.C., LaGuardia and Boston, as well as other destinations like Charlotte, Philadelphia, Chicago and Dallas. The vast majority of the major business destinations anyone would be flying to would be met in the morning flight. They also had the flexibility to hit times they had inbound connections. With the split schedule, people who left outbound through St. Louis in the morning did not realize they could come back the same day through Kansas City on the late night flight. A single hub would allow four distinct connection opportunities through the day, which increased the number of connections. Midwest and U.S. Airways combined would have about 33 destinations and 70 departures daily. This would allow them to improve operations and traveling for passengers. He noted Joplin, Missouri, which only had three trips per day, was averaging about 12,000 enplanements annually. They were hoping, by

making this change, they would be able to fix a lot of the problems they were having. He commented that EAS was a minimum level of service and was hopeful they could grow and get the Columbia Regional Airport away from the EAS program.

Mr. Janku asked if they offered service to Chicago. Mr. Hartz replied they offered service to Chicago Midway out of three cities in Illinois through a State funded program. Mr. Janku stated he read Kirksville had connections to Chicago. Mr. Hartz explained Kirksville got the aircraft back through to maintenance. They had to bridge the aircraft from Chicago to Quincy to Kirksville to Kansas City since the maintenance base was in Wichita for their Kansas City system. He noted Kirksville received service by way of the aircraft flow, even though they were not part of the program. Mr. Janku asked if Columbia could get service to Chicago. Mr. Hartz replied they originally looked at tying Columbia into that system, but due to the St. Louis flight constraints, they could not schedule it.

Herman Lueckenotte stated he believed the only thing that would improve the passenger load was access to a flight every 2-3 hours. He commented that people were subject to travel habits and, currently, they traveled by surface on I-70. He noted the shuttle had 3-4 times as many trips going to St. Louis as going to Kansas City. He explained when he worked for TransMo in Jefferson City, they had seven flights per day to St. Louis and three to Kansas City. He believed it was psychological in that people did not like to go in the opposite direction to go east, so he cautioned the City to not expect the loads to increase by going to only Kansas City. He noted the proposed schedule showed five hours between flights and stated people did not like sitting in an airport for five hours. He thought they still needed to push for another carrier out of Columbia. He commented that Mesa indicated in their annual report that if they lost subsidy, they would put those airplanes in other places. He stated he also did not think they needed to aim for Chicago and Dallas as there were not enough people going to those locations. In addition, they would be fighting with American and Southwest in regard to airfare.

Greg Cecil, 1700 Oak Cliff Place, stated he was on the Airport Advisory Board and encouraged the Council to do what Mesa was asking. He believed the connection with Midwest Airlines was huge. Midwest had expanded by about 50 percent in the Kansas City area. He thought they would be in great shape as long as AirTran did not take them over. He stated he believed four flights to Kansas City would be a good thing, but thought they needed to be sure Mesa connected those flights to the appropriate flights they wanted to be on. He noted Midwest had a lot of non-stop flights, which was a key factor with any alliance. He stated they also needed to be sure Mesa's service improved as he understood that and obtaining refunds on tickets had been a problem. He felt they could do the job, but needed to be focused. He understood they might be able to do a flight to Chicago, but if they did it would be on a 19 passenger plane versus a jet. He commented that he would also like to see the Airport Advisory Board have more opportunity to be involved as there were members who were very interested in commercial air service. He reiterated getting connections in Kansas City was a short term fix.

Mike Naughton, 600 Crestland Avenue, stated he was a security screener at the airport for over four years, but was speaking as a citizen of Columbia and noted, for the past few months, he had been working on the Visioning Project as a member of the Airport

subtopic group in the Economic Development group. His heart went out to the passengers who had been hurt by the lack of reliability and connectivity over the past several years. He felt there were plenty of reasons for this service to be improved and plenty of reasons it could be improved. He noted local employees had been trying very hard to give good customer service in bad circumstances. When being faced with poor reliability and an airline upper-management that displayed no interest in living up to its contractual obligations and ignored the inconveniences created for the people that wanted to fly out of Columbia, it was frustrating to realize they could simply change the situation solely for their own financial benefit. They indicated they could provide service to St. Louis and Kansas City, but did not put the necessary resources and effort into making it work. Since the EAS contract was between the airline and the DOT, there was not much the Council and staff could do, except to make comments. He pointed out the last flight of the day to Kansas City had very small passenger loads because very few people wanted to start their journey that late in the day, especially with the possibility of delays. He recommended the City insist the schedule of flights during the day be compressed so the last flight would depart Columbia between 3:00-4:00 p.m. instead of 5:18 p.m. This would give passengers a better shot at making connections and could improve the number of enplanements overall. He explained that before American left there had been a steady improvement in the number of boardings since the 911 event. With U.S. Airways, there had been a precipitous decline. He pleaded with the Council, City Manager and staff to raise the priority for fixing the Airport to a much higher level. He hoped the final Visioning reports would show the importance of the Airport for the economic development of the City and region.

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

Mr. Janku understood the staff report discussed the possibility of penalties and asked what types of penalties were involved with poor service and the failure to meet customer expectations while still protecting the City's interest in maintaining the subsidy. He wondered what they could ask for in the comments to the DOT. Mr. Watkins replied staff's recommendation was to suggest to the DOT that there be some teeth in basic services, such as being on-time and not canceling flights. He noted they were not aware of any penalties the DOT could impose at this point, but felt the issue should be raised. Mr. Janku wondered if they could ask them to reopen the subsidy and bid it earlier than anticipated if a certain level of performance was not sustained. If they were to provide comments in support of this, he was hoping they could ask for a certain level of performance and if that level of performance was not met, the company would be subject to some consequences. He was not sure what those consequences would be though. He understood there were comments regarding making improvements to the proposed schedule and thought that also needed to be addressed in the comments to DOT.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed the schedule was an important factor. He also believed it was better to maximize the number of flights in one direction or the other, although he agreed there was an issue of going west before going east. He noted the concern with regard to business travelers and thought they should make the earliest flight as early as possible and the latest flight as early as possible. He suggested compressing the schedule. Mr. Stephens stated one of the benefits with the codeshare with Midwest was their interest in Columbia.

Columbia was one of four or five communities within their network they were excited to add to the codeshare. They indicated they would be much more flexible in helping to ensure Mesa made better time connections. They were very focused on Kansas City and were anticipating having 50 flights per day by mid-summer. They also had expansion plans beyond that. It provided them more ability to connect and if something were to happen, there were more opportunities to take care of the passenger. Mayor Hindman asked about compressing the schedule. Mr. Stephens asked if he meant having more flights in the center of the day. Mr. Skala clarified he also wondered if the flights could be earlier, so they did not have late flights with connection issues and could offer something to the business traveler allowing them to go and come back in one day. Mr. Hartz stated the schedule they had to Kansas City was trying to meet that. By having the 5:50 a.m. flight arriving in Kansas City by 6:35 a.m., the traveler would hit the major destinations going east. He did not think they wanted to compress the terminating flight from Kansas City by making it earlier. He believed they wanted to wait for the last flights from the east coast as long as possible. This would allow the traveler a full eight hours of work while still allowing them to be back in Columbia by 10:30 p.m. He explained one of the biggest problems they currently had was the first flight leaving St. Louis was just after 8:00 a.m. and there were only three flights they could connect from. They averaged about one passenger per flight. They lowered fares as low as \$29 on that flight hoping to generate local traffic, but it did not work since there were no connections. He believed the proposed schedule fixed that problem. By coming out of Kansas City a little later, they were able to connect with the first series of connections in Kansas City. This allowed people traveling to get to Columbia by 10:00 a.m. Currently, the earliest flight into Columbia was 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Janku asked what codeshare meant and if it was in terms of revenue or costing the consumer less. He also wondered what gates they would use in Kansas City. Mr. Stephens replied the term codeshare related to their ability to ticket on that carrier and the carrier's ability to ticket on them. Passengers were not required to have two separate tickets. Midwest was in Terminal A and co-located with them in Kansas City. Since each gate in Kansas City had a security check point, passengers would be required to go back through security as they went down the hall. They were working with Midwest, as ridership improved, to provide a van on a security side so passengers would not have to leave the gate area and could go directly to their aircraft on the other end of the terminal. Mr. Janku asked how the baggage would move. Mr. Stephens replied the baggage was seamless. It would leave their aircraft and be moved directly to the next aircraft. They had baggage agreements with all of the carriers except Southwest. Mr. Hartz noted Midwest approached them in regard to building this relationship and expanding it into the new markets. They wanted to work with Mesa to promote service to the markets from Kansas City, so when they promoted their Kansas City operation, they were promoting the fact they operated to 12 AirMidwest markets as well as their 18 non-stop destinations.

Mr. Wade asked what needed to be done this evening. Mr. Janku replied they needed to authorize the staff to express an opinion to the DOT. Mayor Hindman pointed out they did not make the final decision. They were only able to make recommendations. He thought the federal government would try to decide what was most advantageous for their investment.

Ms. Nauser commented that she recently looked at flying in and out of Columbia, but understood she would have to sit in the airport for over 4 hours, which made it easier for them to drive to Kansas City. Last year, the Council made the decision of trying to go with the two-airport option, but that was not working. Now they were left with the Kansas City option only. Personally, she believed the Kansas City airport was cleaner, easier to move around and friendlier. She preferred flying out of Kansas City. She stated she was in support of moving all of the flights in/out of Kansas City. She was concerned with Council trying to determine what times would be more appropriate and believed those that knew the mechanics of airport scheduling should be making those decisions. She pointed out there was a report on the agenda in regard to extra acreage at the Airport and hoped this would broaden discussions regarding what they were going to do with the Airport.

Mr. Janku made the motion to direct staff to submit a letter indicating the City's decision regarding the proposed schedule change, to request Mesa confirm the codeshare arrangement with Midwest Airlines, to request an earlier flight out of Kansas City International to maximize connection opportunities, to request Mesa Airlines track delays and send monthly reports to the DOT and the City, to work with Mesa and the DOT to include specific performance standards in the Essential Air Service contract which would impose penalties or consequences as contracted and to continue efforts to attract additional commercial air service. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **R32-07 Approving the Preliminary Plat of The Overlook located along both sides of West Broadway, extended; setting forth conditions of approval.**

Mayor Hindman noted there had been a request to table this item.

Mr. Janku made the motion to table R32-07 to the May 7, 2007 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

### **B125-07 Accepting certain streets for public use and maintenance.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained, annually, the Council was provided legislation in regard to accepting various segments of streets, generally subdivision streets, paid for by developers for the City to take over for maintenance purposes. This year, there were 154 street segments totaling about 20 miles that would be added to the maintenance list. He pointed out these were privately built streets constructed to City standards.

B125-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

### **B126-07 Authorizing a park operation and management agreement with Boone County for the Atkins property located north of the Boone County Fairgrounds.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted Tom Atkins donated this property to both the City and County jointly for recreational purposes. Following the public hearing last September, the Council directed

staff to pursue a formal management and operation agreement with Boone County to allow construction of two baseball fields and ultimately a complex similar to Cosmo Park. The draft agreement had been approved by the legal departments of both parties and followed the outline discussed last September. He understood the County Commission had not taken any formal action, but believed it would not be a problem. The City would have full and total responsibility for the development, operation and maintenance of the property. In addition, both parties had to approve the Master Plan and the County would contribute \$200,000, which included a Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant that the City and County jointly applied for a couple years ago. He noted the cost of the project was substantially more than \$200,000. This legislation would approve the agreement and was a companion to the next item, which would direct staff to begin design and construction. He pointed out they held this off hoping to have clear direction in regard to the American Legion property, but they were now behind and needed to push forward in order to have the two fields ready for 2008. If they waited several more months, they would miss that season.

B126-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B127-07 Authorizing the development of two baseball fields, an irrigation lake, an access road and a parking lot on the Atkins property located north of the Boone County Fairgrounds; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would direct staff to proceed and would also appropriate County and grant money. For the purposes of moving forward, staff was suggesting they use the \$325,000 that was in the ballot issue for the Legion Park. He noted he committed to the Legion representatives that if they did not move forward with the stadium, the City would find \$325,000 to replace these funds to complete the Legion fields.

B127-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B129-07 Extending the term of the cable television franchise held by MCC Missouri, LLC (Mediacom).**

**B130-07 Extending the term of the cable television franchise held by Falcon Telecable, a California limited partnership (Charter Communications).**

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Boeckmann explained they had been negotiating the franchise and were over 90% finished with only basic economic issues left. The introduction of a bill, which finally passed through the legislature, changed the complexion and offers that were being made in terms of financial aspects. When the bill passed, it had a greater impact on negotiations. He commented that he was not sure what Mediacom's position would be, but noted they owed the City some options. They indicated they might be willing to go ahead with the franchise, but a number of the basic terms would have to be renegotiated. Another option would be for them not to have a franchise with the City and operate under Public Service Commission

authorization, which would be available once the bill became effective on August 28<sup>th</sup>. He noted they knew they would not have an agreement by the time the franchise extension expired and agreed to a 60 day extension as suggested by Medicom. By the time this extension expired, he believed they would know whether or not they would have a franchise or if they would proceed under State authorization.

B129-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B130-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B131-07 Authorizing a local site generator agreement with State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated, as part of the 2006 August electric ballot issue, the voters approved the concept of locating two distributed generator projects in Columbia with a total output of 4 Mw. A contract with MBS was approved at the last meeting for the first 2 Mw and this contract addressed the remaining 2 Mw. The City had to have 15% more than needed in reserves and would have to purchase capacity even if they were not going to use it. These projects allowed the City to have this capacity available at a cheaper cost than the cost of buying it. They anticipated savings to Columbia ratepayers over the seven year contract would be about \$262,000. In addition, it would provide options for back up power for the users and the City system.

Ms. Hoppe asked if they would also be looking at biodiesel fuel for this one. Mr. Dasho replied yes.

Mr. Wade understood the economics was based on avoiding a spike in peak. Mr. Watkins replied that was correct.

B131-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

**B121-07 Changing the street name for the north/south portion of Copperstone Creek Drive to Granite Springs Drive.**

**B122-07 Approving the Final Plat of West Lawn Plat 3 located south of Rollins Road, off of Defoe Drive; authorizing a performance contract.**

**B123-07 Approving the Final Plat of Old Hawthorne, Plat 4 located northeast of Old Hawthorne Drive East; authorizing a performance contract.**

**B124-07 Approving the Final Plat of Old Hawthorne, Plat 5 located northeast of Old Hawthorne Drive Northeast; authorizing a performance contract.**

- B128-07 Appropriating funds for pool filtration improvements at The ARC.**
- B132-07 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.**
- R89-07 Setting a public hearing: considering an amendment to the FY 2007 Action Plan.**
- R90-07 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Summer Food Services Program for Children.**
- R91-07 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for breast and cervical cancer screening services.**
- R92-07 Authorizing an agreement with the National Association of County and City Health Officials for the Medical Reserve Corps program.**
- R93-07 Authorizing agreements with the Missouri Safety Center for overtime enforcement activities relating to hazardous moving violations and seat belt usage.**
- R94-07 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri regarding the Senior Games and the Show Me State Games.**
- R95-07 Officially recognizing the Stonecrest Subdivision Neighborhood Association.**
- R96-07 Authorizing an agreement with Callahan & Galloway, Inc. for the lease of office space located at 223-225 N. Ninth Street for the summer C.A.R.E. Gallery program.**
- R97-07 Authorizing agreements with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the loan of art in the lobby of the Daniel Boone/City Hall Building.**
- R98-07 Authorizing an agreement with Engineering Surveys and Services for engineering services relating to the Highway 763 water main relocation project.**

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

- R99-07 Authorizing an agreement with TranSystems for engineering services for a feasibility study relating to the construction of a COLT railroad bridge over U.S. Highway 63; transferring funds.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this would authorize an agreement with a Kansas City engineering firm to do the preliminary feasibility study in regard to fixing the at-grade railroad crossing on Highway 63. They believed this would give them more information in attempting to secure Federal and State funding to build the multi-million dollar project. Staff accepted proposals from a number of engineering firms and selected TranSystems to proceed with the study. He noted TranSystems suggested using an abandoned bridge from the Burlington and Northern. He thought this should be looked into, but was not ready to purchase and assemble a bridge until they knew it would work.

Mr. Wade asked for clarification on a 30% design. Mr. Watkins replied a 100% design was ready to bid and a 30% design meant they were looking at it. Mr. Glascock clarified 30% was a preliminary design.

The vote on R99-07 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R100-07 Authorizing an agreement with the Memorial Day Weekend - Salute to Veterans Corporation for an air show to be held at Columbia Regional Airport May 23 - 28, 2007.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted Council passed a resolution last summer which committed the City to an air show but had not approved the lease of facilities due to an on-going court case. That case was now resolved so they were bringing forward the lease, which included provisions for compliance with the federal court decision.

The vote on R100-07 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R101-07 Authorizing an agreement with Analytical Bio-Chemistry Laboratories, Inc. for assignment of tax credits for construction reimbursement of Lenoir.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated ABC Labs, who was receiving \$2 million in State tax credits, was assigning one of those to the City to help pay for Lenoir, which was the street running in front of them. The tax credits were dependent upon them meeting their employment and growth statistics and not something that could be bonded against, but would be an income stream over a 15 year period for both the million dollars and interest. He thanked ABC Labs for helping to pull this deal together and the Department of Economic Development for assisting in structuring it.

The vote on R101-07 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. 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.

**B134-07 Rezoning property located on the south side of St. Charles Road, across from Dorado Drive; from A-1 to PUD-6; approving the Fall Ridge - Phase 1 PUD development plan; setting forth a condition of approval.**

**B135-07 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to bicycle parking.**

**B136-07 Naming and renaming streets in conjunction with the Southampton Drive street construction project.**

**B137-07 Vacating a utility easement located on Lot 1 within Grindstone Plaza Subdivision; accepting a conveyance for sewer purposes.**

- B138-07 Vacating utility and drainage easements located within Winchester Subdivision - Plat 1.
- B139-07 Calling for bids for construction of the Lenoir Street Relocation Project, Phase I of the Gans Road Interchange Project.
- B140-07 Authorizing Change Order No. 1 with Brenneke Construction, LLC for the Rock Quarry Road culvert replacement project; approving the Engineer's Final Report.
- B141-07 Authorizing Change Order No. 1 with Emery Sapp & Sons, Inc. for construction of the Aztec Boulevard - State Route PP safety project; approving the Engineer's Final Report.
- B142-07 Confirming the contract with Garney Companies, Inc. for construction of a 36-inch well field supply main from the McBaine Water Treatment Plant to Star School Road.
- B143-07 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B144-07 Authorizing an agreement with The Harold E. Johnson Companies, Inc. for the lease of office space at 310 East Walnut; appropriating funds.
- B145-07 Appropriating funds for the Flat Branch Park Phase II Development Project.
- B146-07 Accepting a donation from the Wal-Mart Foundation for the purchase of digital cameras and equipment for the Police Department; appropriating funds.
- B147-07 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Blueprint for Safer Roadways Program; appropriating funds.
- B148-07 Appropriating funds for FY 2007 Boone County public health nuisance abatement activities.
- B149-07 Authorizing the issuance and sale of approximately \$3,775,000 principal amount of Special Obligation Notes (Regional Park Acquisition Project), Series 2007A.
- B150-07 Amending Chapters 4, 13 and 28 of the City Code relating to licenses and permits.

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

**(A) Intra-departmental Transfer of Funds.**

Report accepted.

**(B) Land Acquisition at the Columbia Regional Airport in Accordance with the Airport Master Plan 2002 Update.**

Mr. Watkins stated the 2002 Master Plan, which was being updated, called for the acquisition of property to allow additional taxiway access. The acquisition was 95% FAA eligible and staff wanted to proceed with acquisition of the property.

Ms. Nauser asked for the amount that was budgeted. Mr. Glascock replied he believed the City's part was \$12,000.

Mr. Janku made the motion to direct staff to proceed with the project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(C) Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission: Enforcement of Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair Ordinance - Recommendation.**

Mr. Watkins explained this was a report from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission on the enforcement of sidewalk maintenance and ordinances. He suggested Council accept the report and if they wished to proceed further, to schedule it for a work session.

Ms. Nauser made the motion to accept the report and schedule a work session at a later date. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(D) Street Closure Requests.**

Mr. Watkins stated there were three street closure requests in downtown requiring Council approval. Staff was recommending approval. He understood there was no request to grant a waiver of the open container rules.

Mr. Janku stated he thought 2:00 a.m. seemed a late. Joy Castillo, a representative of the Cinco de Mayo event, understood they would wrap things up by 11:00 p.m. due to the noise ordinance. The majority of the group would be under a tent area where the band would be playing. The break down and clean up would start at 11:00 p.m. and they would move the duration of the party indoors. Mr. Janku stated his concern was that the parking garage be open. Ms. Custillo replied the ATM access to Bank of America and the Eighth and Cherry parking garage would not be obstructed in any way. Mr. Janku understood the street closure would end at 11:00 p.m. Ms. Custillo replied there would be a period of time for the break down as well. She thought it might take an hour or so to do that. She explained they would not obstruct pedestrian traffic on the sidewalk and the tent would be enclosed in order to assist with containing people inside the tent.

Mr. Janku made the motion to accept the street closures as requested. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(E) Citizen Survey Report.**

Mr. Watkins explained Ms. Crayton asked staff to review how the City could reach additional low income people. They talked to the consultant who made two recommendations. They could over sample by about 100 and tabulate them separately, so it could be compared to the sample as a whole. The second alternative was to provide a limited number of surveys and ask community volunteers in a particular area complete them and bring them back. Again, these would be tabulated separately.

Ms. Crayton asked if they could designate a specific location for people to come and complete their surveys. Mr. Watkins replied they could discuss what would be the best way. He reiterated it would be less than 20 because that was where they needed to be statistically. Mr. Watkins understood this would add to the cost. Mr. St. Romaine stated the cost was \$25.83 per survey. Mr. Watkins thought they would be looking at about \$2,500.

Mr. Wade understood they had two options with one being the oversampling by 100 and the other being the assembly of about 20 people and asked if they needed to decide between one or the other or if they would do both. Mr. Watkins replied they could do one or the other or do both. Mr. Wade stated he thought it would be worthwhile to do both since it would not add much cost.

Ms. Crayton made the motion to move forward with both alternatives for additional response. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(F) Lease of Parking Spaces to Walnut Market, LLC.**

Mr. Watkins explained they received a request from a developer who was working in the Walnut Street area to lease eight parking spaces from a City lot on a long term basis. He noted they did this in garages and thought they might have done it once on a lot in the past. He felt with development downtown, parking was a key issue and providing a long term lease was essential. They would pay the going rate and the City would guarantee eight spaces in the lot next to Kelani.

Mr. Janku asked if the spaces would be restricted 24 hours a day and 7 days per week. Mr. Watkins replied he thought they would. Mr. Janku understood they had very few spaces in the parking plaza that were not 24/7 spaces. The rest were from 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. and then free to the public. He commented that the rate charged should be equivalent to the 24/7 rate.

Mayor Hindman asked if there was any concern in regard to the other businesses that had been using the lot. Mr. Watkins replied he believed the lot was currently metered. Mayor Hindman asked if it was filled to capacity at different times. He assumed it was or they would not be requesting this. He was concerned about providing this business several spaces that other people were relying on. He thought they might want to check with the other businesses that used the lot and asked if this was the lot next to Lou's. Mr. Glascock replied yes and noted these were not the highest used meters. The rate was based on that as well. He noted they could go back and talk to some of the businesses. Mr. Janku stated they monitored the revenues so they would know if it was heavily used. Mr. Wade believed, based on what Mr. Glascock stated, they could assume these were low use and could probably proceed. Mayor Hindman stated he was willing to proceed, but wanted to raise the issue. Mr. Watkins noted this would not be approving an agreement. It would only direct them to bring back an agreement.

Mr. Wade wondered how enforcement of the eight slots was accomplished and asked if they had to call the Police Department. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe understood they would be charged \$1,140 per space per year and asked how that compared to what they were getting now in terms of metered parking. Mr. Glascock replied it was comparable. He thought the rate for an uncovered space was about \$35 per month. Mr. Boeckmann noted that rate was based on the 24/7 rate in garages and was substantially more than they were collecting now on a two hour parking basis. Mr. Watkins stated it would fluctuate if Council approved a rate increase.

Mayor Hindman made the motion directing staff to prepare a resolution and agreement for Council consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Mr. Janku thought it was good to try and support businesses, but believed there was a danger of too much parking being tied up and not available in the evenings for other businesses. He felt they weighed that issue in this situation.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman and seconded by Mr. Janku was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions. Ms. Nauser abstained from the Liquor License Review Board vacancy vote.

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

Hazelrigg, Dennis, 4006 Jungle Tree Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire May 1, 2012

**AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD**

Cecil, Gregory, 1700 Oak Cliff Place, Ward 4, Term to expire May 16, 2011

Rosman, David, 104 Clinkscales Road, #505, Ward 1, Term to expire May 16, 2011

**ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY COMMISSION**

Kendrick, Kip, 1601 Windsor Street, Ward 3, Term to expire June 1, 2009

**LIBRARY BOARD**

Loveless, Jim, 2404 Topaz Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire June 30, 2009

**LIQUOR LICENSE REVIEW BOARD**

Lane, John, 212 E. Green Meadows, Suite 1, Ward 5, Term to expire May 1, 2010

**MAYOR'S COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL FITNESS**

Grabau, Andrew, 1413 Saint Andrew Street, Ward 4

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Ms. Crayton stated she received a letter from a resident on Hubbell Drive who was complaining about the potholes. She asked if someone from the street division could review the situation. Mr. Watkins stated that if she provided the letter, they would respond to it.

Mayor Hindman stated someone called him regarding a situation at Forum at the Break Time Service Station. The caller felt right turn on red coming out of the Forum Shopping Center was dangerous as it was on a curve and signage in the area obstructed the view. He suggested they prohibit right hand turns on red at that location.

Mayor Hindman made the motion directing staff to review the situation to determine if a right hand turn on red should be prohibited at that location. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman stated he thought a couple easels should be provided for presenters with charts at the Council meetings. Mr. Janku agreed.

Mr. Skala understood there was a Council requested staff report that the prior Planning Director had submitted in regard to growth management planning in the urban fringe. He did not believe that report had been publicly discussed.

Mr. Skala made the motion directing staff to review that report and provide additional feedback to the Council for review and a subsequent work session, if necessary. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala understood a letter was submitted to the Council from the Environment and Energy Commission when he was on the Land Disturbance Sub-Committee. He believed the letter was received by the Council without comment and asked for the letter to be revisited. He stated the EEC was waiting on clarification by the Council in regard to land disturbance permitting and whether it was clear the Public Works Director had any discretion beyond the four requirements in the body of the document. If it was not clear, they were asking the Council to provide clarification. Mr. Watkins asked for the date of the letter. Mr. Skala replied it was January 31, 2007. Mr. Janku asked if he wanted a report from staff. Mr. Skala replied he thought that would be helpful as well.

Mr. Skala made the motion directing staff to provide a report regarding the Environment and Energy Commission's letter dated January 31, 2007 and the land disturbance permitting issue discussed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala stated, as a function of his election, he promised his constituents he would be available to them and one way he would accomplish that would be to set up office hours on Saturday mornings from 8:30-10:30 a.m. at the Coffee Ground at 2703 E. Broadway. Ms. Hoppe asked if that was every Saturday. Mr. Skala clarified it would be the Saturday's prior to the Council meetings. Mr. Janku pointed out they had scheduled work sessions on a couple Saturday's. He was not sure whether they preceded a Council meeting though. Mr. Skala clarified he planned to normally be there on the Saturday's prior to Council meetings.

Mr. Wade commented the red light situation on Forum was in his ward and agreed it was a dangerous situation. He thanked the Council for pursuing the review of it.

Mr. Wade stated although he was not asking for a report at this time, he felt, in the future, they might want to discuss the issues regarding annexation and establishing zoning and the problems mentioned by Mr. Janku in regard to not coming into the City. He thought this was an area in which they needed to create a real working agreement with the County in order to create a way to avoid these types of situations. Mayor Hindman noted one of the problems was that they already had the zoning. Mr. Wade stated he understood. Ms. Hoppe asked if he wanted a work session. Mr. Wade replied no. He just wanted to plant the idea and come back to it at a later date. He thought there might be a possibility for a working agreement and believed the legal implications might be complex. He just thought they needed to start thinking about it.

Mr. Wade stated one of the Planning Procedure Stakeholders Group's recommendations was to eliminate duplicate hearings. He thought routine proposals that were recommended with two or fewer negative votes was one area where duplicate hearings could be easily eliminated. He suggested requesting a report in regard to what would be required to have any routine proposal recommended by the Planning & Zoning Commission

with two or fewer negative votes to be automatically placed on the Consent Agenda. He noted he wanted the report to include a process for appeal that would move it to a Public Hearing item with a deadline for the appeal such that the two week requirement for public hearing notice could be met for the second reading. He understood that would make the deadline for appeal to move it off of the Consent Agenda and under Public Hearings by the time the first reading was done. He believed this would improve the efficiency of the Planning & Zoning Commission process and the Council's work. It would streamline the way in which probably 80-90 percent of the routine proposals that came from the Planning & Zoning Commission without any opposition or with very high Planning & Zoning Commission support were handled. He believed it would be a win/win. He noted there was one public hearing at tonight's meeting for which this might have applied and it would have decreased the time Council spent and the cost to the applicant due to having the unnecessary duplicate hearing.

Mr. Wade made the motion directing staff to provide a report in regard to what would be required to have routine proposals recommended by the Planning & Zoning Commission with two or fewer negative votes to be automatically placed on the Consent Agenda, while still including a process for appeal that would move them to a Public Hearing item provided the deadline for the appeal was such that the two week requirement for a public hearing notice could be met for the second reading. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku. He noted he had a lot of questions, but thought a report would be acceptable. The motion made by Mr. Wade and seconded by Mr. Janku was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser noted she gave a speech to an organization and had asked staff for a listing of community awards received. She was amazed as there were a little over two pages of awards. She thought that showed the dedication and hard work of City staff and its elected officials. She congratulated everyone for putting in the hard work to win the awards and obtaining national recognition.

Ms. Nauser stated she wanted to be aware of the comings and goings of people, but when she was focused on staff sitting at the staff table, she was unable to do that. She requested a mirror be placed by the monitor behind her. Mr. Janku thought that was something to think about with the development of the new Council Chambers. Ms. Nauser agreed and asked that in the interim, a mirror similar to the ones banks used to see people coming around corners, be placed near the monitor so she could still be cognizant of who was coming in the door.

Ms. Nauser made the motion for a mirror to be placed near the monitor behind her in the Council Chambers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe stated she received a concern from a constituent in the East Campus area in regard to paint with high contents of lead being removed by a company outside and not being able to stop the work from being done. She noted a major lawsuit was involved in a situation that occurred in the neighborhood. She wondered what kind of procedures were in place or how the City could be involved with having criteria for residents on what to do and a list of companies who were knowledgeable about this. She wanted to know what the City or

a neighbor could immediately do and thought a staff report regarding what the City was currently doing and recommendations on what additional things they could do would be helpful.

Ms. Hoppe stated she and some other Council Members participated in the Step It Up Call for Action in regard to global warming. One of the segments was local action and calling attention to the Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement previously passed by Council. They had three requests in regard to the City. One involved the City creating a timetable for implementation of goals for the Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement. Another was for the City to establish a commission of interested stakeholders to plan, promote and oversee implementation of the Agreement. The third was for the City to publish, bi-annually, a progress report. She suggested scheduling a work session with a staff report providing recommendations in order to make further progress toward that goal. Mr. Janku asked if she was asking for a staff report on what was being done now or what they could be done in the future or if she just wanted to schedule a work session. Ms. Hoppe replied she wanted a work session with a staff report in terms of suggestions and where the City was now and what they thought could be accomplished in the next five years. Ms. Nauser asked if that would be a retreat item. Mr. Watkins replied it could, but noted there would not be much input other than Council and staff at that point. Mr. Janku believed that would be helpful because it could help them determine where they could go. Mr. Watkins stated he would put it on the list for discussion. Ms. Hoppe stated she would be satisfied with that for now. Mr. Janku noted they could get a staff report and talk about how to move forward from there.

Ms. Hoppe understood a pedway was being constructed on the west side of Old 63, but did not believe there was a good way to get across Old 63 from the east where the Shepard Neighborhood and Shepard School were located. She asked if staff could look into the installation of some type of pedestrian crossing, north of Shepard Boulevard, but past the intersection. She also wanted to know the cost.

Ms. Hoppe made the motion for a staff report in regard to providing a pedestrian crossing on Old 63 so the people from the east could get to the pedway on the west side of Old 63. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe stated she received a letter from Ken Midkiff about getting open records regarding the Vandiver Road project and learned that they would have to pay \$900 for those records since Allstate was involved with regard to FEMA and the floodplain. She noted that was based on the \$104 rate per hour to the City per the contract with Allstate. She understood the City's Legal Department, after checking with the Attorney General's Office, indicated that when the City contracted with companies, it did not fall under the sunshine law. She asked who in the Attorney General's Office was contacted and if this was the ultimate person that was knowledgeable in the area. She wanted to make sure they received the correct information. Mr. Boeckmann replied he spoke with Brett Berri, who specialized in sunshine law. He explained Mr. Berri was sent the draft letter and the e-mail received from Mr. Midkiff to ensure he had the facts. He noted he spoke to him regarding his opinion before

sending the items. He understood Mr. Berri discussed this with others in the office and that they did not see a problem with his letter. Ms. Hoppe noted Mr. Midkiff's suggestion was for the City to incorporate into contracts the requirement of providing the public access to the information and records that would have been discoverable per the sunshine law. Mr. Watkins asked what they would do when they contracted with an engineering company in Kansas City, St. Louis or Chicago. He explained there was a practical reason why the Attorney General's Office ruled the way they did. He wondered if that meant they would have to keep a separate or duplicate file at the City. Mr. Janku pointed out any records the City had were open. Incorporating this would mean every record was open. Mr. Boeckmann noted, in this case, Allstate did not have any problems providing the records. He understood the issue was what they were charging and noted he did not sense Mr. Midkiff as still being interested in getting the records, so he did not pursue those facts. It was a question of how much they could legitimately charge even if they were subject to the sunshine law. He commented that the rate they were charging was the rate for an engineer and he did not know if it was necessary for an engineer to collect the information, but noted that sometimes, depending on the request, it might be necessary. If it was copying, they were charging more than the ten cents allowed for an 8 ½ x 11 inch document. When it came to copying, they could only charge the rate of a clerical per the sunshine law. If it took a higher paid person to do the research, it was a legitimate charge.

Ms. Nauser asked if a company the City contracted with would not be subject to the sunshine law. Mr. Boeckmann replied anything they send to us that was otherwise an open record was an open record. Their working papers were not open according to the Attorney General's Office. Reports, to include preliminary reports, given to the City were open records. Ms. Nauser understood the research behind the reports were not necessarily an open record, but the final product given to the City was. Mr. Boeckmann replied that was correct. He noted, in his opinion, in this type of situation, the staff should work with whatever member of the public was asking for the report depending on the reasonableness of the request. He commented that at times they contracted with attorneys on development charges and fees. If the City had copies, it was open, but he would not want to pay the rates the attorneys charged the City when they were asking for a portion of hundreds of pages of documents. Mr. Janku believed if an engineering firm received a request, they would want to comply with a full response versus turning it over to a lower paid clerk who did not provide a full response as they would be criticized. He felt they probably wanted someone who understood what was being requested. Mr. Boeckmann pointed out on occasion, they received very broad sunshine law requests asking for all e-mails, etc. and he did not have his secretary check his e-mails. He did that personally because he was familiar with it. The same situation could apply to an engineering firm.

Ms. Hoppe understood if there was a reasonable request, the City would work with the contractor to provide the information in the most reasonable way. Mr. Boeckmann noted the City received a lot of sunshine law requests and he was not aware of most because they were so reasonable. At times, the Journalism School gave broad ranging assignments to its students, which resulted in the City receiving requests for all copies of records. They respond saying it cost, for example, \$5,000 to comply with the request and tried to get it

narrowed down a bit. If they started making all of the City's contractors subject to this, they might get journalism students contacting Allstate and others. Mr. Janku thought that would keep many contractors from working with the City. Ms. Nauser agreed they would not be able to find anyone if they were subject to people requesting everything they had done for the City of Columbia. Ms. Hoppe stated she appreciated the clarification and the explanation. Mr. Skala believed there should be some way to reasonably find out information that was pertinent for a particular question. He noted the reasonableness was the issue.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk