

MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
MAY 18, 2009

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 18, 2009, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER and HOPPE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of May 4, 2009 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

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

SPECIAL ITEMS

Command Sergeant Major Mike Lederle flag presentation.

Command Sergeant Major Lederle explained he was a member of the United States Army and a detective with the Columbia Police Department and wanted to thank the City for allowing him to serve his Country in Kosovo. He commented that many soldiers within his command were unsure of their jobs and livelihoods when they came back home due to the economy. It was a great sense of relief for him to know his job as a City employee was secure. On behalf of all citizen soldiers, he presented a flag of the United States to the City. The flag had flown over Camp Bondsteel, Kosovo, on Veterans Day, November 11, 2008. He thanked the City for its continued support of the Guard and Army Reserves, and noted he was a grateful employee of the City of Columbia and grateful citizen of the United States.

Mayor Hindman thanked Command Sergeant Major Lederle for his comments and noted the City was proud of his service. He stated they were pleased to be able to be recognized for supporting citizen service with the military.

Mayor Hindman understood Command Sergeant Major Lederle was with the Multi-National Task Force East - Kosovo and asked about his job. Command Sergeant Major Lederle replied he was the senior enlisted soldier for a task force of approximately 2,300 soldiers from the United States and six other NATO nations. Mayor Hindman understood they included Poland, Ukraine, Romania, Armenia, Lithuania and Greece, and noted that was impressive. He thanked Command Sergeant Lederle for his service to the Country. Command Sergeant Major Lederle also presented the flag of the Republic of Kosovo to the Mayor and stated they had declared their independence on February 17, 2008.

Columbia Silver Level Bicycle Friendly Award Presentation.

Robert Johnson stated he, Steve Kullman and David Heise wanted to congratulate Columbia for winning the Silver Level Bicycle Friendly Community Award from the League of American Bicyclists. The League of American Bicyclists began the Bicycle Friendly Community Program in 1995 as a way to recognize communities for the ability to make bicyclists a valued part of the transportation system. The award was judged on education, encouragement, evaluation, engineering and enforcement, and the levels of recognition were honorable mention, bronze, silver, gold and platinum. There were currently 23 silver communities, nine gold communities and three platinum communities in the United States. Chicago, Illinois was nearest silver or higher award winning city. This year there were 29 applications for bicycle friendly designations, and only thirteen communities received any recognition. In addition, Columbia was the only Silver Level Award winner. The others received either an honorable mention or bronze. He commented that Columbia would benefit from this designation. The most visible benefit would be road signs to let people know they were a bicycle friendly community. Those coming to the City would know bicyclists were an important part of the culture and a valued part of the transportation system. It would also show Columbia was a place where people should not feel forced to drive automobiles everywhere. He believed this improved the quality of life for the City's residents and made Columbia an even more attractive place for businesses to relocate and residents to work and live. He presented the award to the City.

Mayor Hindman thanked Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kullman and Mr. Heise for the certificate and road signs. He noted they represented the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission and the PedNet Coalition, which along with City staff, had made this possible. He stated he was proud of this designation and was convinced that this type of investment in the community was not only good for the health and quality of life of the community, but was also a tremendous economic development investment as well.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B26-09 Voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of Rolling Hills Road, extended, approximately one mile north of State Route WW; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.

R44-09 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Hawthorne Woods located east of Rolling Hills Drive, extended, approximately one mile north of State Route WW; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations.

The bill was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained there were still unresolved issues with regard to the development agreement in terms of cost sharing for one of the major roads in the subdivision. Staff was recommending this be tabled to the June 15, 2009 Council meeting.

Mayor Hindman understood R44-09 was a companion item with the same request for tabling and suggested they table both items at the same time.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor Hindman continued the public hearing to the June 15, 2009 Council meeting.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to table B26-09 and R44-09 to the June 15, 2009 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B119-09 Amending the Major Roadway Plan, a part of the 2025 Transportation Plan.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the Planning and Zoning Commission had held several hearings and work sessions in considering the addition of some recent CATSO Major Roadway Plan amendments to the City's Major Roadway Plan. Unlike the County, which adopted the CATSO Plan, the City had a separate Major Thoroughfare Plan, so it could make changes that were not reflected in the CATSO Plan. The ordinance under consideration tonight included proposals recommended for denial by the Planning and Zoning Commission. All of these roads were on the CATSO Plan, but the Planning and Zoning Commission had recommended they not be put on the City's Major Roadway Plan. The eight proposed neighborhood collector and residential streets were in the Scott Boulevard and Route K areas.

Mr. Teddy described the eight proposed roads using the overhead. He explained these roadways would appear on a Plan to be used as a planning guide. They were not project proposals. The long range transportation plan did not show projected funding by any jurisdiction within CATSO to build these as public projects. They were illustrative planned roads. Adding them to the Plan gave them the ability to set aside right-of-way as development occurred in order to provide for connectivity. He commented that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended the denial of these eight roadways and staff concurred with the recommendation.

Mr. Sturtz asked if putting those lines on a map sent a signal that the City encouraged the road in the future. Mr. Teddy replied he thought that was the general perception, even when they qualified them as long range, uncommitted projects. He believed people objecting to further development felt it increased the chances of a roadway project in their neighborhood. He noted connectivity was not always perceived as a good thing as there was a reduction in privacy.

Mr. Sturtz understood they would discuss the comprehensive plan and the appointment of a task force to develop the plan later in the meeting, and asked how this Major Roadway Plan would work with it in the future, if land was set aside where one of the roads was planned. Mr. Teddy replied the Major Roadway Plan would be evaluated as part of the comprehensive planning process, and the advantages and disadvantages of the type of plan the process yielded now would get a thorough review.

Mr. Skala understood this was a virtual planning document and asked what it meant if they denied some of these projected roads. He wondered what the advantage or disadvantage was of denying something that was only a projection on a planning document. He noted they had a policy for connectivity within the City, and some of these areas might be

annexed in the future. Mr. Teddy replied the opportunity for better circulation might be lost. He explained that if the City did not put these roads on its Roadway Plan, the City would not have as much bargaining power to request the set aside of right-of-way for a collector street or strategic local street needed to support development. He noted there were pros and cons to all of these roadways.

Mr. Skala asked if they had to be developed as shown on the plan if they were approved as placeholders. Mr. Teddy replied they did not.

Mr. Skala understood if these were denied, they would lose some of the advantages they might have had if they decided they were necessary in the future. Mr. Teddy commented that having it on a plan meant there had been a preliminary determination that some additional roadway network was needed in the area, and through a process of review, City staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission would take it to the next level by looking at what the alignments should be to coordinate with subdivision activity. If there was a County initiated roadway project, additional analysis and data would be needed to set an alignment for the road.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the natural resources inventory had been looked at to determine where the roads should be located. Mr. Teddy replied they did not use the data layers made available from the University, but had used topographic maps, the national wetlands inventory, stream mapping, etc. to look at the natural features that existed. The general practice was to avoid stream crossings and impacts to forested areas and other sensitive areas if possible. Those things were balanced with the need for street connectivity.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Rob McGavock, 6231 W. Stedman Road, stated he was concerned about the K-1 area and described its location relative to his home using the overhead. He noted it would extend through his front yard and through a neighbor's house. He hoped it would be denied.

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

Mayor Hindman commented that he sat on CATSO and explained the CATSO Technical Committee was charged with determining what the road network should look like and where connectivity should be located. The Technical Committee was not determining the right-of-way line. They were providing a rough idea of where in general there ought to be connectivity for a roadway system so traffic would not be forced onto one or two roads. This was done with the assumption that there would be development. If there was not development, it would not happen. He pointed out there was no real political consideration when the Technical Committee made recommendations regarding the road system. He explained the Technical Committee went before CATSO with these recommendations and they were approved because they made sense in terms of connectivity. He noted the people who had acquired property in the area, however, had not expected this, and had therefore complained to the County and the City Planning and Zoning Commission, which had accepted their position with respect to these eight items. If this were undeveloped land and they were developing an interconnected road system, he thought they would include these eight roads being proposed to be removed. He felt the lesson was that they needed to get as far ahead of development with this kind of planning as they could, so people could not legitimately say they did not expect something like this to happen because the community

might be better off with the connections. He believed there would be more intense development in the area as time went on, but if they put the roads on the Plan, the people in the area would be understandably concerned, and if they did not put the roads on the Plan, it would be difficult to get a road system in the area. He reiterated he thought they needed to get as many roads as possible on the Major Roadway Plan recognizing the roads might not be built in accordance with the Plan. He noted that CATSO recommended these roads based on the recommendation of the Technical Committee and without any consideration for a particular property because they had not been provided that information.

Mr. Skala commented that from his perspective placeholder in planning trumped some of these other considerations because they did not know if it would be developed and the extent to which it would be developed. If there was a density issue and the areas developed more densely, he suspected they would rue the day they did not have these opportunities available. If it did not become more dense, it would not matter because the road would not be built. At this point, which was early in the process, he was inclined to err on the side of future planning and the potential for placeholders rather than suggesting they take these roads off of the table since they did not know what the future held.

Mr. Wade stated he would support the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission because he felt they had done a thorough job of analyzing it. In addition, there was support for the recommendation from the County and the City's Planning and Development Department staff with regard to most of these.

Ms. Nauser stated she was an advocate of better planning, but noted the County, City staff and other organizational layers had looked at this and had come to the same conclusion. While she appreciated connectivity, the potential change to the dynamics of so many neighborhoods was something she could not support at this time. She stated she was in favor of better planning as mentioned by Mayor Hindman. She also thought the comprehensive planning process they would soon begin would help alleviate some of these dilemmas. She reiterated that she would support the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with Ms. Nauser's comments.

Mr. Sturtz commented that he would defer to the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission as well. He thought they could agree planning was great and stated he did not believe interconnectivity should be the only value they looked at when planning ahead. The concerns that had been raised about neighborhood integrity, open space, etc. should also be in the mix.

Mr. Thornhill stated he had concerns that a road proposed years away could encourage land acquisition for the sole purpose of believing a road might go through the area. He did not foresee it as necessary in the areas being proposed and would support denial as well.

B119-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA. VOTING NO: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. Bill declared defeated.

B122-09 Authorizing construction of the County House Branch Trail Phase I project from the Twin Lakes Recreation Area to Stadium Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would be the final Council approval to move ahead with Phase I of the County House Branch Trail project. It would connect the Twin Lakes Recreation Area to an existing street just north of Stadium. The legislation immediately following this would authorize the acquisition of nine permanent and five temporary construction easements. The total project cost was about \$775,000 and funding would come from non-motorized transportation grant.

Ms. Hoppe noted there had been a demonstration involving pervious surface at the Courthouse and asked if a pervious surface had been considered for the trail. Mr. Hood replied it had not and pointed out the recommendation was for a paved impervious trail surface. Ms. Hoppe commented that she was asking because she thought it might be cheaper.

Mayor Hindman stated he had been in a meeting where pervious asphalt trails were discussed and understood it was recommended they not be used in wet bottom areas.

