



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, March 7, 2016
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 7, 2016, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP and SKALA were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 15, 2016 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Trapp asked that B43-16 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. Upon her request, Mayor McDavid made a motion to allow Ms. Nausser to abstain from voting on REP18-16 due to a conflict of interest. Ms. Nausser noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that she was a member of the Country Club of Missouri. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote. Mr. Skala asked that B33-16 be moved from consent agenda to old business. The agenda, including the consent agenda with B33-16 and B43-16 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Trapp and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

- SI5-16 Resolution of Appreciation - John Blattel, Finance Director.
- Mayor McDavid asked Mr. Blattel to join him at the podium to be recognized for his upcoming retirement. He read and presented a Resolution of Appreciation to Mr. Blattel for his service to the City of Columbia.
- SI6-16 Swearing in of Michele Nix as the Director of Finance for the City of Columbia.
- Mayor McDavid asked Ms. Nix to join Mr. Matthes, City Manager, and Ms. Amin, City Clerk, to the podium.
- The City Clerk administered the oath of office to Ms. Nix as the Director of Finance.
- SI7-16 Presentation of the financial audit results.
- Ed Scavone, Chair of the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee, explained the Committee had met with the external audit firm of RSM, previously known as McGladrey, and John Blattel, the City's Director of Finance, on February 19. He noted Mr. Blattel had opened the meeting by providing an overview of the City's financial conditions and had pointed out this was seventh year RSM McGladrey had served as the City external auditor, which meant there was only one more year on the contract with that audit firm. He commented that Kevin Smith of RSM had given a presentation of the audit process and the results of the audit. The audit had been conducted utilizing professional

governmental auditing standards as these standards had been established to provide reasonable assurances that misstatements were detected. He pointed out internal controls had been considered in the planning of the audit, but the audit did not include the examination of all internal controls. He explained Mr. Smith had indicated that none of the transactions noted had been material or unusual as defined under the professional standards, and no adjustments to the financial statements were required. In addition, there were not any disagreements between city management and the auditor in terms of the application of significant accounting principles. He commented that Mr. Smith had discussed the four audit product documents, the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), the Single Audit Report, the Passenger Facility Audit, and the Management Letter. The audit provided an unmodified clean opinion of the CAFR. The City had complied in all material respects with the requirements described in the U.S. Office of Management and Budget circular in terms of the Single Audit Report. No findings were noted with regard to the Passenger Facility Audit, which was conducted to meet FAA requirements, or with regard to the Management Letter. He noted this was a tribute to Mr. Blattel and his team, and stated the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee wanted to thank Mr. Blattel for his years of service to the City and the Committee.

Mr. Matthes commented that he had been in this business for about 20 years, and this was the cleanest audit he had ever seen. It was a great tribute to Mr. Blattel and his staff in the management of City finances.

Mayor McDavid thanked Mr. Scavone for his expertise and his service to the City.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC6-16 Grace Vega - Community policing.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, spoke on behalf of Ms. Vega who was unable to attend, and explained community policing was a topic of great interest to Race Matters, Friends. He believed the community had the right to decide the kind of policing it wanted and that it was not the role of the police to decide what kind of policing to provide as the decision would affect the mission, vision, goals, allocation of resources, strategic planning, policies and procedures, training guidelines, efforts of recruitment, etc. of the Police Department. He commented that he had been disturbed by the Police Department's response to the recommendations of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. He noted the Police Department worked very hard to protect its citizens, but their response was specific to the Columbia Police Department and had very little in terms of citizen input. It appeared as if they felt they knew what was best and that they believed they were doing it correctly. In addition, the Police Department had implied they would need more officers and would need time to train them in order to do community policing, and would make due until then. He understood two officers would be assigned to each of the three strategic planning focus areas, and agreed that was a step in the right direction in terms of having officers in the same area so they were able to get to know the people in those areas, but noted this was not community policing. He commented that if the City Council wanted to build trust with its citizens, they would have to direct the Police Department to work with those citizens. Community policing was a philosophy and approach to really involve the community, and it required an equal share in decision-making authority at its core base. It also did not have to wait until funding was available for 30-40 more officers either. He asked the Council to direct and enable the Police Department to conduct a long-term community-based strategic planning process using outside facilitation in the design of the process as it would build and increase trust in public officials and police officers. He thought this could be done now, and that it could be funded by the current budget. He believed this could build support for

the eventual funding for more officers and training.

SPC7-16

Rhonda Carlson - Building Construction Codes Commission.

Ms. Carlson provided a handout and explained the Building Construction Codes Commission reviewed the building codes, which entailed a large stack of code books, every three years. These professionals had participated in almost 30 meetings this year with regard to the building codes, and it was not free time as many would consider it billable time since they could have spent that time earning a living. They generally only met once a month to hear appeals to building codes, but every three years they reviewed the building codes. She noted her handout listed all of the codes that were reviewed, and explained the only code for which they did not have direct input was the energy code. They had to work through it on their own, which they were able to do, but they would prefer to have direct input. She commented that the Environment and Energy Commission independently reviewed the energy code, and provided their recommendations to Council. She thought it would be helpful to the Building Construction Codes Commission if the Environment and Energy Commission worked directly with them instead of providing recommendations separately as she believed it would be less adversarial if that occurred.

SPC8-16

Jeff Stack - Homeless human beings and our collective responsibility as a civilized society to provide shelter for them.

Mr. Stack commented that the evolution of City government had been incredible from his perspective in terms of caring for the homeless in the community by supporting Room at the Inn, providing cots and police to help, committing money to purchase land for a shelter, etc. This past year five churches had stepped up to offer life-saving shelter to people in desperate situations. Last year, more than 400 people had volunteered to help make Room at the Inn happen, and they were not sure how many would volunteer this year while it was in operation for three months. Prior to the Room at the Inn, a couple dozen people had passed in the winter from exposure. This past year, only one person has passed. He commented that he was saddened because the shelter had closed on Thursday, so there were now at least 50 men and women that did not have a place to stay. He thought they needed to do more, and to not do more was to be derelict in their collective duty to humanity. He stated life was the most precious of all human rights, but without shelter there was no life. Last year, 189 people were served by the shelter over about 10 days. He explained the number of homeless people was increasing as economic times became more desperate and difficult. According to data, the number of homeless people had almost tripled over the last seven years. Although the weather was currently mild, they would receive a lot of rain over the next several nights, and he wondered what some would do. He pointed out many of them were a step of misfortune away from being homeless. He encouraged the City to be an active leader as many spaces were available, such as City Hall, the ARC, the Armory, etc., to get people off of the streets. He stated he did not feel the shelters needed to be centered in the North Central neighborhood, and thought shelters should be spread around town to show a commitment to provide for the most basic of all human needs. He noted empty office buildings, such as the one on Chapel Hill Road, near Forum Boulevard, was another example of a space that could be used. He suggested they be creative. He understood great strides had been made in ending homelessness for veterans and believed they needed to replicate that effort to end homelessness for all men and women in the community. He suggested a homeless shelter in the downtown area instead of pushing it off into a certain district.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH8-16 Construction of improvements to the historic Maplewood Home building located in Nifong Park.

Discussion shown with B40-16.

B40-16 Authorizing the construction of improvements to the historic Maplewood Home building located in Nifong Park; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.

PH8-16 was read by the Clerk, and B40-16 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor McDavid stated Nifong Park was a very important part of the park system and the City's legacy as Lavinia Lenoir and Frank Nifong married and lived at Maplewood. The family was influential in establishing Lenoir Manor and had contributed to Boone Hospital. He commented that the homes needed to be maintained, and money for renovations and repairs needed to be budgeted annually. By not doing regular maintenance, they ended up with \$180,000 of fixes. He stated he would support this funding and urged future councils and administrators to consider including a line item in the budget for the maintenance and repair of structures like the Blind Boone Home and the Maplewood Home.

Mr. Skala commented that they did not have many City owned structures as they only had the Maplewood Home and the Blind Boone Home, and noted he would suggested something beyond a maintenance budget as he thought they might want to hold some money in a trust use in other parts of the community too. He suggested this method be used for sewer and road infrastructure as well in terms of maintenance costs as a large portion of the capital improvement budget was due to items being worn out. He agreed regular attention needed to be given the Maplewood Home, and noted he was happy to support it.

Mr. Trapp stated this measure showed the City's ongoing commitment to historic preservation, and the Maplewood Home was a great asset in Nifong Park. He pointed out this was a similar amount of money that had been used to restore the Blind Boone Home, but in this situation, he had not received or seen any negative comments. They were both historic structures for which they had responsibility in terms of ongoing maintenance and repair. He pointed out they tended to treat historic structures owned by African-Americans very different than they treated historic structures owned by a rich, white doctors, and thought it said something about the community. He asked the critics of the Blind Boone Home to take a look at their heart as he wondered where the outrage was with regard to this house.

B40-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B31-16 Vacating the remainder of an east-west alleyway located within the block bounded by Sixth Street, Locust Street, Seventh Street and Elm Street (Case No. 16-44).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if a particular right or property would be given up by the City through

this vacation procedure. Mr. Teddy replied it would be half of the alley. He explained there was an existing right of the City to establish a 15-foot wide alley, which was the historic width of alleys in the downtown. He stated the east half had been vacated in 1945, and was uncertain as to why the entire block had not been addressed at that time.

Mr. Thomas asked if compensation was ever paid to a public entity when the public entity gave up a right such as this. Ms. Thompson replied not typically, and explained she had never heard of cities receiving compensation for vacating a public right-of-way. The premise behind a vacation of public right-of-way was that the landowner retained fee simple interest when the right-of-way was dedicated, and the public only had the right to use it for as long as that right-of-way existed. It could be sought to be vacated when it was no longer necessary for public use, and once vacated, it returned back to the adjoining property owners. In this situation, the University of Missouri owned the property on both sides so it would go to them.

Ms. Peters understood the City would still have access to fiber optics and electric lines. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. Mr. Teddy stated there was a three-phase underground line, which was of interest to the City, and Mediacom had a fiber line. Those comments had been made as part of the alley vacation review, and the representative of the University had indicated the University would agree to retain the easement rights. Ms. Peters understood this meant the University would not build directly on top of it. Mr. Teddy stated that would likely be addressed during the planning of the museum building. The burden was normally on the party constructing the building to relocate utilities if there was an encroachment.

Mr. Skala asked when the Mediacom fiber optic line had been placed underground in this location. Mr. Teddy replied he did not have any details other than the comment. Mr. Skala understood it existed. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Ms. Thompson explained the process in terms of right-of-way vacations was that all of the utilities were contacted to determine if there were any facilities in the area that would prohibit a complete a vacation. This was the reason for the amendment sheet with the caveat. They wanted to ensure the easements were maintained for the utilities placed within the right-of-way. She noted utilities had the right to put facilities in the right-of-way.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B31-16 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid understood \$35 million in bonds had been sold, and the Missouri State Historical Society building would be a spectacular addition to the City of Columbia. He pointed out this was only possible because the City of Columbia and the University of Missouri had each donated land worth \$5 million, and noted he was pleased the City was a part of it.

Mr. Skala stated this was a public-private partnership that could bring extraordinary benefits, to include economic development, to the City. Anything they could do to make this happen as quickly as possible was worthy of support.

B31-16, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA.

VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B32-16

Authorizing an agreement with TranSystems Corporation for professional engineering services for the design and limited construction administration of the Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street East-West Trail Connection GetAbout Columbia Project (Phase B).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood staff was only asking for approval to fund engineering

services. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Mayor McDavid understood multiple interested parties meetings and public hearings had been held in the selection of the trail route, and the intent of this was not to re-litigate the route options. Mr. Nichols stated was correct, and explained Council had directed staff to proceed with Option 1 in terms of the design. Mayor McDavid understood this would be funded by the non-motorized transportation grant, which was the federal grant the City had received. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters understood the engineers would survey where the trail would go. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Ms. Peters explained someone had contacted her about an old tree with a rope swing as they believed the tree was in the path of the trail. She asked if the placement of the route would be reviewed. Mr. Nichols replied this was the conceptual alignment, and the detailed alignment would be provided after a detailed survey. He noted the route had been walked with a few council members, and this was the general alignment that seemed to satisfy the mode shift and the environmental constraints. He reiterated it was conceptual, and the detail route would be provided once the engineering design was completed. Ms. Peters understood the Council was approving the funding for this engineering work. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Ms. Peters asked about the limited construction portion of this contract. Mr. Nichols replied it was limited construction administration. He explained City staff would do the day-to-day inspections, but they did not have the expertise to do shop-drawing reviews of the bridge. This firm had the expertise needed for the bridge design.

Mr. Thomas understood the Council had instructed staff to proceed with both Option 1 and Option 3. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct, and explained the City only had the funding for Option 1 at this time. They were in discussions with the Parks and Recreation Department and the University of Missouri in terms of Option 3. Mr. Thomas understood it would be looked at as a separate project. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

Sutu Forte stated she was representing It's Our Wild Nature and displayed a slide show of what the area looked like currently. She described many of the beautiful features of the area. She also displayed photos of the Moon Valley area and noted the construction of a trail in that area had destroyed it as it was no longer native or natural due to the amount of excavation. She commented that they had been told these mistakes would not happen again. She asked the Council to work with the residents as this was a precious area, and they knew things others did not know. She stated they had been unaware of the so-called public meetings. Last March, they had surveyed people by going door to door, and a majority of them wanted to leave the area the way it was while improving the existing route on Old 63 through Stadium Boulevard. She commented that people referred to these trails as rich, white people's trails. The \$152,000 could be used to analyze and survey areas in town that really needed help in terms of walking and biking. She questioned whether it was ethical for a Council Member that had been the former President of the PedNet Coalition to have a vote. She stated It's Our Wild Nature and others were proposing the reconsideration of Option 4.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluffdale Drive, understood the Council had approved Option 1 and Option 3, pending funding, but it was only to the east bank of the creek as the west side would be determined later, and that public meetings would be held for it. She also understood it would be a Parks and Recreation Department project. Now, the plans had changed and it had been incorporated into Option 1. She did not believe this was what Council had voted on last year. She asked the Council to vote against this proposal to spend \$152,000 and to reconsider using these funds for Option 4 as a safe passage along Stadium Boulevard was necessary. Option 4 was less expensive and would leave money for other projects while achieving the desired mode shift. The plan the Council was being asked to vote on tonight did not support the original mode shift study from Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street. The route was no longer designated from Shepard Boulevard to the Bluffdale Drive connector or from the University of Missouri parking lot to

the intersection of Williams Street and Rollins Street. The connectivity for pedestrians and wheelchair users had been removed. Instead of the trail starting at Shepard Boulevard, it was now designated from the Bluffdale Drive cul-de-sac to a University of Missouri parking lot. City staff had indicated people would need to figure out how to get from Shepard Boulevard or the University of Missouri to the connections on their own. She felt this was deceptive to the ADA community because it ignored the parts of the route that made it impossible for wheelchairs and physically challenged pedestrians. The chosen route was only designed for bikers and pedestrians in top physical condition. She commented that when she was in college she would park in that lot and walk up the hill, which was almost impossible if it was raining or snowing.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding Ms. Wren's comment about Option 1 not connecting to Rollins Street. Mr. Nichols replied that connection could be made if funds were available, but it would not meet ADA standards because the sidewalk would follow the road grade. Mr. Thomas thought Ms. Wren had indicated the Option 1 they had voted on only went to the east side of the Hinkson Creek, which he thought was incorrect. Option 1 had included going over the creek to the Rollins Street parking lot. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Ms. Wren stated it had only included the bridge. Mr. Thomas reiterated it went to the Rollins Street parking lot.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, commented that she had previously been opposed to paving trails, but she was now somewhat disabled until she decided to have elective surgery, and thought paved pedways were wonderful as she could use them when she was unable to go on the rest of the trail. She explained she primarily used the trail for exercise, so she supported trails like this that were paved as they took her to nature. Paving was cheaper and easier for those that were considered disabled to utilize.

Ryan Quade commented that Columbia was very blessed to have received GetAbout federal funds and believed it needed to be used in the best possible way. He explained he did not believe anyone was saying trails were not needed, but infrastructure already existed in this area, and Option 4 would cut a lot of costs. The savings could be diverted to locations where there was a lack of adequate and safe bike trails, such as the Third Ward. He felt most of the money had been diverted to the economically rich and well-off areas of the west side of Columbia and the downtown. He stated more than a white strip a few inches from vehicles was needed for a safe bike trail. He noted he lived near the Boone County Fairgrounds, and the most feasible way to get downtown was to bike down the dilapidated and cracking sidewalks along Route B with cars zooming by at upwards of 45 mph. If they wanted mode shift across the community, he suggested money from this fiscally wasteful project be diverted to Wards 2 and 3 as infrastructure was already there. While it was not ideal, there were work arounds such as the previously considered Option 4, which would involve a guard between automobile traffic and bikers on Stadium Boulevard. He reiterated he believed these funds should be routed to areas that needed legitimate ways to get to the heart of Columbia.

Ginger Owen, 5775 E. Heller Road, provided a handout and stated this proposal was a revised version of Option 1 that took a different path from the original concept approved. She understood the reason was because the East Campus neighborhood did not want to build a concrete road through Clyde Wilson Park and the University of Missouri did not want it to interfere with their sensitive raptor center and the mule barns. The plan had changed to recreational trailheads. The one trailhead at the bottom of Rollins Street was so steep and dangerous for students that a stairway was built to provide access to campus from the parking lot, and the other was at the end of the Bluffdale Drive cul-de-sac allowing access at the discretion of commuters. While the majority of the Hinkson Valley community had adamantly expressed they did not want this trail, the City was not listening to them. She commented that she believed this trail would open these neighborhoods up to the increased problems of crime. She thought lights should be installed in the East Campus neighborhood, sidewalks to existing trails needed to be repaired or built, and lighted crosswalks needed to be installed throughout town. She

suggested this money be used for those that really needed this safety net, and not for the few that only wanted a faster way to campus. She did not feel this was mode shift. She believed it was favoritism. She referred to her handout and explained it was a revision to Option 4. It would connect Shepard Boulevard to Williams Street by using the exiting pedway on Old 63 and Stadium Boulevard, improving the bridge over the Hinkson Creek to safely accommodate commuters of all modes, continuing to the pedway on Ashland Road, turning onto East Campus Drive, and veering onto the East Campus loop to the wide drive behind the School of Veterinary Medicine to Williams Street. It would create mode shift for those east of the Hinkson Creek bridge, would have virtually no environmental impact, would involve less property acquisition, and was the best option financially for the use of non-motorized transportation funds. As a past president and member of the PedNet Coalition, she asked Mr. Thomas to abstain from voting on all issues involving GetAbout funds because she believed his vote was biased and involved a conflict of interest.

Michelle Windmoeller, 705 E. Rockcreek Drive, stated she was representing the PedNet Coalition and explained they had not called on their membership to show up tonight because they felt this issue had been previously discussed. She noted the PedNet Coalition supported funding for the study as they wanted to see the results because they believed it would provide a positive way to move forward with the trail. She commented that the trail would connect the downtown to east Columbia, and would connect to areas further north when the trail that would be located under I-70 was completed. She agreed the area where this trail would be located was beautiful and pristine, but only a few people were able to view it now. She noted they believed in opening nature and the trails to everyone regardless of where they lived or their financial circumstances. They felt keeping people away from nature was not socially equitable. She stated the PedNet Coalition did not support Option 4 because it would not create mode shift, and the GetAbout funds were specifically for mode shift.

David Leuthold, 2000 Valley View Road, commented that a substantial footage of his property adjoined the Altis property, which was part of property being considered for the trail. He stated he was supportive of this proposal and urged the Council to move forward with it. He explained he had lived at this address for 33 years, and for ten of those years, when he was employed by the University, he had walked to work every day, and sometimes got wet when crossing the Hinkson Creek. Walking to work and back home had been a highlight of his day, and he favored extending that opportunity to a fair number of other people. He noted the bridge would provide people a way to get across the creek without getting wet. He thought this trail project, if completed, would enhance the value of his property because he believed there were many people like him that preferred to walk or bike to work. He pointed out one reason the property was accessible to those that lived in the area was because his neighbor had mowed trails there for more than 40 years. He explained Clyde Shepard, who originally owned the property and for whom Shepard Boulevard had been named, had intended to give the property to the City as a park, but the City had declined at the time because they wanted to install sewer. After Mr. Shepard had passed, the neighbors had collected money with the intent to purchase the property and give it to the City as a park, but they were outbid by a private individual. This was when his neighbor had started mowing the trails to keep it open. He reiterated he thought the number of people that had the ability to enjoy the area should be expanded.

Brian Johnstone, 711 Bluffdale Drive, stated there was currently a large tree across the creek that made dry accessibility across the creek available both ways. He commented that he, his wife, and his wife's brother lived on Bluffdale Drive and were avid walkers, and primarily enjoyed walking on a natural trail that paralleled the Hinkson Creek. The trail was also enjoyed by his two dogs and his neighbors. He stated he enjoyed this natural wooded area that offered tranquil space for rest and relaxing activities, and believed natural areas should be treasured and preserved. He explained he had joined with fellow

advocates for the preservation of natural areas. He commented that he had problems with transparency and fair notice for the events, and his primary area of concern was with the practice of the Council submitting proposals which were fluid and transitory. He understood a proposal could be approved initially, and later changed without notice in a manner that was detrimental to community needs. An example of this involved the Bluffdale Drive to campus project. The plan had changed substantially as the route of the trail was different than when information had been provided during an earlier consideration of the construction options and a parking lot had appeared to have been added at the end of the Bluffdale Drive access point. He believed plans that clearly represented the motive and intention of Council actions should be shared with the community in a timely manner, and if a plan was changed substantially, community input should be requested prior to implementation. He also felt plans needed to have ready funding sources, and there should not be tentative resources for funding. He commented that he believed there had been a failure and overdevelopment of the trail program, and the current level of trails were more than adequate. He thought the community would be best served by using this funding to maintain the management of the trails and to upgrade trails to better suit the needs of those in wheelchairs and those with walkers.

Mr. Thomas asked if the route of Option 1 had changed substantially since last year and whether a parking lot had been added at Bluffdale Drive. Mr. Nichols replied everything was in concept at this time, and noted he had not noticed any changes from what they had brought forward at the public hearing. He pointed out this bill would allow the City to hire the consultant to work out the details of the trail location.

Nellie Owen stated she lived in Boone County, north of Hallsville, and commented that the trails needed to be ADA compliant per the Federal Highway Administration since GetAbout funds would be used. She explained she was in a wheelchair, and she and lady in a walker had recently traveled to the store from Keene Street. She noted she had to take her car because she did not want to try to cross the 63 bridge to get to the nearest trail access. She stated the trail was wonderful, but the connectivity to get to the trail for a person in a wheelchair was lacking as there had been large chunks of rock. The trail led them to the south side of Broadway, near Applebee's, where there was a sidewalk, but it was too steep for her to wheel herself up. At the top of the hill, there was glass all over the sidewalk. She also noted crossing Broadway was a challenge because she had to go west to push a button, and then had 22 seconds to cross six lanes of traffic. She commented that GetAbout funds were Federal Highway Administration funds, and ADA compliance was necessary. She reiterated the connectivity to get from one point to another was lacking. She noted she would not be able to make it up the hill to the School of Veterinary Medicine and would not be able to make it up or down the hill at Bluffdale Drive with the proposed trail, and asked the Council to consider ADA compliance issues before constructing the trail.

Patricia Holt displayed a video showing Ms. Owen and her friend traveling to the store in her wheelchair. There were many obstacles, to include issues with sidewalks along the way and other connectivity issues closer to the trails. Ms. Holt suggested a bench at certain locations on the trail to give people breaks. She also suggested some of this money be used for upkeep.

Lee Ruth, 807 N. Valley View Drive, explained Hinkson Creek was in his extended backyard. He commented that last year, he had attended a public presentation at Shepard Boulevard School where four options for this trail were presented. It had been presented as a choice between the four options, and there had not been any mention of combining any of the options. After the meeting, he had been surprised to find that several people had supported Options 1 and 3, and wondered if they had all arrived at this combined option independently or if some people had been advised that the combined option was on the table even if it was not officially on the table in an effort to gain more support for Options 1 and 3, which were the two most expensive options. He commented that they now had a revised Option 1, which was neither the original Option 1 nor the

combined Options 1 and 3, and it was being fast-tracked with this \$152,000 for a survey. He suggested the Council table this issue until more of the public had the opportunity to review the details of this new option, which he considered Option 5, as they had not been aware of the arguments for or against it. He believed there had been a considerable lack of transparency with the illusion of transparency in this process because decisions were being made behind closed doors. He suggested allowing the public to really know what was happening.

Robert Wilson stated he was a retired Navy Captain, an avid cyclist, and a member of the National Brotherhood of Cyclists, which was a predominately African-American organization, and believed this trail would benefit the entire community in the long-term. He understood they wanted to increase the number of minorities walking and biking, and expanding the network of trails could help in that effort. He explained he decided to retire to Columbia due to its trail network, and thought they should continue to build the network so it would benefit the entire community.

Gerry Neuffer explained he lived on the hill, which overlooked all of this land, as he had purchased the property from Clyde Shepard in 1957, and had mowed the trail that was there today. It was a beautiful place, which he enjoyed. He commented that Mr. Shepard had a vision to give the land to the City for free to build a park, but the City would not take it because a sewer line would be constructed and they did not want it to get in the way of it. The sewer line was there now so there was nothing to prevent this any longer. The issue now was that the ownership of the land had changed from Mr. Shepard, who would have given it freely, to another party that might not want to sell it. Mr. Neuffer stated the trail was the vision of Mr. Shepard with accesses at Stadium Boulevard, Rollins Streets, Bluffdale Drive, and the hill where there was currently a small park. Unfortunately, Mr. Shepard had been unable to see his vision through, and when the land was sold at auction, it was purchased by someone else who thought it was more valuable than what had been paid. Mr. Neuffer thought it would be nice for there to be a trail to the University, and a bridge would assist with that effort. This would allow a connection to other trails as well. He stated he was in favor of building a trail there, and was not in favor of Option 4.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked those that were disabled for bringing these issues to Council, and suggested these issues be considered in future planning efforts. He noted there were many large rocks in the one area as shown on the video. He thought the City could benefit from video as it showed the facts.

Richard King, 109 W. Parkway, stated he was the President of the Board of Directors of the PedNet Coalition and had been a member of the organization for over ten years. He commented that he was frustrated by some of the comments made, such as the accusations that the City had changed the plans and had made non-transparent decisions. He explained he had been involved in the process since the beginning and had participated in many of the meetings. He noted this issue had been publicized and everyone had been provided the opportunity to speak. In addition, the Council had voted on the issue and had made the decision to move forward with the trails. He understood the issues of getting around Columbia with a wheelchair as he found areas that were frustrating when he ran and biked throughout the City, but he believed this money was specifically designated for these trails. He stated he felt the City benefited from these trails and needed to continue building the trail network. He asked the Council to vote to continue moving forward with this project.

Ms. Nausser asked about the park bench program as she wondered if people or organizations could make charitable contributions to purchase more park benches for this portion of the trail. Mr. Griggs replied the City had a memorial and heritage bench program in addition to a tree program, which was utilized for areas with gaps. He noted there were concerns with regards to benches along certain portions of certain trails as the width of the trail would be narrowed by the placement of a bench whereby two wheelchairs could not pass simultaneously. This was the reason benches were not

along Old 63.

Ms. Nauser asked about the possibility of expanding the length of time for people to cross at the Broadway intersection identified. Mr. Nichols replied staff would look into it.

Mayor McDavid commented that he thought he might have ridden on recreational trails in more cities within the last three weeks than anyone else in the Columbia, and noted he would be excited to see Options 1 and 3 completed. He explained there had been a long and public process in the selection of these options. Option 1 would provide University of Missouri students with direct access to Stephens Lake Park and Option 3 would connect the Third Ward through Hominy Branch to the Grindstone Nature Area. It would also provide a connection all of the way to St. Charles, Missouri, and would connect those in the south part of Columbia to Stephens Lake Park. He thought these were exciting additions to the City's trail heritage, and explained he would endorse this funding for engineering services.

Mr. Thomas stated this would be funded with non-motorized transportation pilot program funds, whose express purpose was to increase pedestrian, bicycle, and wheelchair accessibility and mode share throughout the City. A major part of this strategy was the citywide network of trails. Due to economic and topographic reasons, the City's trail system followed the creek system, which tended to flow from the northeast to the southwest. This minimized hills and made it easier to build trails to ADA standards. It also minimized road crossings because roads already crossed the creek via bridges. Neighborhoods, business districts, schools, etc. tied into the system via connector trails that came off of the plateaus, ridges, etc. He noted the sewer system followed these same paths as well. There had been a highly engaged community discussion last year in terms of how to spend funds in this particular area, and four options had been discussed. He commented that he had never really agreed with the idea of calling them options as they were four separate routes that could be built. The vast majority of the public that had weighed in at the interested parties meeting and the City Council meeting had urged them to support both Options 1 and 3 because, together, they connected Stephens Lake Park to the Grindstone Nature Area along the Hinkson Valley. It was a missing link in the entire network of trails following creek corridors. Currently, one had to go over the Shepard hill, which was 100 feet, to get from Stephens Lake Park to Grindstone on a bicycle. Although it was a nice pedway, it was a huge barrier for people moving throughout the City on the trail system. He understood they had the funding for Option 1 and Council had recommend going forward with Options 1 and 3 as the highest priority. He explained he wanted to see Options 2 and 4 eventually constructed as well. Option 2 would connect from the bottom valley to where Shepard Boulevard met Old Highway 63, and Option 4 would improve the sidewalk and bike lane on Stadium Boulevard. They were all important, but Options 2 and 4 were lower in priority than Options 1 and 3. He thanked Ms. Owen for bringing to their attention the very difficult issues with moving around the City, and noted he would follow up on some of those issues as he thought the timing could be addressed or bulb-outs could be incorporated to shorten the crossing distance. He explained he would support preserving the remainder of the Altis property after the construction of the trail and getting it into public ownership if that was possible as this would allow people from all over the community to enjoy the property. He stated he also supported going ahead with this engineering study for Option 1 today.

Ms. Nauser explained she had voted to support this in March of 2015, and would continue to support this project as she did not generally change her mind unless something egregious was identified. She noted she had reviewed the minutes of the meeting, and Council had directed staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Option 1, as amended to not include sidewalks on Southwood Drive and parts of Bluffdale Drive. The schematics shown during the presentation for the public hearing had shown Option 1 from Bluffdale Drive to Rollins Street. At Hinkson Creek, there was a purple area showing where the trail could go, and some of that was displayed on the map shown tonight. She

understood another portion could have gone north of the Raptor Rehabilitation building. She did not feel it made sense to place a trail next to the Raptor Rehabilitation building and understood the reasoning for not placing the trail there. She did not feel the path for Option 1 had changed as it showed a trail from Bluffdale Drive to Rollins Street, and stated she would continue to support the project and the engineering work moving forward.

Mr. Skala noted this had been controversial from the beginning due to the challenge of this area. He commented that the Third Ward would soon be out of isolation as Phase II of the trail that traveled through the Woodridge subdivision would go under I-70 connecting to The Links golf course and Indian Hills, and would thus connect Indian Hills to Stephens Lake Park. He explained he had been a proponent of Option 4 last year as it was less expensive. He agreed this connection from Old Highway 63 to the University of Missouri was needed, but was concerned about bridge crossings and thought that after they had approved the Grindstone Trail project, they were now considering low water crossings as a compromise between the natural areas and providing for the trail. He commented that he thought the COLT railroad trail should be considered if more money becomes available as it traveled north-south and would provide another avenue for mode shift benefitting Wards 2 and 3. He stated he was concerned about the issue raised in terms of the access to trails and thought those should be considered. He understood this issue was specifically to execute professional engineering services, and thought it was wise to proceed so they had more detail. He hoped it would include the public so their fears could be assuaged. The route always moved to some degree because the engineering work had not been completed so they did not know what was involved. He thought there might be room for some compromises as well, such as ADA compliant accesses and low water bridges.

Mr. Trapp stated he did not feel they had heard any new information today. He noted there had been an existing Council decision, and he believed it was important to look at past council decisions. He understood they were an organization that changed its membership, but felt they needed to move through time. He pointed out most items came back to them to vote on about seven times. By starting down a path and rejecting it, they were open to the charge they could not govern. As a result, he thanked Mr. Skala for altering his vote due to the facts on the ground. He noted Mr. Skala had made an argument, which had not persuaded the majority of Council, and had now determined this was a continuation of that decision. Mr. Trapp explained he had hiked the area with the engineers and thought they would show as much sensitivity possible to the topography. They had a passion for nature and an understanding for the complexities of siting the trail with the least disturbance as possible. He recalled some real limitations in terms of bridge placement, but understood they would make an effort to avoid bigger trees. He commented that the area was lovely and this would provide more access to allow more people to appreciate the loveliness. He explained they had looked at the Altis property, but it was expensive, and they had tried to prioritize the use of greenspace acquisition money to those projects that would provide the most wilderness preservation. He explained they reviewed projects based upon an objective scoring system, and tended to move forward with those that scored the highest and made the most sense to the City as a whole. He stated they were trying to be wise stewards of these funds and continued to put a sizable amount of money into greenspace acquisition, which the City of the future would appreciate. He agreed changes had been made to the trail project so it was different than what had been presented, and those changes were made based upon comments by people that lived in the area. He provided the Bluffdale Drive sidewalk as an example. He felt it was a reasonable decision then and was still a reasonable decision now to move forward with this project.

Mr. Ruffin stated he was inclined to support the decision of the previous Council and focus on the issue at hand, which was the authorization of an agreement for professional engineering services, which was something he would support.

Ms. Peters commented that she appreciated It's Our Wild Nature for pointing out how nice the area was and believed it would be helpful to allow more people to enjoy the area. She explained she did not feel this was being fast-tracked as it had been voted on last year. In addition, it appeared as though this had been in the works for a number of years. She noted this particular item was just the approval of engineering services so they could determine where the trail could be routed and if it could get across the Hinkson Creek and connect to the area the University had donated. She thought it was worth the money to have professional engineers look into the issues and for them to ask the engineers about the opportunity for low or high water bridges. She noted she appreciated the video of Ms. Owen as well as it gave them an idea of what needed to be addressed. She stated she would support this issue.

B32-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B33-16 Appropriating non-motorized transportation (Round 2) grant funds for capital projects and/or activities.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked about the \$300,000 associated with the Shepard to Rollins trail connection. She understood \$150,000 would be used for engineering services and asked how the remaining \$150,000 would be used. Mr. Nichols replied staff was setting up the projects. If they moved faster than anticipated, they would need some money for right-of-way acquisition in the project account. They had enough to fund the design. They wanted to set this up in case they were able to move at a certain pace as this would allow staff to move forward without coming back to Council for each of the five projects.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluffdale Drive, commented that she had been confused by this item since they had just approved an agreement and were only now voting to appropriate the funds for the agreement. Mr. Nichols explained they already had funds in the project from a previous appropriation. Ms. Wren understood the \$300,000 was for design. Mr. Nichols stated it was funds that would be added to the project. It would allow money to be available if they were able to get to the point of right-of-way negotiations. Ms. Wren asked if that was what it had indicated on the chart as she thought it had stated \$300,000 for design. Ms. Peters agreed that was what the chart indicated. Mr. Thomas asked if that was an error. Ms. Wren did not believe the money could be used for easement acquisitions. Mr. Nichols explained the money would be a part of the design process. Staff would have to come to Council with an easement acquisition ordinance in the future, but this would take care of moving \$3.5 million into the account for all five projects. Ms. Wren asked if it was an additional \$300,000 on top of the \$152,000. Mr. Nichols replied the total project cost estimate, which included construction, design, and right-of-way, was close to \$1 million. Ms. Wren noted the \$300,000 was identified to be for the design of the project, and the agreement for \$152,000 that had just been approved was also for design. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Ms. Wren asked if it was \$300,000 or \$450,000. Mr. Nichols replied the contract with the consultant was \$152,000. Ms. Wren understood that meant they were giving themselves \$150,000 for overages. Mr. Nichols stated they were actually giving themselves a \$300,000 buffer. Ms. Wren felt the Council should have voted on this item prior to the agreement for engineering services because they voted on something that had not had the funding appropriated for yet. Mr. Nichols explained there was currently \$153,726 in the project account so they had enough to award the contract. Staff wanted to appropriate more money to the project in case there were any other expenses.

Nellie Owen explained she lived in Boone County, north of Hallsville, and noted Mr. King had indicated the GetAbout funds had only been allocated for nature trails, which she did not believe was true. She commented that of the four cities that had received the

non-motorized transportation funds, Columbia had been the only city that had prioritized bicycle routes. The profile for investments for non-motorized funds went to bike parking, on-street infrastructure, off-street infrastructure, both on-street and off-street infrastructure, which included sidewalk improvements and on-street bike lanes, and outreach, education, marketing, and promoting walking and cycling. She provided comparative data between Columbia and Minneapolis. Columbia used the money for 13.2 miles of shared-use lanes while Minneapolis had 2.9 miles. Columbia had 70.8 on-street miles and Minneapolis had 65.7 on-street miles. Columbia only had 6.1 bike boulevard miles while Minneapolis had 27.8 bike boulevard miles. The on-street shared lanes for Columbia was 44.4 miles while Minneapolis had 10.9 miles. She noted Columbia only had 2.1 miles of sidewalk and crosswalk miles. In terms of people per square miles, Columbia had 247 people per square mile and Minneapolis had 65.51 people per square mile. She commented that this money was not only for recreational trails, and it could be used to repair sidewalks in Wards 1 and 3. She stated another pedestrian had died today due to the crosswalk. She suggested the City consider pedestrians and not only bicycles. The other pilot programs had evenly funded pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and had provided connectivity to markets, hospitals, and workplaces. She did not feel recreational trails would take her to the market.

Mr. Skala commented that this bolstered the argument that they were very friendly to trails. He compared it to roads as 51 percent of the capital improvement project funds were for two projects, so it did not leave much money for other roads in other wards. He believed these were equity issues. He pointed out two of the projects on this list would assist with those equity issues, and those were the Hominy Branch - Phase II project and the Clark Lane West project as they totaled about \$2.5 million, which was a substantial portion of the remaining money. He explained why St. Charles Road was not funded with the 2005 capital improvement sales tax funds and wished they could have had the same kind of improvement there that they now had for Clark Lane. He noted his appreciation for the dedication to some of the trails necessary in the Third Ward to provide connectivity.

B33-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B43-16 Accepting a STOP Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant from the Missouri Department of Public Safety; authorizing an Award of Contract and Certified Assurances and Special Conditions.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Lieutenant Buck provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked about the coordinated community response, specifically in terms of batterer intervention providers and how that work was coordinated. Lieutenant Buck replied the intervention specialists now met on a quarterly basis to discuss policies and the overall approach to domestic violence. The batterer intervention program was important in that they were doing something to treat the offenders of domestic violence so they could change their ways and live a healthier non-violent lifestyle.

Mr. Trapp asked how the decision was made to reduce the number of meetings. Lieutenant Buck understood it went from monthly meetings to quarterly meetings and that most of these groups had been working together for 15-20 years. A bi-monthly meeting still existed, but it only involved law enforcement and prosecutors and was case specific. She understood there would be a bi-monthly brown bag lunch in an effort to network and to discuss issues related to domestic violence. She explained she had not been at the meeting, but understood a batterer intervention specialist had been invited.

Tasca Tolson stated she was with TMT Consulting and was a batterer intervention provider. She explained she was the newest agency in town and had been struggling to make connections in an effort to find guidance and provide services. She believed these

services were really important because there would not be victims if there were not any batterers. She commented that education was important in terms of training and having access to the STOP grant because many clients could not afford to go their groups. The lack of access to funding was really difficult for those with it as a probation requirement. She wanted to ensure they were reaching out to these individuals and that the funding was available for anyone that wanted to participate. She was also in favor of mentorship so they could all help each other.

Mr. Trapp commented that he was a big believer in coordinated community response, and there were two main ways it was done in communities that had it. He thought Columbia was lucky in that they had it. This was a more modest approach of bringing together batterer intervention, domestic violence survivor services, the police, and probation and parole for a coordinated effort. In some communities there was even a larger coordination as they brought in health providers. He noted it was a pernicious activity that drove a lot of violence in the community. The City had two full time officers and additional staff solely for domestic violence cases. It was a huge driver of social disruption in the community. He explained he had met Ms. Tolson after she had begun her business as she had reached out to him through a colleague about coordinating with Phoenix Health Programs since he used to work in batterer intervention. He had learned Ms. Tolson was trained on the Duluth model and had asked Ms. Tolson if she had reached out to the DOVE unit as he thought it was important for her to coordinate her efforts with other batterer intervention providers in town since she was new. He was surprised it had been less welcoming and there had been less engagement than he had anticipated. There appeared to be less coordination now than there had been years ago when he was involved. He commented that part of the grant application specifically listed the Family Counseling Center but did not mention TMT Consulting even though it provided a similar service. He pointed out he ended up doing some consulting work with TMT Consulting because Ms. Tolson had to work with someone that had requisite experience training in order to be fully certified, and her competition was the only other one in the community. He noted he had worked with her over the summer and had contracted with her as Phoenix Health Programs. As a result, he knew she ran an excellent program as did the Family Counseling Center. He explained he wanted to ensure they were embracing the idea of a coordinated community response, which meant all of the players needed to be at the table. As they put forward the 2017-2018 STOP VAWA grant, he expected it to be updated to include everyone in the community that provided the service. If they only had some providers at the table, they would reach a point where some batterers had greater levels of accountability than others since coordination would not occur in terms staffing particular cases and ensuring the victims were kept safe and the offenders were held strictly accountable for their actions. He thought this was a start and felt they could do more in terms of coordination. He believed a robust response to domestic violence was needed as it cost lives on a daily basis across the nation and was a scourge upon the community. It needed a concerted effort to address issues thoughtfully and with compassion and strict accountability. He thought they could do better and noted they had done better in the past. Even if the grant allowed for fewer meetings, he did not feel they should hold fewer meetings. He understood he could not tell staff what to do, but encouraged everyone involved to continue to put forward their best efforts to bring everyone to the table to ensure the information was shared beyond the minimum to maintain the grant. He thought they should be at the maximum allowed based upon resources so they would serve the people of the community well. He noted he planned to support this measure.

B43-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B34-16 Accepting a conveyance for street purposes.
- B35-16 Authorizing construction of the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 3, the Ninth and Elm Pedestrian Scramble Project and the Ninth and Elm Storm Drainage Replacement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B36-16 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri as it relates to coordination of construction disturbance and landscaping as part of the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Projects No. 1 and No. 3.
- B37-16 Authorizing a utility agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission as it relates to the relocation of City-owned water facilities in conjunction with proposed I-70 bridge improvements at Business Loop 70 and Creasy Springs Road.
- B38-16 Authorizing construction of the Rollins at Rockcreek Culvert Replacement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B39-16 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Rollins at Rockcreek Culvert Replacement Project.
- B41-16 Authorizing acquisition of a trail easement for construction of the Chapel Hill connector to the County House Trail.
- B42-16 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget to add and delete positions in the Human Resources Department; amending the FY 2016 Classification and Pay Plan by adding a position.
- B44-16 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for public health services.
- B45-16 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for animal control services.
- B46-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 2 to the memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Corrections to provide tuberculosis screening and testing services.
- B47-16 Authorizing an agreement with Wyman Center, Inc. for Teen Outreach Program (TOP) activities; appropriating funds.
- R21-16 Setting a public hearing: Phase III development of the Thomas E. 'Country' Atkins Jr. Memorial Park Baseball Complex to include construction of two baseball fields, and the installation of lighting, additional parking, walkways and an irrigation pump station and deep well.
- R22-16 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the southwest corner of Wyatt Lane and Wilson Turner Road (Case No. 16-54).
- R23-16 Setting a public hearing: consider the FY 2016 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Annual Action Plan; establishing a comment period.

- R24-16 Authorizing an agreement with Sustainable Farms & Communities, Inc. for the use of Clary-Shy Community Park located on the west side of Clinkscales Road and north of Ash Street for the operation of a farmers market and community education garden.
- R25-16 Transferring funds as it relates to the purchase of a tandem axle dump truck for the Sewer and Storm Water Utilities.
- R26-16 Authorizing an amendment to the HOME agreement with The Housing Authority of the City of Columbia for tenant-based rental assistance.
- R27-16 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Russell Subdivision - Plat 5 located on the northwest corner of Rollins Road and Russell Boulevard (709 Russell Boulevard) (Case No. 16-52).

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B48-16 Authorizing a real estate purchase and sale agreement with St. Charles Road Development, LLC for the acquisition of 15.88 acres of land adjacent to the Lake of the Woods Golf Course.
- B49-16 Approving the Final Plat of Somerset Village Plat 3 located north of the Lake of the Woods Golf Course, north of St. Charles Road and west of Battle Avenue (Case No. 16-33).
- B50-16 Approving the Final Minor Plat of West Mount Lathrop & Thilly, a Replat of Parts of Lots 21 and 22 West Mount, located on the southwest corner of Lathrop Road and Thilly Avenue (600 Thilly Avenue); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-53).
- B51-16 Granting a variance from the requirements of Section 25-48.1 of the City Code relating to construction of a sidewalk along a portion of the Providence Outer Road frontage adjacent to Rock Bridge High School, subject to a condition (Case No. 16-49).
- B52-16 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Gates Real Estate, LLC for the acquisition of property in The Gates subdivision located near High Point Lane and Route K for land preservation and neighborhood park purposes.
- B53-16 Approving the Final Plat of The Gates Park located on the west side of High Point Lane and south of State Route K; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-5).
- B54-16 Authorizing Lease Amendment No. 2 to the agreement with the

- Transportation Security Administration, acting by and through the designated representative of the General Services Administration - Public Buildings Service, for the lease of office space in the North Terminal Building at Columbia Regional Airport.
- B55-16 Authorizing Phase III development of the Thomas E. 'Country' Atkins Jr. Memorial Park Baseball Complex to include construction of two baseball fields, and the installation of lighting, additional parking, walkways and an irrigation pump station and deep well; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.
- B56-16 Authorizing construction of the Manor Drive storm water improvement project; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.
- B57-16 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Manor Drive storm water improvement project.
- B58-16 Appropriating funds to correct a funding shortfall in the Sewer Utility as it relates to the conversion of a boiler from fuel oil to natural gas.
- B59-16 Accepting conveyances for sewer and temporary construction purposes.
- B60-16 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding and deleting a position in the City Manager's Office; amending the FY 2016 Classification and Pay Plan by making a classification reassignment; appropriating funds.
- B61-16 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to pawnbrokers.

X. REPORTS

- REP17-16 Membership for the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group.
- Mr. Trapp made a motion to allow the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group to remain at eleven members. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.**
- REP18-16 Zoning Text Amendment to Conditional Use Standards (Case No. 16-48).

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood a tennis club use was not allowed in the R-1 zoning district. Mr. Teddy replied only outdoor tennis clubs and some related recreational uses by conditional use were allowed in the R-1 zoning district. This meant the Board of Adjustment would consider it on a case-by-case basis. Mayor McDavid asked if the Country Club of Missouri was on R-1 zoned property. Mr. Teddy replied yes. Mayor McDavid asked how they would put a bubble over their courts. Mr. Teddy replied they would not be able to as the indoor aspect was not an allowed use. He noted there was some concern with regard to the appropriateness of domed structures in the R-1 zoning district.

Mayor McDavid understood they could accept the Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation or they could ask for an ordinance to be prepared.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought the Planning and Zoning Commission was quite clear in its unanimous decision that this might have an impact in residential areas. He stated he was not opposed to tennis as he loved to play, and would personally enjoy having a place to play in the winter, but he thought it might be problematic in a residential area for the neighbors. He noted he concurred with the opinion of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

REP19-16 Citizens Police Review Board 2015 Annual Report.

Mayor McDavid understood this had been provided for informational purposes. He commented that in his review of this report, he had focused on the five appeals the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) had received. The Board had agreed with the decision of the Police Chief in three of the five appeals. One had not been filed timely, and another had been referred back to the Police Chief for investigation so it was still under review. He thought this report had an excellent history of the formation of the CPRB and was a very useful resource. He viewed the report as positive as it validated the good work of the City's public safety officers in general. He also felt the CPRB was fulfilling its mission and meeting its promise.

Mr. Skala agreed this was good report, and explained he had been around when the CPRB had been formed. He thought the CPRB had done Youmans work and noted their emphasis on NICOLE training as he believed it was important for professional development at this level in terms of efficiency and judgement.

Ms. Nauser stated she had been on the Council when the CPRB was formed, and many months of conversation had been held many months of conversation with regard to the need for this type of board. She believed this was a great example of the process working for people that felt they had not had their voices heard irrespective of the outcome. It was also a testament to the officers in that there were only five incidents over an entire year that had risen to the level of challenging a decision. She commended the CPRB as they were doing great work in trying to bridge the trust gap and bringing accountability to the Police Department. She noted they provided citizens another opportunity to have their grievances heard.

REP20-16 Commission on Human Rights 2015 Annual Report.

Mayor McDavid understood this had been provided for informational purposes. He thought fourteen complaints had been documented, and three involved the ban the box ordinance. Of those three, only two appeared to be valid complaints. He felt it was an excellent report.

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased people were complying with ban the box. He noted he knew people that had received interviews that would have previously not been interviewed. It was providing people the chance to offer evidence of rehabilitation and making the community safer. He appreciated the unanimous support of the Council and those who lobbied the State to protect the rights of Columbia to determine how they would handle issues of this nature. He pointed out the economy seemed to still be doing well, and this had not brought an end to the business community in Columbia.

REP21-16 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor McDavid understood this had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, stated she was a member of the newly formed steering committee for the community land trust. She noted Mr. Brown, who had spoken with the Council during the work session earlier tonight, had talked about leveraging public investment. She explained she had been the beneficiary of a very similar public investment when she lived in Greenbelt, Maryland. She stated Greenbelt was a cooperative community, and the qualities of their affordable housing program were very similar to the form, structure, and process described by Mr. Brown. Greenbelt, which had been formed in 1937, was a New Deal program that had come out of the Depression. In 1952, the government had decided they no longer wanted to own those homes and land, and the community had come together to form a cooperative taking ownership of 1,600 unit. There were three different styles with different price points. Her mother, a newly divorced mother of three children, had purchased the least expensive in 1965 for

\$6,000. She upgraded a couple years later to a three-bedroom brick townhouse for \$11,000, and when she passed in 1985, they sold her home for \$50,000. It had appreciated in value, but there were controls so it remained affordable. Today, she looked online to see how much Greenbelt houses cost, and the range from a low-end one-bedroom to the upper-end was \$65,000 to \$169,000. There was a metro rail station in Greenbelt, making Greenbelt real estate much more popular for those working in Washington D.C, so surrounding homes were in the neighborhood of \$400,000. She noted the program worked. Living there, she had learned community involvement was expected and not suggested. She reiterated she was the beneficiary of a public investment, and she and her siblings now owned their homes and were college graduates. She stated she was delighted to be a part of the steering community and appreciative of Mr. Trapp's support of their work. She also looked forward to working closely with Council as they explored the possibilities for the community. She passed around a brochure regarding Greenbelt Homes.

Ms. Peters asked Ms. Fowler about the historic preservation work in terms of the salvage of the St. James Condominium. Ms. Fowler replied they had experienced unprecedented cooperation from the property owner, and were planning an ambitious salvage of the 21 units inside the St. James building beginning on Saturday, March 19 and continuing throughout the weekend. She commented that there were some real treasures in the building and the hope was to reinstall a selected number of those items in downtown historic structures to create a living museum of the pieces that were handcrafted and hand-installed in 1903. She encouraged the Council to assist if they had a few hours that weekend. She thanked Ms. Peters for bringing her and the owner together so they could talk about these possibilities.

Traci Kleekamp-Wilson, 2905 Greenbriar Drive, thanked Mr. Matthes for taking the time to meet with Race Matters last week and appreciated John Clark speaking about community policing earlier this evening as it reiterated the idea consensus was needed with regard to the philosophy of community policing. It was not the number of officers or the budget. It was about shared governance and how they thought policing should look for the City. She believed it would be easier to obtain approval for a revenue bond to support more police officers if this was done where there was a consensus. She thought it would be helpful if what they wanted from policing came from them versus an authoritarian dominant narrative. She felt it was important when moving forward to find ways to make space for people in the community on how to do government differently in terms of shared governance and ideas. She hoped they could continue meeting and working together.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, understood the City had recently annexed the Midway Truck Stop and property beyond it. Mayor McDavid stated that was not correct.

Mr. Elkin commented that there had been a shooting on Range Line Street this past week and there were more and more communities of violence within the City.

Mr. Elkin explained the first Habitat for Humanity home was located on Boyd Lane, which intersected Lamp Lane where a gentleman had recently been arrested. He wondered why the gentleman went to Lamp Lane. He wondered if more lighting on streets were necessary. He also asked the Council to look into how much enforcement was needed in areas where there was more violence.

Mr. Trapp stated he appreciated the hard work of the Building Construction Codes Commission (BCCC) in terms of looking at energy code revisions whereby most of the controversy occurred. He noted the City Council was the elected leadership of the City. They stood for election based upon a set of principles, which was energy conservation for many of them. The method of analysis of the BCCC had been to take all of their

technological expertise and reject any energy efficiency that did not have a ten year payback. If they wanted their recommendations to be accepted by Council, he believed the method of analysis they needed to look at was whether these suites of energy efficiency standards would be paid back as a whole because the ones with the longer paybacks were supported by those that had the shorter paybacks. If they chose only the easy items, they would never meet the energy efficiency standards, and that would drive greater energy costs and greater efficiency. He agreed there would be an upper level of investment in constructing the home and understood those building the homes and businesses wanted to reduce those costs so sales costs were reduced and more square footage could be added, but he believed the person owning the home or business would gain those costs back. He noted energy efficiency was building for permanence because they were building better structures. It would take the stress on the utility and put it on the cost of new construction instead of socializing those costs to those that paid for utility expansion.

Mr. Trapp noted the last update meeting regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence would be held on Friday, March 11 at 5:30 p.m. in Conference Room 1A. There would not be any presentation. It would be a planning meeting to listen to citizen voices to decide upon an ongoing process of implementation and monitoring going forward.

Ms. Nauser explained she had recently been asked about the progress of the Highway 63 connector near Walmart on Conley Road and wondered about the status of the project. Mr. Skala understood the connector had been planned through a Transportation Development District (TDD) and the work had been suspended due to difficulties involving the owners and purchasers of the property. He believed the connector was still in the planning process, but the actual work had been suspended. Ms. Peters asked if this was the connector from Business Loop to I-70. Mr. Skala replied it would be I-70 to Conley Road. Ms. Peters understood it would not require people to merge onto I-70. Mr. Skala stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser noted there was continued standing water on Nifong Boulevard between Monterey Drive and Santiago Drive. The area still had standing water from the last rainfall and the ducks in the spring and summer tended to nest at the location since it was a continual pond of water. She understood there would be road construction when traffic signals were installed at Peachtree Drive, but felt that area of the shoulder needed some kind of trenching to clear a path for the water to move now. It was close to families and their homes and was a health issue with regard to mosquitos. She asked if it could be trenched by this spring and summer.

Ms. Nauser had been contacted by a constituent with regard to people who were walking their dogs along Green Meadows Road, near Murry's, and were conscientious enough to pick up after their dogs, but would then deposit the bags of waste on City streets. She noted she had driven by this evening and had noticed three bags. It was not a healthy situation. She was not sure what needed to be done and wondered if they needed a sign asking people to put their dog waste in receptacles. She did not feel they should have to tell adults to do these types of things, and asked staff to look into the situation.

Mr. Skala suggested everyone read the article from the July 2012 issue of *Governing Magazine* entitled *Let's Talk*, which was about the Washington D.C. Police Department and a real philosophy of community policing.

Mr. Skala noted crime was spilling over from Demaret Drive, which was in Boone County, to the City in terms of the Lake of the Woods Road, Kelsey Drive, Rice Road, and Boyd

Lane areas, and a solution was to try to arrange for two of the community police officers to have a substation in the area where the City and County lines met. This would provide for a presence and avail those police officers to much quicker response times to those areas. He thought this was coming in the area and felt it could not come soon enough. Mr. Matthes explained staff was looking into this possibility and had looked at space.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been knocking on doors campaigning on Boyd Lane, and had approached a gentleman in his garage. This gentleman had stated Mr. Skala had made him nervous and explained he had a concealed carry weapon. Another gentleman had told Mr. Skala that he had scared his mother going door to door. Mr. Skala pointed out people on Boyd Lane were worried, and this was a reason they needed relief with a police substation. He hoped they could get this done soon.

Mr. Skala stated he had been Chair of the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) for many years, and some of this adversarial relationship had begun then with the Building Construction Codes Commission (BCCC). He agreed they went through a lot work every three years or so in the review of the building codes. He noted the two commissions worked together to some degree, but there were also some adversarial feelings so they did not always work things out. He thought it was a good idea for the two commissions to work together as much as possible as they were both valuable to the Council with their information streams.

Mr. Skala noted there would be a Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast round-a-bout discussion and information session at City Hall on March 15 at 5:30 p.m. He explained there would be a Benton Stephens overlay meeting at City Hall on March 16 at 6:00 p.m. to discuss strengthening the Benton Stephens urban overlay in terms of development and maintaining the neighborhood. He stated the first tiny home meeting would be held on March 10. He noted tiny homes could assist with homelessness in certain situations. Mr. Trapp asked if that was open to the public as it would be in Conference Room 5D of City Hall. Mr. Skala replied he was not certain how many people the room could hold.

Mr. Skala asked for a status report regarding fiber. He wanted to know where the City was in negotiations and how they might be able to move forward. He wondered if they had encountered any difficulties with the private sector, and if a commission might need to be established in the future.

Mr. Thomas stated another pedestrian was killed this morning, and there had been four pedestrian deaths in late 2014 and early 2015. He noted the Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety had almost completed its work. He explained their recommendations were virtually finalized and they were holding two meetings next week. He thought their report would be on the April 4, 2016 Council Meeting agenda. The first recommendation would likely be for the City to adopt a Vision Zero policy, which meant safety would be the number one priority in designing, implementing, and operating transportation systems and that traffic deaths and serious injuries were preventable and unacceptable. From that point, they would review the systems they had and make appropriate changes, and design new systems.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Clark, Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp, and Mr. Skala for their comments regarding community policing. He had previously asked that the Police Chief develop a strong vision for community policing, but now felt they had to have a community process. He stated community policing started with authentic community engagement that allowed everyone to come forward and explain how they would like to see public safety operated in their community. He urged staff to develop a plan for a visioning process, which he thought might take twelve months. He noted engaged community processes led to good

policies, practices, and programs, and this was needed in the Police Department due to its low staffing, low morale, etc.

Mr. Thomas commented that there were two encouraging development processes in the Fourth Ward in terms of negotiations between landowners/developers and adjacent neighbors/property owners. One was an annexation and rezoning west of Scott Boulevard, which was within the urban service area. There had been a very good meeting last Thursday with many representatives of adjacent neighborhoods present. Various aspects of the development had been negotiated to include traffic flow, density, preservation of an Indian burial site, protection of sink holes, etc. The other was at Ridgmont and College Park Drive where there was a possibility of half of the tract being preserved as public open space and the other half being developed with smaller houses as it might be more acceptable to the adjacent residents and preferred by the developer. He stated he was pleased that there had been a good and transparent discussion with both potential developments.

Mr. Thomas stated he would miss the April 18 Council Meeting if he was re-elected.

Ms. Nauser agreed a community dialogue with the Police Department was necessary, and suggested an outside facilitator be utilized during the process. Mr. Thomas stated he endorsed that suggestion.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.