Mr. Skala stated he did not believe there was any reason they could not have a hybrid trail so those areas subject to low water levels could involve hardened surfaces and other areas could have pervious surfaces. He noted he was not suggesting it was appropriate for this trail. He was only stating it did not have to be an either/or situation.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jay Dow, 2405 Ridgefield Road, stated his home was about 400 yards from the Twin Lakes entrance and encouraged the Council to approve this project because it would be a terrific asset to the neighborhood.

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

Mayor Hindman noted they had voted on this several times. He understood the only differences were some slight changes in easement descriptions and the addition of two or three temporary construction easements.

Mr. Wade stated comments he had received were in support of this project. He noted it was a needed and logical extension to the trail system.

B122-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B123-09 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the County House Branch Trail Phase I project from the Twin Lakes Recreation Area to Stadium Boulevard.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would authorize the acquisition of easements for the County House Branch Trail Phase I project.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Adam Clapper, 1900 Fairview, stated he was present on behalf of a property owner who would be affected by the project, and understood the City was only acquiring easements

and would not be taking possession of that part of the owner's property in order to build the trail. He also understood the definition of an easement was a non-possessor interest in a parcel of land for a specified purpose. Mr. Hood explained the actual title to the land would remain with the owner, but the City would acquire an easement which would allow them to construct a trail across the portion of the property where there was an easement.

Mr. Clapper asked what would happen to the trail if it needed to be rerouted or if it ceased to be used for the purpose for which the easement was acquired. Mr. Hood replied the City would have to acquire a new easement for the new route if the trail was rerouted, and he assumed there would be the potential to vacate the existing easement if the trail was no longer on it. Mr. Clapper asked what would happen to the alterations or changes made to the property as a result of the initial structure. He noted the property in question had issues with a high hill and water erosion. Mr. Hood assumed any problems would be corrected, but noted he was not exactly clear on what was being asked. Mr. Glascock believed if a problem existed causing them to reroute the trail, they would probably remove the concrete, seed and mulch it. He noted they would not try to fill it in to its original condition.

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

B123-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B120-09 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit through truck traffic along a portion of West Boulevard.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this ordinance was requested by Council and would prohibit through truck traffic along portions of West Boulevard.

Mr. Wade noted truck traffic was an issue in two areas. One area involved the elementary school and was part of the continuing safety concern around West Boulevard Elementary. The other area was from Stewart Road to Stadium Boulevard because trucks were not driven as one would expect them to be driven on a residential street. He commented that he would request this item be tabled to the first meeting in July and for a second neighborhood meeting be held in June and wanted the Public Works Department to provide different ways to manage truck traffic in terms of safety for the elementary school and for the stretch from Stewart to Stadium. The group could then discuss what they believed would solve the problem.

Mr. Wade made a motion to table B120-09 to the July 6, 2009 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Wade pointed out that if the decision for resolution was different than this ordinance, there would likely be an amendment to the ordinance.

The motion made by Mr. Wade and seconded by Ms. Nauser to table B120-09 to the July 6, 2009 Council meeting was approved unanimously by voice vote.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B117-09 Voluntary annexation of property located at the western terminus of West Smiley Lane (415 W. Smiley Lane); establishing permanent R-1 zoning.
- B118-09 Rezoning property located on the northwest corner of Oakland Gravel Road and Vandiver Drive from R-1 to PUD-7.
- B121-09 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to transportation fares.
- B124-09 Appropriating funds to be received from the Missouri State CIT Council for crisis intervention team training through the Police Department.
- R100-09 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the west side of Range Line Street, southwest of the intersection of Range Line Street and Boone Industrial Boulevard (4515 and 4525 North Highway 763).
- R101-09 Setting a public hearing: construction of sanitary sewers in Sewer District No. 166 (Thompson Road).
- R102-09 Setting a public hearing: construction of a sidewalk on the north side of West Worley Street between Clinkscates Road and the west side of the Sanford-Kimpton Health Facility.
- R103-09 Setting a public hearing: special assessments for construction of sidewalks along the north side of Business Loop 70, between Creasy Springs Road and Garth Avenue.
- R104-09 Setting a public hearing: amending the 2008 Community Development Action Plan as it relates to supplemental CDBG funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.
- R105-09 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for core public health functions.
- R106-09 Authorizing Adopt A Spot agreements.
- R107-09 Authorizing an agreement with The Professional Golfers’ Association of America for sports development funding under the Tourism Development Program.
- R108-09 Authorizing agreements with The John William Boone Heritage Foundation, Midway Exposition Center and Gateway Chapter of MS for Festival and Event Funding under the Tourism Development Program.
- R109-09 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri regarding the Senior Games and the Show Me State Games.
- R110-09 Authorizing HOME agreements with Job Point and Columbia Community Development Corporation.
- R111-09 Authorizing application to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for a State Revolving Fund Loan under the Public Drinking Water Program for water infrastructure improvements.
- R112-09 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Safety Center to conduct enforcement activities for activities relating to hazardous and non-hazardous moving violations and seat belt usage.

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

NEW BUSINESS

R113-09 Authorizing the Planning and Zoning Commission to prepare a new Comprehensive Plan; establishing a Comprehensive Plan Task Force to assist in the process.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted one of the Council's major priorities in this year's budget was to move forward with a new comprehensive plan for the City. The Planning and Zoning Commission was tasked to come up with a process and Council had their report with the recommendation that they be directed to move ahead and for the Council to establish a comprehensive plan task force to assist in the process. The task force would be appointed by the Council and would be composed of fifteen members.

Mr. Teddy explained this resolution did two things. It started the building of a new comprehensive plan by giving that direction to the Planning and Zoning Commission and it authorized the creation of a fifteen member task force that had an executive function in providing assistance to both the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Council with regard to the comprehensive plan. In discussions with the Planning and Zoning Commission, the best estimate was that tenure would run until the end of September 2011. He pointed out this signified the commitment made in the Vision Implementation Report for a list of recommended changes to the comprehensive plan as well as recommendations for revisions to the development codes, which primarily involved the zoning and subdivision regulations.

Mr. Sturtz understood the members of the task force were only expected to meet once a quarter for two years, which did not seem like a lot considering the breadth of this job. He wondered if it would be accurate to say they would be meeting more often. Mr. Teddy replied they would not meet as often as the Planning and Zoning Commission. If the task force organized in subcommittees, it could be more often, thought monthly was a good possibility.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he wished this process would have started sooner and thanked the Council because it took a lot of work to get the process started. He was looking forward to getting past the notion of a clump of plans being a comprehensive plan.

Ms. Hoppe asked if there were several books available, such as the Citizen's Guide to Planning, for Council, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the task force. Mr. Teddy replied they had the Citizen's Guide on order, the Growing Smart legislative guidebook was available on-line and the ICMA guidebook could be made available to interested persons for further reading.

Mr. Wade made a motion to amend R113-09 by changing the language in Section 6(f) to read, "development of 'growth management' and 'smart growth' principles and techniques". The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote. Mr. Wade noted this was discussed at the work session.

Mr. Skala commented that this was one of the most important initiations of activity in the two years he had served on the Council. Growth management planning and the comprehensive plan that would precede it were basic to some of the promises he made when he ran for office. He stated he was pleased to support this.

Mr. Wade complemented the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Planning and Development Department staff for what appeared to be a clear and well developed process for a complicated topic.

Mayor Hindman noted it would be up to the Council to ensure they had a good task force.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed this was one of the most important things they could do in the present for the future and commented that the Planning and Zoning Commission and the members selected for the task force would have to put in a lot of work to do a good job and to get it done.

The vote on R113-09, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. 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.

- B125-09** **Rezoning property located on the northwest corner of Walnut Street and Divot Drive (2311 East Walnut Street); allowing less stringent landscaping and screening requirements.**
- B126-09** **Approving the Columbia College Campus Master Plan Update.**
- B127-09** **Amending Chapter 6, Chapter 24 and Chapter 29 of the City Code relating to the projection of balconies into the public right-of-way.**
- B128-09** **Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish standards for self-storage facilities in C-2 zoning districts.**
- B129-09** **Authorizing an agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for professional administrative services.**
- B130-09** **Authorizing the acquisition of land in Valleyview Subdivision located between Barberry Avenue and Zinnia Drive for park purposes.**
- B131-09** **Appropriating funds for the C.A.R.E. Gallery Program.**
- B132-09** **Appropriating funds to be received from the Missouri Safety Center to conduct enforcement activities for activities relating to hazardous and non-hazardous moving violations and seat belt usage.**
- B133-09** **Appropriating insurance reimbursement funds for the cost of fire suppression materials.**
- B134-09** **Appropriating funds for the creation of a maquette for the J.W. “Blind” Boone Home.**

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

(A) Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Requests.

Mayor Hindman noted this report was provided for informational purposes.

(B) Potential Sewer District on Wilson Avenue and High Street.

(C) Potential Sewer District on Cliff Drive.

(D) Potential Sewer District on Hunt Court.

(E) Potential Sewer District on Bingham and W. Ridgeley Road.

(F) Potential Sewer District on Hill Creek Road.

(G) Potential Sewer District on Wilson Avenue and Ross Street.

Mr. Watkins explained Reports B-G were all potential sewer districts in various parts of the community. The policy was changed about a year ago making it easier for people on private common collectors to get problems resolved. He believed it was in the community's best interest to do this because it had the potential of eliminating a significant amount of infiltration and inflow, which caused the City to expand the capacity of its lines and plants. He thought this was a good investment, and noted that once it was done, they would not have to go back and do it again for many years. He pointed out that although he was supportive of these districts, there was limited funding. While he supported the idea of having meetings in order to determine the appropriate alignment for these sewers, he wanted everyone needed to know they would most likely not be able to construct all of the sewer districts the Council had approved, to include the ones being discussed tonight. He suggested they go ahead and form the districts, but make sure the people in the districts understand it would be years before they were constructed because additional funding would need to be found. In the next sewer ballot issue, which would be a couple of years down the road, the City would need to substantially expand the amount of money allocated in that ballot issue in order to begin to address this problem throughout the community.

Mr. Glascock pointed out the sewer districts potentially being approved tonight were not funded.

Ms. Hoppe commented that with regard to Report B, she had talked to the property owner with concerns, and had explained the fact there were options for the route and the need and advantages to the City and the neighbors. She recommended placing the sewer line at the back of the property as far from the house as possible, if it would work.

Mr. Watkins stated they would look at the needs and requests within each individual district. The maps provided simply showed a line as a placeholder. Mr. Glascock pointed out each of these would have a public hearing in the future.

Mr. Sturtz referred to Report G and noted only four of the 27 owners had signed the petition, and asked for clarification. Mr. Watkins replied they would begin to have neighborhood and district meetings, and if they found the majority of people did not want the sewer or if they were unable to reach an accommodation as to where the line should go, the project would be dropped. Mr. Sturtz understood this had moved forward because some people were petitioning for it. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct.

Mr. Sturtz referred to Report F and noted it indicated 100 percent of the cost would be assessed to the property owners, which was different than the others as they had indicated funding would come from a future CIP project. Mr. Watkins explained it was different because it did not currently have public sewer. The policy was to form the district similar to what was done for a private common collector and for funding to come from an assessment to the property owner. The City essentially charged \$5,000 per property, and the balance became an assessment that was not collected until some very unusual things happened. Mr. Glascock pointed out these properties currently had on-site sewers. They were not hooked to the public sewer.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to proceed with the preliminary design to determine the feasibility and cost associated with the sewer districts indicated in Reports B, C, D, E, F and G. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(H) Sewer Backup at 200 Block of West Sexton.

Mr. Watkins explained Mr. Thomas had approached the Council at its April 6, 2009 Council meeting regarding sewer backup at his residence. Staff was directed by the Council to prepare a report regarding the situation. He commented that it appeared as though the problem was much more widespread than Mr. Thomas' house, and staff felt the most logical way to fund the project was with CDBG funds because they believed the area was eligible for CDBG money. Unfortunately, the application deadline for the upcoming year of CDBG funds had passed, and the Community Development Commission was reviewing applications at this time. Therefore, money would not be available in this round. They believed it would be a good project for the next round. He noted this did not preclude the Council from directing staff to include this project or move things around to add this project as they moved forward with the CDBG budget.

Mayor Hindman understood they could amend the CDBG Plan. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct. If the Council wanted, they could tell the Community Development Commission to include the project. He noted he did not believe they had a good dollar amount at this time, but could do some quick planning. They could also add this project when the CDBG budget came forward in August or September. If they followed the normal process, they would be looking at the 2011 budget for this project.

Mr. Thornhill asked if this was the right time to ask staff to determine the cost of the project. Mr. Watkins replied that if the Council was serious about this project, staff wanted to know so they could study it and come up with a budget. Mr. Thornhill thought they needed to know the project cost in order to determine if CDBG funding was the right way to approach the project.

Mr. Wade commented that his first thought was that this was a sewer problem that needed immediate attention, but after reading the report, it appeared as though there was a short-term quick fix. He understood they had sewer backup, but wondered if there was a public health issue with this situation. Mr. Watkins replied that anytime they had raw sewage coming up, it was a public health problem. In this case, it was confined to a limited area. A break in an outdoor line would affect a larger area and involve other issues, such as

mosquitoes. Mr. Wade stated the decision as to whether to advance this was impacted by whether it was a public health issue and he did not feel he had a clear indication of its seriousness.

Mayor Hindman understood Mr. Thomas could pursue funding for a back flow valve to solve his problem on a temporary basis. Mr. Sturtz agreed and noted that could be done right away.

Mr. Sturtz asked if they could take an incremental approach by doing this and obtaining more information with regard to the street as they were receiving second hand information with regard to his neighbors. He thought it would be nice to know if the neighbors were experiencing problems like him. Mr. Watkins explained this would solve Mr. Thomas' problem, and staff felt comfortable that there were other potential problems along this line on the street.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Thomas' individual problem would be solved by the back flow valve he would have to purchase for his residence. Mr. Watkins thought they could pursue emergency home repair money. Mr. Glascock pointed out he was not sure it would solve the problem. It would prevent sewer from backing up into his sewer when there was wet weather. The problem was that if he flushed his sewer, it could not get out. It also did not let other sewer back up into his so he would not get his neighbor's sewer.

Mr. Wade understood there was a public health issue at this location, so the Council needed to think about moving ahead in 2010. He thought Mr. Thornhill's suggestion to obtain the cost would be of value. He asked who would do the application if they decided to proceed. Mr. Watkins replied the Public Works Department.

Mr. Thornhill made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding this project, to include the estimated cost. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Watkins understood the Council wanted staff to obtain more information, particularly on the cost of the Sexton Street sewer. Mayor Hindman noted they also wanted to know what the real problem was.

(I) Recycling Efforts – Pink Bags.

Mr. Watkins noted Council requested a report concerning some of the plastics the City currently did not recycle. He explained they were not sure about the market for these plastics and were not comfortable with how much of the waste stream they had. Staff felt this was not something they wanted to move ahead with, but if the Council disagreed, they needed someone who knew the market to do the analysis of the waste stream. He noted it would have a cost impact on the solid waste utility because they would need to provide additional bags and an additional sort.

Mr. Glascock commented that this would require an expansion of the material recovery facility because they were out of space. He noted the east and west coasts were looking at this and suggested they wait until the issues were ironed out there before doing it in Columbia.

Ms. Nauser had read that a lot of recyclables were being stored due to the economy and asked if this was an issue. Mr. Glascock replied aluminum was back up, but it was not a

hot market like it was a couple of years ago. Ms. Nauser asked if he thought this was a trend and if they would have to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of recycling. Mr. Glascock replied he thought there were chances for it to grow, but he was unsure as to whether it could grow right now. He stated they needed to do a better job with education. He believed there was a market and stated he wanted to get recycling above 10 percent.

Ms. Nauser asked if they had seen an increase or decrease in recyclables with the change in the bag delivery system. Mr. Glascock replied recyclables had stayed about the same. He noted they had seen a dramatic decrease in the cost because they no longer delivered bags that were not being used. Mr. Wade thought that would change as people used their excess bags.

Mr. Skala asked if they could sequester some of the plastics they did not typically recycle at drop off locations. He noted it was not helping them to have this stuff in the landfill. Mr. Watkins explained they did not know how much in terms of tons was in the waste stream. In addition, if they were trying to make an impact on the landfill, he believed the money could be better spent getting more people to recycle the kinds of things the City was already prepared to recycle. He felt putting a few more dollars toward that would have a bigger impact than obtaining other plastics.

Ms. Hoppe wondered how much they were losing in recyclables by not having recycling cans in areas where they should have them, such as Gordon Manor and Stephens Lake Park. She thought they should do more of that. Mr. Watkins thought the City had received a grant for additional recycling containers, but those had probably not been put out yet.

(J) Misuse of Official Information Ordinance.

Mr. Watkins commented that this was requested by Council. He noted he felt the 60 day requirement was a problem.

Mr. Skala stated Mr. Albert had suggested this, but he, as a Council person, had requested the potential change to the ordinance based on the fourth point, which he believed would fit in Section 16-223 of the Code involving the misuse of official information. The three other points in that Section dealt with pecuniary interests. He stated he was not wed to the idea of a misdemeanor or the 60 days for the reasons stated in the report. He did, however, feel it was important to put in the fourth item of a public servant committing the crime of misuse of official information if he/she knowing made false statements to the City Council or staff or knowingly delivered false documents to the City Council or staff. He noted that when he had requested this, he had suggested this go both ways. It was not an accusation that there was any misuse of information coming from the staff to the Council. In addition, it was not a suggestion that the Council would mislead staff. He felt it would be reassuring to the citizenry for this to be a part of the Section involving the misuse of official information. He reiterated he was not wed to item c) if there was a problem with the deadline. He commented that the report suggested the Council could take action with the City Manager, but he did not believe that precluded having this as part of the ordinances.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was in favor of items a) and b) because she felt it was important for government to be honest and transparent, and for the public to know it was important.

She noted the decisions Council made was crucial to the information received. If they did not knowingly receive correct information, it impacted financial decisions and the citizens. She was hopeful this would never need to be used, but felt it gave an extra bit of confidence to the citizens. With regard to the 60 days in terms of a request by Council, she thought that was something that could be worked out with staff. She did not believe it needed to be included in the ordinance as a misdemeanor.

Ms. Nauser asked how one would prove “knowingly” if they did not have a specific hand written note indicating someone planned on lying to the Council. Mr. Boeckmann replied that would be the problem of the special prosecutor appointed by the court. Ms. Hoppe explained it would be the same as how someone would prove “knowingly” in any other statute.

Ms. Nauser understood this would have to go to a special prosecutor. Mr. Boeckmann explained a public servant was City staff, and the City prosecutor would not be in a position to prosecute in most cases since it would be a conflict of interest. As a result, they would need outside counsel.

Mr. Skala asked how the concept of interference in the Charter was dealt with because it was also subject to interpretation. Mr. Boeckmann replied the removal of a public official from office was an issue for the County prosecutor. As far as he knew, that provision of the Charter had never been attempted to be applied. Mr. Skala understood that was a problematic provision in the Charter similar to the problematic addition of these items into the ordinances. Mr. Boeckmann stated he believed they were totally different situations.

Mr. Sturtz asked if a Council member believed a department head had misled the Council, if they would have the ability to tell the City Manager. Mr. Boeckmann replied yes. Mr. Sturtz understood they could not suggest any action for the City Manager to undertake. Mr. Boeckmann explained that if that was brought to the City Manager’s attention, it was his job to look into it and to determine whether something wrong was done and the type of disciplinary action that should be taken. He believed that if an ordinance, such as the one being proposed, was passed, the working of it would be problematic.

Ms. Nauser asked if it was up to a Council member to file charges against the City staff person they believed knowingly made a false statement. Mr. Boeckmann replied it would be up to the prosecutor to file charges. The police report would be sent to the prosecuting attorney and the prosecuting attorney would ask the judge to appoint a special prosecutor to address the issue. Ms. Nauser understood it would be up to a Council member or a citizen to initiate the process by filing a police report. Mr. Boeckmann stated anyone could initiate the process. Mr. Watkins noted one of the administrative concerns he had was that anyone could initiate it causing them to go on several goose chases.

Mr. Skala agreed there might be some wild goose chases, but if they did not include it in the area of misuse of official information, it did not engender a lot of confidence in the public that they would deal with it properly. Mr. Boeckmann asked if this was a problem. He explained they typically did not enact ordinances unless it was to address a problem. Mr. Skala asked how many problems were associated with pecuniary interests in past fifteen to twenty years. He wondered whether there had been any prosecutions on any of the other three items in Section 16-223. Mr. Boeckmann replied he did not know. He explained

Chapter 16 was basically the criminal code and basically mirrored State statute. Ms. Hoppe understood they had not had a lot of accusations from the public. Mr. Boeckmann stated he could not think of any examples. Mr. Skala could not see the harm of including this in the Code.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend the ordinance by deleting item c) and adding “or staff” to the end of items a) and b). The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Nauser stated she would prefer to vote on this as two separate amendments and asked for clarification regarding the addition of “or staff”. Mr. Skala stated the attempt was to make this fair for everyone. The misuse of official information could go in two directions. Ms. Hoppe replied she thought the intent was for the Council to be equally covered by the ordinance if a Council member knowingly made a false statement to staff. Mr. Skala agreed that was his intent. He noted he considered Council members to be public servants as well. Mr. Boeckmann stated he did not have the Code with him and was not sure if a public servant included a Council member or not. He understood Mr. Skala wanted to make it a prosecutable offense for a Council member to give false information to staff.

Mr. Sturtz understood Mr. Skala felt there was not enough accountability if someone misled someone else. Mr. Skala stated he thought it would be nice to show the public they were serious about the misuse of official information. He explained he did not think there was a huge problem. Mr. Sturtz noted they could go to the public if they felt the City Manager had misled them as there was public opinion. He felt they were adding something that was not called for right now.

Ms. Nauser reiterated that if they went forward with the amendments, she wanted them separated.

Ms. Hoppe rescinded her previous motion and Mr. Skala agreed. Mr. Boeckmann pointed out they did not have an ordinance in front of them, so they would need to make a motion asking staff to prepare an ordinance.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to prepare an ordinance that included items a) and b) of the draft ordinance attached to the report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved by voice vote with only Mayor Hindman, Mr. Sturtz and Ms. Nauser voting no.

Mr. Skala made the motion to amend the ordinance proposed in the previous motion by adding “or staff” to items a) and b). The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Thornhill, Mr. Skala and Ms. Hoppe voting yes.

(K) Potential Sidewalk Project on Leslie Lane.

Mr. Watkins explained this report involved some safety hazards for walkers along Leslie Lane, between Providence Road and Garth Avenue. Council had asked staff to look at moving the sidewalk construction to a higher priority.

Mr. Teddy commented that the Sidewalk Master Plan contained a rating matrix that was biased in favor of high volume roadways. Leslie Lane was built as a local street, but had a higher traffic volume than a local street. There was not a sidewalk on either side with the exception of a couple of lots on the east end. If a sidewalk were built, it would create a crosswalk to a sidewalk on the west side of Garth, and provide a route to school. He noted

there would be a number of obstructions that would have to be considered in the sidewalk design as there was vertical curvature to the road with some compromised sight lines. The cost estimate at the time the Plan was put together was \$66,000.

Mayor Hindman understood it was a priority number two project and would receive more attention if it were to be a priority number one project, but that staff was not asking them to change the priority. Mr. Teddy explained they would re-rate Leslie Lane as having five points instead of four points, which would place it on the top of the list for local streets. They scored it as a zero under the category for a sidewalk on one side of the street, but it actually had no sidewalk on either side, so it was given another point. He noted the intent in putting together the report was to review the Plan in terms of Leslie Lane.

Mayor Hindman asked whether it should be moved up on the priority chart. Mr. Teddy noted it scored a five, which was not the highest score for a sidewalk on the Plan, but it was high compared to other local streets. Another factor brought up in the report was that since the Plan had been published, the Phoenix Programs facility was being constructed, so there was an additional residential facility that would generate pedestrian trips in the neighborhood.

Mayor Hindman asked if staff automatically changed the chart or if it was something they needed to do since they had determined it had been rated low. Mr. Teddy replied it was something Council would want to do if they agreed with the assessment. Mr. Watkins stated this could be an amendment if Council wanted. He noted they had traditionally given a higher priority in terms of dollars to roads with higher traffic. Even if they bumped it up, it would probably not be funded quickly.

Mr. Skala asked if it would be a good idea to make the amendment to give it the extra point. Mr. Watkins replied it was up to the Council as it was one of those things that had no practical impact.

Mr. Wade stated he did not see any reason to change anything.

Mr. Thornhill commented that he had requested this information and had suggested it be moved up in priority, but he did not mean that in relation to priority number one or priority number two. He meant it in a basic priority sense. He explained he had received several calls from people who felt it was unsafe. He wanted staff to review it to determine if it could be moved up on the list of priorities. Mr. Watkins understood he meant he wanted it moved up on the CIP in order to get it funded. Mr. Thornhill stated it was probably not prioritized correctly as was indicated by Mr. Teddy. Parking was allowed on both sides and it was a fairly heavily traveled road with significant blind spots. He explained his goal was to move it up in priority at some point.

Mr. Thornhill made a motion to amend the 2007 Sidewalk Master Plan by adding a point to the Leslie Lane project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(L) NERC CIP Standards Analysis.

Mr. Watkins explained the City was required to present this analysis of 41 CIP standards and requirements publicly to the Council per the National Electric Reliability Council requirement. He noted no action was required at this time.

(M) Stadium Corridor Sub-Area Plan.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a report from the Planning and Zoning Commission on the status of their efforts to develop a sub-area plan for the east part of Columbia. One recommendation, which made sense to him, was for the plan to be expanded to include the area encompassed by the East Stadium EIS since data was available.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing the Planning and Zoning Commission to proceed with the sub-area plan as proposed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(N) NLC Prescription Discount Plan.

Mayor Hindman noted this report was provided for informational purposes.

(O) Columbia Citizens Police Review Board.

Mr. Watkins stated this report included the proposed citizens police review board ordinance, which Council would consider. The goal of the report was to put the legislation out early so discussion could begin.

Ms. Hertwig-Hopkins described the process of a written complaint alleging non-criminal misconduct of a police officer involving interaction with the public using a flow chart on the overhead. The written complaint would go to the Internal Affairs (Professional Standards Unit) for evaluation. It would then go to the Police Chief for a decision. There was then the opportunity for the police officer and/or complainant to go to the Citizens Police Review Board for its evaluation. If the police officer was unhappy with the decision of the Citizens Police Review Board, the police officer would be able to appeal to the City Manager if there was no suspension, demotion or discharge. If there was a suspension, demotion or discharge was involved, the police officer would be able to appeal to the Personnel Advisory Board before going to the City Manager. If the complainant was unhappy with the decision of the Citizens Police Review Board, the complainant would be able to appeal to the City Manager. If the City Manager decided it merited a suspension, demotion, discharge or greater disciplinary action, the City Manager could refer it to the Personnel Advisory Board for a recommendation, which would be provided to the City Manager. She noted it was important to those on the Citizen Oversight Committee for the appeal to end with the City Manager.

Mayor Hindman noted they were having a special Council meeting to obtain citizen input and this was being made available so it could be reviewed by those interested.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

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

Mr. Sturtz made a motion to only make one appointment to the Planning and Zoning Commission this evening, and to re-advertise and accept new applications for the other vacancy. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

John, Martha, 2011 N. Country Club Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire November 1, 2012

BOARD OF HEALTH

Lyon, Sally, 701 Thilly Avenue, Ward 4, Term to expire August 31, 2011

BOARD OF PLUMBING EXAMINERS

Glass, Mike, 128 N. Cedar Lake, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2011

Shanker, Richard, P. O. Box 10202, Ward 6, Term to expire May 31, 2011

BOARD OF MECHANICAL EXAMINERS

Kidwell, Dennis, 1105 Bob-O-Link, Ward 6, Term to expire June 17, 2012

Oetker, Steven, 4108 W. Rollins, Ward 4, Term to expire June 17, 2012

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Smith, Patricia, 4601 Akeman Bridge Road, County, Term to expire December 15, 2013

DISABILITIES COMMISSION

Brookins, Christy, 3210 Kohler Circle, Ward 4, Term to expire June 15, 2012

Henson, Lee, 3104 Greenbriar Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire June 15, 2012

Price, Cheryl, 511 Parkade Boulevard, Ward 2, Term to expire June 15, 2012

Weinschenk, Kathleen, 1504 Sylvan Lane, Ward 3, Term to expire June 15, 2012

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY COMMISSION

O'Connor, Tom, 806 Leawood Terrace, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2012.

HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD

McCollum, Mary Anne, 601 N. Williams Street, Ward 3, Term to expire May 31, 2013

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Todd, Marissa, 1604 Hickam Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire March 1, 2011

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Devine, Daniel, 710 Ridgeway Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2012

Donaldson, Meredith, 1001 Pheasant Run Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire May 31, 2012

Kloepfel, Terry, 111 W. Alhambra Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2012

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Wheeler, Doug, 1515 Tidewater, Ward 2, Term to expire May 31, 2014

Mayor Hindman commented that at the Council mini-retreat, it was suggested that subcommittees of the Council be appointed to review the non-mandated core services identified in a handout provided at the mini-retreat. Mr. Wade noted the subcommittees would lead the discussion to help assess the programs they might want to change due to the budget. Mr. Watkins suggested they also look at the ones with mandates as many did not mandate a particular level. Mr. Wade agreed, but noted due to the limited time they had, he suggested they start with the non-mandated services.

Mayor Hindman appointed Mr. Thornhill and Ms. Nauser to review the non-mandated core services for the Airport, City Clerk, City Council, City Manager, Cultural Affairs, Economic Development, Emergency Management, Finance, Fire, Health, Human Services and Law; Mr. Sturtz and Ms. Hoppe to review the non-mandated core services for the Parks and Recreation – General Fund, Planning and Police; and Mr. Wade and Mr. Skala to review the non-mandated core services for the PSJC, Public Works - Administration, Public Works – Streets and Sidewalks, Recreation Services, Transit and Volunteer Services.

Mr. Watkins pointed out that the Council subcommittees were subject to the open meetings laws and the meeting notices needed to be posted at least 24 hours in advance. Ms. Amin noted those notices needed to be posted at City Hall and at the meeting location, if different than City Hall. Mr. Boeckmann stated they also needed to keep minutes of the meetings, but they did not need to be detailed. Ms. Nauser asked if there were tape recorders available for them to borrow. Ms. Amin replied the meetings did not have to be taped.

Mayor Hindman understood this work needed to be ready for the Council retreat. Mr. Watkins commented that if the subcommittees wanted to pass their work on to the rest of the Council, it would be helpful if they could provide it to the City Clerk's Office a couple of days in advance of the Council retreat.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Wade made a motion for staff to prepare recommendations for possible action with regard to the management of safety and truck speeds on West Boulevard for presentation at a neighborhood gathering on June 17, 2009. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sturtz and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade stated he had been invited to meet with the Disabilities Commission recently and there was a discussion about sidewalks that were in such disrepair that they were unusable. He understood the Disabilities Commission had further discussed the issue after he had left the meeting. He asked that the substance of the discussion be provided to the Council prior to the Council retreat.

Ms. Nauser understood the Kilgore's Pharmacy was broken into and that it was the same pharmacy that had been broken into a while back by a security company with an employee with a criminal record. She noted the City did not have an ordinance discussing whether a convicted felon could own, operate or work for a security company. Kansas City, St. Louis and Springfield had such ordinances.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to review the ordinances of Kansas City, St. Louis and Springfield, Missouri, and to prepare a report indicating whether it might be something the City of Columbia needed. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff provide a report with juvenile crime statistics indicating the number of juveniles arrested and the types of crimes they were arrested for within the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., and a breakdown of who was making the

arrests for all of the juvenile arrests. She wanted to know if City police officers, school resource officers or others were making the arrests. She also wanted the information to encompass 2007 until now. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe stated there was reported trash dumping on the dead end road behind Hollywood Theater that connected to Bluff Creek and asked the staff to look into the situation.

Ms. Hoppe commented that some residents felt lighting was needed on Old 63, north of Grindstone and south of Stadium, for safety reasons.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding whether lighting on Old 63, north of Grindstone and south of Stadium, was warranted for safety reasons. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe asked for the reason for the delay in activating the pedestrian crossing at Old 63 and Broadway. Mr. Watkins replied he thought they were waiting for some parts.

Ms. Hoppe commented that the transfer of funds report included a transfer of \$591,000 involving the Rock Quarry-AC/Grindstone intersection and she wanted to ensure a pedestrian crossing signal going east-west on Grindstone at Rock Quarry was included in the CIP, GetAbout or other plan.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion for staff to determine if a pedestrian crossing signal going east-west on Grindstone at Rock Quarry was included in a plan, such as the CIP or GetAbout. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk