INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 18, 2013, 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 MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, NAUSER and HOPPE were present. The City Manager, Deputy City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 4, 2013 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Dudley and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor McDavid noted he wanted to move B42-13 from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda with B42-13 being moved from the consent agenda to old business was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

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

CITY OF COLUMBIA NEW CENTURY FUND, INC. BOARD
Gillispie, John, 5500 Kelsey Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2015

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION
Huntington, Angela, 5369 E. Trikalla Drive, Boone County, Term to expire December 15, 2014

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Andrade, Amanda, 1608 Whitburn Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire March 1, 2016
Dean, Gabriel, 608 N. William Street, Apt. 1, Ward 3, Term to expire March 1, 2016

DISABILITIES COMMISSION
Spence, Sean, 604 West Boulevard South, Ward 4, Term to expire June 15, 2014
MAYOR'S COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL FITNESS
Nichols, Jeff, 5206 Steeplechase Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2015

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
Seat, Michael, 1206 Sunset Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire March 1, 2015
Seyer, Shanna, 1012 Rogers Street, Apt. B, Ward 1, Term to expire March 1, 2015
Turner, Alyce, 1204 Fieldcrest, Ward 4, Term to expire March 1, 2015

SUBSTANCE ABUSE ADVISORY COMMISSION
Stroud, Dan, 2700 Green Valley Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire October 31, 2014

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI EXTENSION COUNCIL OF BOONE COUNTY
Toigo, Alan, 1416 Shannon Place, Ward 4, Term to expire March 1, 2015

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT
Victor Chapman - Need for sidewalks along Clark Lane.

Victor Chapman, 4201 Clark Lane, provided the Council a handout and stated he had lived at the Stonegate Mobile Home Park for twelve years and was concerned about his neighbor who walked on Clark Lane. He shared pictures with the Council to show the paths people had to use, which were 2-3 feet wide, and noted some areas did not have any path. For years, he had worried about the people walking along Clark Lane because the road and path were both narrow and he was afraid someone would get hurt. He understood the City planned to construct a sidewalk on the north side of Clark Lane from Golden Corral to the round-a-bout and asked that a sidewalk also be installed from Woodland Springs Road to the Pine Grove Mobile Home Park. He also asked that Council make these sidewalks a top priority and to install them in 2013 before someone was killed or seriously injured in his neighborhood.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B45-13 Authorizing the installation of fire sprinkler systems in Fire Station Nos. 4, 5 and 6; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Chief Witt provided a staff report.
Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.
There being no comment, Mayor McDavid closed the public hearing.
B45-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

(A) Construction of the Wilson Avenue and Ross Street PCCE # 17 Sewer and Stormwater Improvement Project.

Item A was read by the Clerk.
Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.
Ms. Hoppe understood $275,000 was already available due to the ballot issue and would remain allocated for this project, but the remaining $150,000 was not yet funded. Mr. Glascock stated the $150,000 was for the stormwater portion and would come from stormwater funds. Ms. Hoppe explained she wanted to ensure the funding would be there if the project was delayed in order to do both the sewer and stormwater projects together. Mr. Glascock commented that if funding was not available for the stormwater portion, he would suggest borrowing that money from the sanitary sewer fund and paying that fund back with stormwater funds in the future. He stated he would notify Council if that was necessary when the project was ready to bid.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Steve Salsberry stated he was representing Clay Salsberry, who had an interest in the property at 1501C on Ross Street, and noted they would work with the City as the sewer and stormwater needed to be upgraded.

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

Ms. Hoppe commented that she recalled the interested parties meeting on this issue had been well attended and received, and noted staff had done an excellent job with its presentation at that meeting.

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased to see the coordination of the projects between sewer and stormwater. He understood it was not always easy for different government entities work together, but it made a lot of sense.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans, specifications and construction of PCCE # 17 Wilson Avenue and Ross Street sanitary sewer and stormwater improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(B) Construction of Alluvial Wells No. 16, No. 17 and No. 18 in the McBaine Bottoms.

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen and Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe understood the northern locations were better due to many factors, and asked why they would not do three wells at Site C instead of Site A. Mr. Johnsen replied Site C was closer to a lower water depression area so there was a better water level area at Site A. If they put three wells at Site C, they might not get as much production because the three wells would compete against each other and would have a bigger area of influence with some of the other wells in the area. Ms. Hoppe understood three wells by Site A would be better than three wells at Site C. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Schmidt understood the wells declined in production due to sedimentation and the location of the well. Mr. Johnsen explained there were two different issues. One was screening of the pump as the shaft tended to sink and the screen was clogged with calcium build up. The other involved the strata in the area outside of the screen. He noted the wells and filters were cleaned, but the filter could not be completely cleaned as time went by and
the production would degrade. Mr. Schmidt commented that since the decline in production involved sedimentation, they could install a new well next to an old well for an increase in production. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct, and pointed out they had to enough distance between them to ensure the sedimentation issue did not overlap between the wells.

Mr. Dudley asked for the cost savings to move one of the old wells off of a casing and onto a new casing. Mr. Johnsen replied he was uncertain, and explained it would need to be researched as they would want to make sure there would be a payback with the use of the old wells.

Ms. Hoppe asked Mr. Johnsen to discuss the Comprehensive Water Management Subcommittee. Mr. Johnsen explained the three wells they wanted to install would provide the City four years to complete a water treatment plant study, which would involve a condition assessment, conduct in-depth water modeling for the area and do long-range planning for the system, and the Water and Light Advisory Board had put together a subcommittee to look at water management planning in terms of public policy. He noted they planned to develop a water integrated resource plan similar to the plan they had for electric so all of the supply and demand options were included.

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased the City was addressing the demand side of the equation, but thought they also needed to move ahead with these three wells because the most important priority was to ensure a safe and stable water supply.

Ms. Hoppe thanked staff for its work and the Water and Light Advisory Board for its recommendation of a comprehensive management plan and the formation of the subcommittee.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with construction of Alluvial Well Nos. 16, 17 and 18 for raw water production in the McBaine aquifer. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(C) Approval of the final design concept proposed by artist Beth Nybeck for the Short Street Parking Garage Percent for Art Project.

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Stevens provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if there was still a concern for people climbing on the sculpture. Mr. Stevens replied no, and explained the two tallest waves were angled so they would be difficult to climb. He understood that might not prevent someone from climbing on it, but it was designed to discourage it. He pointed out the artist wanted people to interact with and climb on the lower waves of the sculpture. Mayor McDavid asked for the cost of this project as it was not in the report. Mr. Stevens replied the overall cost of the project was $80,000. He noted $58,000 went to the artists for their commission and the remaining $22,000 was for contingencies, administration, etc.

Ms. Hoppe understood it had been reduced from four waves to three waves. Mr. Stevens stated that was correct, and noted he thought it would fit the space better with three waves.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor McDavid closed the public hearing.
Mayor McDavid stated he liked this design. Mr. Trapp commented that he liked it as well.

Ms. Nauser commented that she believed the Percent for Art program was wonderful for the City as it brought character to the community and made it more viable. She noted she had always supported the program and would continue to do so. She pointed out she liked the design as well. Mr. Stevens stated Columbia was fortunate to have the program as only two cities in Missouri had it.

Ms. Hoppe stated she had been impressed that 600 people had responded, and noted it showed the community was interested in the Percent for Art program as well. Mr. Stevens commented that he was happy they had received that much feedback as it was important for a public art project of this nature to represent the citizens.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Commission on Cultural Affairs to accept the artist’s design concept for the Short Street Parking Garage Percent for Art project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS

B30-13 Vacating sidewalk easements on Lot 321A and Lot 322A within Copperstone, Plat 7 located along Blue Hollow Court.

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid understood there was a request to table this item to the March 4, 2013 Council Meeting. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion to table B30-13 to the March 4, 2013 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B38-13 Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Route K, approximately 2,000 feet south of the intersection of Providence Road, Route K and Old Plank Road; establishing permanent R-1 and PUD 5.5 zoning; approving the Preliminary Plat & PUD Plan of Parkside Estates; allowing a reduction in the required perimeter setback.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid explained the Council had received a letter from Robert Hollis, the attorney for the applicant, requesting this issue be tabled to the April 15, 2013 Council Meeting and for City staff to be instructed to send this matter back to the Planning and Zoning Commission if there were any changes.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion to table B38-13 to the April 15, 2013 Council Meeting and to send the matter back to the Planning and Zoning Commission if there were any changes. The motion was seconded Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B42-13 Authorizing an intergovernmental cooperation agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for transportation services on campus.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes and Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that one of the problems with Columbia Transit that was not a problem in many other college towns was the inadequate collaboration with the
University of Missouri. He noted he was a fan and an alum of the University of Missouri, but felt there were two competing transit organizations managed by two independent transit advisory boards, which did not communicate. He referred to the Campus Mass Transit Study Plan System Evaluation Final Report submitted by Mitch Skyer of Solstice Transportation Group to the University of Missouri on August, 21, 2012, and explained it listed six findings. Those findings included the addition of GPS on buses with passenger information technology, which the City had initiated, the establishment of a process where the City of Columbia and the University of Missouri could co-develop transportation solutions to better meet student needs, which had not yet occurred, appropriately optimizing University provided transit service to meet student needs by expanding service further into the community adjacent to campus, adding later service and reallocating underutilized current service, which he did not believe could happen without collaboration, the implementation of a shopping/retail shuttle for students on and near campus, which he did not believe could happen without collaboration, significantly improving transit marketing website information, social media communications and the ability for students to provide interactive feedback to transit operators, which was being done by the City, clarifying and redefining the relationship between the University of Missouri and Columbia Transit to ensure service, quality and control training were met and contract terms were optimized to meet current and future transit needs of the student body, which he did not believe had happened. He reiterated he felt they had two different systems and that Tiger Line, which was part of this contract, was overtly competing with FastCAT. He did not think it made sense for an empty FastCAT bus to drive down the street followed by an empty Tiger Line bus. In addition, the contract assumed no responsibility on the part of the University of Missouri for students living off-campus. He did not like the idea of a five year contract even though it was potentially renewable on an annual basis because he thought collaboration needed to begin in the near future. It perpetuated a commuter culture at the University of Missouri, which was not in the best interest of the City of Columbia, and continued a fragmented, inefficient and costly transit system with little ridership.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend the contract associated with B42-13 so it was a one year contract. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she had also planned to move this item from the consent agenda as she had questions relating to the five year contract in terms of the City’s plans to improve transit and how the two systems would be coordinated, overlap or be duplicated. In addition, she believed the recommendation of the consultant for the need for collaboration was essential in order to better to serve both the City and the University and not waste money.

Mr. Matthes pointed out this renegotiated contract had increased the payment to a little less than $250,000 and represented the fully loaded cost of the service. He agreed it did not pay for the Black and Gold routes or any other part of the transit system, but felt it represented a positive step forward in the sense the City would be recouping its fully loaded costs. He also agreed there was a long way to go in terms of collaboration. He explained staff would soon bring forward the ordinance language change requested by the Council, which would reconstruct the transit commission so its focus was buses and the membership.
included representatives of the University of Missouri, Stephens College and Columbia College.

Mr. Kespolh commented that he recalled the cost to run a bus per hour was about $101.00 when the City was renegotiating the contracts on the Black and Gold routes, but this contract included a rate of about $66.00 per hour. He noted he had asked for the hourly cost of a bus and understood it was being researched, but would not be available for three weeks. As a result, he agreed it was best to make this a one year contract. He stated he also did not see the pricing for GPS in this contract, which the University was insistent on being included. Mr. Noce explained the contract indicated GPS would be included as soon as the City could provide it. Mayor McDavid pointed out the $66.00 per hour estimate was close to the cost of CyRide, which was $63 per hour, so it was not out of reason although there was a discrepancy. Mr. Kespolh understood and noted he did not want to commit to a five year contract based upon $66 per hour until it was verified. Mr. Matthes stated staff would check the numbers and provide that information to Council. He pointed out the GPS technology was included in the $66 per hour because the cost was less than a traditional bus route since these routes were smaller.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Ms. Hoppe to amend the contract associated with B42-13 so it was a one year contract was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B42-13, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B47-13 Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotions and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Buckler provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe commented that an ounce of prevention was worth a pound of cure, and noted she thought this was good.

B47-13 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

**B35-13 Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Richland Road, approximately 700 feet west of Bay Hills Drive (5000 East Richland Road); establishing permanent PUD-4 zoning.**

**B36-13 Approving the Final Plat of Lake George Plat 2 located on the south side of Richland Road, approximately 700 feet west of Bay Hills Drive (5000 East Richland Road); authorizing a performance contract.**
B37-13 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southeast corner of Wyatt Lane and Mule Deer Drive (3980 Wyatt Lane); establishing permanent R-1 zoning.

B39-13 Approving a revision to the PUD Plan for Arbor Falls located south of the intersection of West Old Hawthorne Drive and Pergola Drive and approving the PUD Plan for Arbor Falls, Plat No. 3.

B40-13 Approving the Final Plat of The Gates at Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 2 located on the east side of Rolling Hills Road, approximately 4,000 feet north of Route WW; authorizing a performance contract.

B41-13 Approving the Final Plat of Westover Subdivision Plat 3, a Replat of part of Lot 2 and Lot 1C of Westover Subdivision and a part of Lot 157 of Westwood Addition, located southeast of the intersection of Stewart Road and Greenwood Avenue (802 West Stewart Road); authorizing a performance contract.

B43-13 Accepting conveyances for temporary construction, sewer and drainage purposes.

B44-13 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.

B46-13 Appropriating tax credit revenues for future improvements to the Avenue of the Columns streetscape project along Eighth Street.

R30-13 Setting a public hearing: construction of the FY 2013 and FY 2014 CDBG downtown sidewalk projects.

R31-13 Setting a public hearing: construction of the Maplewood Drive PCCE #12 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.

R32-13 Setting a public hearing: construction of the Prairie Lane connection project from Prairie Hill Subdivision to Vanderveen Crossing Subdivision, construction of traffic calming devices on Prairie Lane, a midblock crosswalk with a center median at the Bear Creek Trail Connector on Blue Ridge Road, and a sidewalk on the north side of Blue Ridge Road between Snow Leopard Drive and Piranha Court.

R33-13 Setting a public hearing: demolition and replacement of a Parks and Recreation vehicle maintenance building located at 1615 Business Loop 70 West.

R34-13 Setting a public hearing: consider an amendment to the FY 2013 Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.

R35-13 Authorizing a training center and training satellite agreement with Missouri Emergency Medical Education, LLC, on behalf of AHA Training Center MO20758, to provide community-based emergency cardiovascular care training programs.

R36-13 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for festivals and events funding under the Tourism Development Program for the 2013 Mizzou International Composers Festival.

R37-13 Authorizing an agreement with Sustainable Farms & Communities, Inc. for the use of city-owned property located on the west side of Clinkscales Road for the operation of a farmers’ market.

R38-13 Authorizing an agreement with the Unit Owners Association of the Columbia/Boone County Health Department Condominium for repair of the canopy at the Sanford-Kimpton Building.
R39-13 Authorizing a housing site demolition and re-use agreement of participation with the Columbia Housing Authority for properties located at 105 Lynn Street and 700 Oak Street.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

None.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

B48-13 Approving the Final Plat of Steeplechase Estates Plat 2 located north of Steeplechase Drive and on the east side of Howard Orchard Road; authorizing a performance contract; accepting conveyances for utility and street purposes.

B49-13 Vacating an underground utility easement on Lot 15 within Hickman’s Addition located on the south side of Walnut Street, west of College Avenue.

B50-13 Authorizing the demolition and replacement of a Parks and Recreation vehicle maintenance building located at 1615 Business Loop 70 West; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.

B51-13 Authorizing transportation enhancement funds program agreements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the College Avenue Median/Pedestrian Refuge Project and the Garth Avenue Sidewalk and Median/Crosswalk Project.

B52-13 Appropriating funds for construction of the small vehicle drop-off facility project at the Columbia Sanitary Landfill.

B53-13 Appropriating funds for the Medical Reserve Corps program.

B54-13 Appropriating asset forfeiture funds to purchase communication headsets for the Police Department SWAT Team.

B55-13 Accepting the 2013 Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Grant from the Missouri Department of Public Safety; appropriating funds.

B56-13 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. for the 2013 Long Range Water System Study; appropriating funds.

B57-13 Authorizing a Second Amendment to the Redevelopment Agreement with Broadway Lodging, LLC and Columbia TIF Corporation relating to the Regency Hotel TIF Redevelopment Plan & Project.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP25-13 Proposed Traffic Modifications along Trinity Place and Allen Street.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.
Mayor McDavid asked if the recommendation of staff was for temporary delineators at Trinity Place and Park Avenue. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Hoppe asked if the temporary delineators would be replaced by something permanent in the future. Mr. Glascock replied the reason for recommending temporary delineators was to allow Columbia Housing Authority (CHA) to determine if it worked. If CHA was not satisfied, those delineators could be removed, and if they were satisfied, a concrete median or something more permanent could be installed in the future. Ms. Hoppe pointed out the delineators at College and Ash were either gone or horizontal. Mr. Glascock explained the plan was to put in something more permanent at College and Ash.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to bring forward an ordinance reflecting the changes mentioned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl.

Mr. Schmidt stated this made sense to him and would simplify things in the area.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Kespohl directing staff to bring forward an ordinance reflecting the changes mentioned was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP26-13 Disabilities Commission - Transit Services for Official City Meetings.**

Mayor McDavid commented that there were two solutions to this problem. One was to provide more service in the evening and the other was to hold the meetings in the afternoon when paratransit operated. Mr. Matthes explained this was a special situation in that particular individuals were invited to provide input. The City was able to provide transportation in this instance, but could not afford to do it for every meeting held, so they would either have to move meeting times or increase service, and at this time, the City was struggling to pay for the service it already provided.

Mayor McDavid suggested meetings be held when paratransit service was available when possible and prudent. Mr. Matthes noted the City generally held meetings in the evenings so more people could attend since it would be after work.

Mr. Schmidt asked if the recommendation was for the Disabilities Commission to meet in the afternoon and for service to be provided for attendance to City Council meetings. Mr. Matthes replied he believed this was informational report to let people know this happened. He pointed out the City could not afford service beyond the normal operating hours.

Mr. Schmidt commented that people with disabilities tended to be a larger percentage of the people who attended City Council meetings than the population at-large as they faithfully attended and participated in the meetings. He thought it would be wise for the City do what they could to accommodate them. Mr. Matthes explained the most affordable way to accommodate this goal was to change meeting times to earlier in the day, and noted they could conduct a pilot.

Mr. Schmidt asked if the City had a multi-wheelchair bus that could be used for City Council meetings. Mr. Matthes replied every bus the City had was ADA compliant, but those were fixed routes whereby the buses stayed on particular routes. Paratransit service would go to people’s homes so the level of service was different. Mr. Schmidt commented that he was looking for something different than moving the meetings or providing paratransit in terms of attendance to City Council meetings. Mr. Matthes stated the City could look into
whether there were any grant opportunities, etc. for a pilot program to determine usage of that type of service.

Ms. Hoppe asked how late paratransit ran. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it ran until about 6:00 p.m. Ms. Hoppe commented that they could encourage boards and commissions to meet earlier. Mr. Schmidt noted they would then have issues with people that worked.

Mr. Schmidt asked if it cost more to operate paratransit at night or if it was due to adding more hours of service. Mr. Matthes replied the addition of hours had a cost impact. Mr. Schmidt wondered if there was a trade-off, such as shifting the hours of paratransit so it would end later for certain public meetings. He asked if that would cost more money. Mr. Glascock replied it would likely not cost any more money, but it would cause confusion among the riders, especially if they depended on the service early in the mornings. Mr. Matthes stated they could poll the paratransit customers. Ms. Nauser thought it would be a good idea to poll the customers to determine what types of meetings they would like to attend as well. Mr. Schmidt believed it would also be useful to do a pilot to determine how many people would use the service if offered. Mayor McDavid noted he thought it would be interesting to know how many paratransit riders had access to the internet, so schedule changes could be posted on the website. Mr. Matthes stated staff would poll those using paratransit.


Mayor McDavid understood only eight appeals of complaints had been made, and noted the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) tended to be a board whose goal was to render itself useless. He felt, a few years ago, there had been a fair amount of contention and an adversarial relationship, and saluted the CPRB and the Police Department for what appeared to be a collaborative process.

Mr. Kespohl stated he was visited by a member of the CPRB whose concern was that there was not enough to do, and as a result, they wanted to review all cases resolved by Internal Affairs. He thought they might want to obtain more information from the CPRB. Mayor McDavid commented that it would be interesting to hear from the Police Department on that issue as well.

Ms. Nauser commented that the CPRB was established as an outcome of a consultant’s recommendation and the fact the community felt their grievances were not being heard. She stated people now had the opportunity for their grievances to be heard and noted she would be concerned if the scope of the CPRB were expanded. Mr. Dudley agreed and noted he felt the contention would likely come back at a higher level if the CPRB started second guessing the work of Internal Affairs.

REP28-13 Historic Preservation Commission - Providence Road Transportation Project

Mayor McDavid commented that this report suggested there were improper procedures involved in the notification of the public hearings and inadequate input from all stakeholders. He was not sure it was something they should litigate at this time, but believed they should take it into consideration as they decided how to continue.
Ms. Hoppe stated she was interested in obtaining input from staff with regard to the feasibility of the alternative suggested by the Historic Preservation Commission as she did not believe that had been provided.

Ms. Nauser stated she wanted to comment on the idea that there was a lack of notification or collaboration between the stakeholders from 2008-2010. She noted she had attended all of the stakeholder meetings she could possibly attend, which included meetings with the neighborhood, the fraternity and others involved, and at no time during that period did anyone tell her they were not included or their voice had not been heard. The result of those meetings, when the twelve or thirteen options were being discussed, was that no one liked any of those plans. The issue was not that anyone had been excluded. It was that no option was acceptable to all of the parties involved. She wanted to clarify this as she felt it was contrary to the implication of this report.

REP29-13 Providence Road (Stadium Boulevard to north of Turner Avenue).

Mayor McDavid stated this report provided information on an option that had not been presented to the Council in November, but had been brought up by Bruce Beckett during the public hearing. He understood this option of reconstructing Birch as the north/south feeder would be $1.3 million less than the option that would demolish two homes for a north/south feeder, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Glascock replied he showed a net savings of $1 million. Mayor McDavid understood a sidewalk had been added and believed the difference should be calculated without the sidewalk, which was why he thought the true cost difference was $1.3 million.

Ms. Hoppe understood staff had estimated $400,000 per property for the three lots in Phase 1, which involved two homes and a vacant lot. The vacant lot would likely cost $42,000-$75,000, so the cost estimate could be reduced by at least $300,000. In addition, the cost of the two homes would likely be less as well. Mr. Matthes noted this buffer was fairly common with large scale projects to accommodate what they might find underground or in terms of asbestos.

REP30-13 Forum Boulevard at Hinkson Creek.

Mayor McDavid understood Forum Boulevard by the Hinkson Creek was a safety issue, and believed this report was intended to show there were other infrastructure needs.

REP31-13 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Bruce Beckett, 809 E. Happy Hollow Road, commented that he had spoken at the public hearing held on November 19, 2012, and had suggested an alternative to Phase 1B, and asked for the consideration of Council as he believed it was superior. It addressed the traffic issues in the Grasslands that precipitated this entire exercise. It provided the required traffic lights and kept Bingham and Brandon open. Phase 1B would temporarily close Bingham Road until Phase 2 was completed. He believed having three entrances into the
Grasslands was superior to having only two entrances as Phase 1B would allow. In addition, the alternative did not require any taking by eminent domain since there had been a dedicated right-of-way on Birch since 1961, and would address pedestrian safety by installing sidewalks on the south side of Burnam Road. It would also save eight beautiful houses on Providence Road. He believed taking those homes would rip the face off of the Grasslands neighborhood as those homes had historic and aesthetic value. He noted this alternative would also save money regardless of the whether the $400,000 per parcel estimate was accurate or not because if someone litigated the taking of the homes, it would cost more than $400,000 per parcel. He believed this alternative would also save the $3.7 million required for Phase 2. He asked the Council to direct staff to revisit this and to bring forward a new ordinance or resolution that would allow them to choose this alternative plan versus continuing with what was approved on November 19, 2012.

Robbie Price, 111 E. Brandon Road, stated he was the President of the Grasslands Neighborhood Association and thanked the Council for not rescinding the hard work that had gone on for many years and resulted in a long range solution to a long term problem in Columbia in terms of traffic on Providence Road. Providence Road was a major north/south artery and served thousands of people each day. He commented that the plan that had been brought before the Council on November 19, 2012 had seriously considered the consequences of not doing anything and provided a well-reasoned, rational solution to a problem that had existed for a long time. He thought the Grasslands Neighborhood Association, as a stakeholder, should talk to all of the property owners in the neighborhood to determine how they felt about the project in terms of traffic on Birch, changing the idea of how this project would continue, etc. because it would have serious consequences on the neighborhood. He stated he appreciated the Council not taking any action this evening and asked that they give the Neighborhood Association time to study the issues among themselves. He also suggested they wait until after the April election so they had a firm Council to work with on the issue.

Rob Duncan, 3611 Holly Hills Court, stated he and his wife owned the property at 903 S. Providence through South Providence LLC, and noted the property was slated for destruction. He explained they had purchased the property in the spring of 2012 and had never been informed of any meeting of the Grasslands Neighborhood Association nor had they been invited to any such meeting, and suggested all owners be invited to the Neighborhood Association deliberations. He pointed out they had received one notice from the City of some intended action, but had received it just before traveling to India on business. They had tried to contact the City, but were unable to from India, and upon their return after the end of November, 2012, they had spoken to someone regarding their concerns. He commented that a citizen meeting had not been held and there had not been any other outreach. He believed there should have been an effort to contact them sooner since eminent domain would be exercised in the taking and destruction of their property. He understood an interested parties meeting was required by ordinance and had not been held. He was concerned the City was taking property with eminent domain without following its ordinances, and noted eminent domain was a huge power of the Council. He asked the City to follow its ordinances out of respect for the rule of law, and to rescind the current Phase 1
plan for Providence Road since it had not been followed. He noted he was sensitive to the Grasslands need for safe access to Providence Road and felt there was a lot of good innovation that could be utilized, but he also believed the City needed to hold a concerned citizens meeting and genuinely reach out to engage people like he and his wife before taking their property through eminent domain. He asked the Council to rescind their initial approval of the Providence Road improvement project out of respect for City ordinances, and to follow the ordinances moving forward.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, commented that this was a key intersection in terms of traffic flow, pedestrians and a beautiful and picturesque neighborhood, and noted the plan that was presented to Council on November 19, 2012 had never been presented at an interested parties meeting. He understood there had been an interested parties meeting in 2008 and no preferred alternative came out of that meeting. New plans had then been developed and another interested parties meeting were held in 2010 to vet those plans. He noted he was familiar with the traffic patterns at that location and was sensitive to the safety concerns. It was a difficult problem and he understood why it had taken years to come up with a solution, but the solution that was proposed should have gone through the appropriate process. An interested parties meeting should have been held to discuss the basic concept of using eminent domain to acquire and raze people’s homes. He stated this had not occurred, and believed it was a serious deficiency in terms of this plan. It was a failure of process and a violation of people’s rights. He pointed out a property owner had contacted him in a professional capacity to retain his services as he was an attorney with a litigation practice. He explained the easiest and best solution was to rescind what they had done on November 19, 2012 and hold an interested parties meeting on the proposed plan. He suggested making sure the property owners whose homes the City was slating for demolition were included in the process, and noted there was very little cost in doing this. He commented that Mr. Price had asked the Council to delay a decision until after the election. He reiterated the Council should rescind the resolution of necessity and bring whatever plan was believed to be the best forward to the public at an interested parties meeting.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, Lot 81, stated he was an interested party because he drove south on Providence Road. In addition, he was part of the People’s Visioning and had been asked to attend the most recent University of Missouri and MoDOT meeting. He had discussed a plan he had created with representatives of the City of Columbia and MoDOT. He suggested creating four lanes going south and one lane going north. He understood Carrie Gartner with the Downtown Community Improvement District had suggested interchanging lights so the direction of the lanes could be adjusted depending on traffic flow. At the previous meeting, he noted he had suggested synching the lights at Stadium, Burnam and Stadium Boulevard, and for a pedestrian walkway at Burnam. He also thought they should take land from the east, which was University of Missouri property, to add a sixth lane for a permanent solution. He understood it was not an issue of University land, but an issue of expensive power lines being buried on the east side. He believed having three lanes going north and three lanes going south would provide a long term solution and would not require the closure of any streets. He also suggested placing “no left turn” signs at all of the streets in the area.
Tootie Burns, 117 W. Burnam Road, commented that since the past four speakers in opposition of the previously approved proposal did not live in the Grasslands neighborhood, she felt she needed to speak. She pointed out the alternative suggested by Mr. Beckett would redirect the problem to those that lived on Birch Road and away from the property he had an interest in, which she did not believe really solved any problems. She also noted she and Mr. Duncan’s wife, Annie Sobel, had served on a board together, and she had welcomed Ms. Sobel to the neighborhood and offered any help as a former member of Neighborhood Association Board since those properties had past problems and issues, so it frustrated her to hear Mr. Duncan say no one had reached out to them. She stated nothing had changed since Phase 1 was approved and Phase 2 was proposed. The facts that made these proposals the preferred options had not changed and no new long term vision had been offered. She asked the Council to remember why this made sense and continued to make sense, and to move forward with the plan that comprehensively addressed the imminent needs of the Grasslands neighborhood and the future of the City when considering the Providence Road project.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, commented that this was a problem that affected the City as whole due to the unmet infrastructure needs within the City that exceeded $200 million. There was a relatively reasonable cost solution that protected the safety of students walking along Burnam Road, provided the ability to expand a road the City already had and saved millions of dollars for some of the other unmet needs. She suggested the City consider an expanded definition of the interested parties as well. She noted she lived in the North Central Columbia neighborhood, which had many unmet needs, and this affected the entire City when looking at the big picture, and not just those in the Grasslands neighborhood. She asked the Council to find a practical solution that protected students and affordable housing along Providence Road, and provided an opportunity to fund some of the other unmet needs within the City.

Donna Buchert, 5601 Highlands Parkway, stated she was a member of the Mu House Corporation of Delta Gamma, which was located at south corner of Providence and Burnam, and explained her corporation had not been notified of any meetings because they were not considered a stakeholder, but 82 girls that lived at that house and made left turns on to Providence Road. In addition, delivery trucks needed to make left turns on to Burnam to get to the house. She understood the issues of the people in the Grasslands in trying to make left turns and they would be able to make a safe left turn with a light, but the girls that lived in the Delta Gamma house would be limited to a right turn out, a right turn in and no left turn. She commented that she had spoken with someone at the University and understood there would be no parking by students on Richmond Avenue or Burnam, so about 100-150 cars would need to find parking somewhere else on campus. She thought the members of the fraternities and sororities that counted on the parking needed to be notified that they would no longer be able to park there in 2015. Even though they were not a stakeholder in the sense they were not having property taken from them, the house members needed to be kept informed to pass on this information to the students and their parents as they would now need to pay for parking.
Mark Rosenbaum, 407 Burnam Avenue, commented that the men of Alpha Gamma Sigma strongly opposed Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Providence Road improvement project that was voted on and approved by the City Council on November 19, 2012. Their alumni adviser, Larry Schuster, had been contacted by the City on November 9, 2012, and during that phone call he had expressed concerns that a step had been skipped in the process since a stakeholders meeting had not been held since 2010, and they agreed with Mr. Schuster’s concern. They were also concerned about the removal of the light at Providence and Rollins as they would lose the ability to turn left on to Providence and Rollins as well as the ability to safely cross Providence by foot, the addition of a four way light at the intersection of Burnam and Providence since they still lost the ability to turn left on Providence even though pedestrians would be able to safely cross there, and making Kentucky Boulevard a right in/right out as it would hinder them in making a left on to Providence. He urged the Council to table the approved Providence Road improvement project plan and to not move forward with another vote until an interested parties meeting had been held. He provided the Council with a handout.

Chris Pascucci, 1107 Merrill Court, stated he was the property owner of 905 S. Providence Road and did not believe the last few months had been great for the City as there had been great degree of contentious talk in the newspaper and social media that did not benefit the City. He believed they were supposed to work as a community to make Columbia a better place, and were successful most of the time, but in this instance that had not been the case. Some of the decisions made by the early residents of Columbia had to be right since they were enjoying the results of those decisions 100 years later. He asked the Council to review the process to determine how everyone might sacrifice a little for a better result for the community.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he believed the Historic Preservation Commission had partially the best suggestion in order to restore public confidence in the planning process and in developing a long range solution that was based upon shared public knowledge. He suggested the Council direct staff to establish a clear stakeholder engagement strategy as he did not believe public comment and interested parties meetings were enough. He understood various people felt they had solutions, but he did not think they all knew what the problems were since MoDOT and the University were talking through someone else. He thought they needed to look at the South Providence corridor from at least Stewart or Broadway going out 25 years in order to understand all of the problems. He suggested starting with the four major players and an education process whereby the issues were publicly addressed as that would not be done at an interested parties meeting. He did not believe the City had a well defined set of problems in order to create solutions. He reiterated since they had everyone’s attention, the Council could direct staff to establish a process for the entire corridor that would begin with an education process.

Will Littrell, 305 Bingham Road, provided a handout of the 1920 map of Columbia to the Council and noted Providence and Stadium were not shown on that map. He believed Providence would be widened and did not feel Columbia should continue to be the junior partner. He thought they should be an equal partner with the University of Missouri. He commented that things were done by fiat through the 1970’s due to the size of the community
and the way things operated. The perception was that things were still being done in that same manner. He understood a moratorium might not be popular, but believed they needed to take a wait and see approach for the next couple months. He felt this was a real opportunity for the City to create a plan with the University, and did not think the City needed to cater to the University. He pointed out the City had grown tremendously since the 1980's and did not have a publicly released plan for its future. He understood the Providence Road corridor would expand and widen, but felt a better public process was needed.

Karl Skala, 5201 Gasconade Drive, commented that he agreed with the comments of Ms. Fowler in terms of equity and the implementation of practical solutions for the Grasslands problem and other traffic issues. The City had always taken an incremental approach to these issues and the last CIP bond issue in 2005 involved $105 million for a ten year plan for roads. He recalled the one-half cent transportation sales tax had passed in 2005 by 271 votes, but the one-eighth cent sales tax, which would have provided an additional $25 million, had failed by 60 percent. There was also a small incremental change to the fee structure to recover development costs. As a result, they only had $80 million for the $105 million in projects, and many projects did not get completed. He understood the City was now facing a $203 million bond issue for 2015, which would have to go to the voters. He believed equity needed to be considered for the entire City when discussing the savings in terms of solutions for the Grasslands because this issue affected everyone as everyone wanted solutions to the City-wide traffic problems. He thought they needed to work collaboratively and realistically for the best outcome for the most people.

Ms. Nauser explained this issue had been going on for many years and recalled working on this in 2007 through the end of her term as the Fifth Ward Council Member in 2011. This was a prime example of trying to fix a problem created by not planning adequately. This was a fifty year problem they were trying to solve by 2013 standards, and it was difficult due to established neighborhoods, routes, etc. She stated she was disappointed in the process as it appeared as though proper procedures had not been followed. It was a big concern because they were talking about spending $7 million in taxpayer money on a project involving eminent domain, which was the ultimate power of government, and the notifications were inadequate and the proper meetings were not held. She agreed with Mr. Clark in that the City lacked planning, and there was not a plan for this area. She suggested the Council rescind what was passed on November 19, 2012 and begin the process again. She understood there were many stakeholders involved and noted concessions would need to be made as not everyone would get what they wanted because there was not enough room in the corridor to accomplish everything. Some people would be required to change their traffic patterns. Those involved would need to come together to decide what could be given up for the benefit of everyone. She believed all of the parties, which included the fraternities, MoDOT, the University of Missouri, the Grasslands neighborhood, etc. needed to get together again for a discussion. In addition, she felt a time limit needed to be determined for establishing a solution or moving on as this had already been going on for ten years and the City had millions of dollars worth of projects needing to be funded. She reiterated that she felt they should start over so they were able to go through the proper procedures, which
included an interested parties meeting and involved all of the stakeholders, to come up with a solution everyone could live with.

Mayor McDavid asked if a motion to rescind could be passed tonight. Mr. Noce replied he believed they should follow the process that had been utilized when this was approved in order to reverse their decision.

Ms. Nauser stated she thought they should also look at the option that involved Birch along with the other options that had previously been discussed. She understood there were a lot of hard feelings and believed they not only needed stakeholder buy-in, but also buy-in from the community as it was a community issue, especially since it involved eminent domain.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she did not believe they had heard from the Legal Department regarding the issue of whether another interested parties meeting was legally required since there had been two other interested parties meetings in 2008 and 2010. She asked if the City needed to hold another formal interested parties meeting before the Council had voted on Phase 1 and Phase 2 at the November 19, 2012 Council Meeting. Mr. Matthes stated staff would research the issue and get back to Council. Mr. Glascock explained two interested parties meetings had been held in 2008 and 2010, and the purpose of those meetings was to gather information. The purpose was not to design the project. They used the information to determine the best solution. He noted rarely, if ever, were two interested parties meetings held, so the City followed the process. Ms. Hoppe stated that had been her recollection for a variety of projects she had been involved in throughout the years as the City did not necessarily hold an interested parties meeting after every revision.

Mr. Glascock pointed out an ordinance had not come forward for Council approval to acquire anything for the project yet, so Council had not provided staff permission to condemn any properties. He noted the project had not yet been designed either.

Ms. Hoppe thought they should be provided an opinion from the City Counselor before making a decision based on that assumption.

Mr. Matthes commented that staff probably should respond as a lot of assumptions were being made based on a very limited look at the history. The sunshine request provided e-mails, but it did not include the discussions at meetings, over the phone, etc. over the past ten years. He did not want anyone thinking this had not been discussed as it had been discussed a lot. He noted the problem was this had gone on for ten years so many in the room did not own property in the Grasslands when this first started and those new people had not been involved. He understood why those people new to this felt they had not been consulted or involved. He agreed it was probably a good idea to start from scratch in order to get everyone involved and have a deadline because if they took another ten years to resolve this, the same issues would arise. He pointed out the staff would try to get enough consensus around any idea in order to be able to move forward. He noted the opinion of staff was that process was followed, but the Legal Department would be asked to comment. Mr. Glascock explained there was a difference between an interested parties meeting and a public hearing. Some issues were aired at the interested parties meeting, but the goal of the meeting was to obtain information to move forward based on the greatest consensus. The public hearing allowed an opportunity to bring up any issues and differences of opinions.
Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to prepare the necessary paperwork to hold a public hearing to rescind the motion made by Council at the November 19, 2012 Council Meeting involving the Providence Road improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl.

Mr. Kespohl stated he did not believe the process was followed and noted he believed the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) needed to be involved in terms of providing input since the project involved demolition of homes. He explained he also agreed with Mr. Clark in terms of planning. There were only five ways to get from Stadium Boulevard to Nifong Boulevard, and those were Highway 63, Old Highway 63, Rock Quarry Road, Providence Road and Forum Boulevard. The center road was Providence Road, which was why it was the busiest. It was the main corridor through town. He commented that he believed Providence Road would likely need to be widened in the future. He explained he had participated in a discussion regarding southwest Columbia in terms of crossing the Perche Creek, and felt the City should plan now for more than five bridges crossing that creek so these same types of issues did not occur in the development of west Columbia. He commented that with regard to Phase 1A, he was concerned about the stacking of cars on Providence Road to turn right on to Burnam and then making an immediate left on to the new street because those vehicles on Burnam would block the left turn. He pointed out they had this issue on Providence Road at Green Meadows many years ago and had to remove left turns, and thought they should have learned a lesson then. He noted he was also concerned about the cost of $7 million and suggested they review other options as well.

Ms. Nauser understood the Council would need to present a list of road projects to the community in 2014 when considering requesting an extension to the capital improvement sales tax, and suggested that be the deadline for any new project to come forward for this corridor.

Mayor McDavid stated he would support the motion made by Ms. Nauser with the understanding someone would ultimately be unhappy. He noted some were unhappy with the process, and he believed Council should have been presented with the Birch Street option on November 19, 2012 versus having to hear about that option from someone speaking during the public hearing. He understood staff was frustrated as that option had been vetted, but pointed out there was a $4.3 million cost difference between the Birch Street option and the option of Phase 1 and Phase 2 recommended to Council and there were substantial unfunded obligations throughout the City. In terms of the Providence Road improvement project, he felt they were trying to solve two problems. One was an increased capacity on Providence Road and the other was the distortion of internal traffic problems within the Grasslands. He did not believe they had been presented with the full set of options from which they could wisely choose, and noted that was the reason he would support the motion made by Ms. Nauser.

Ms. Hoppe explained the biggest issue for her was whether proper procedure was followed, and noted she wanted input from the City attorney on that concern prior to making a decision. This had been a ten year process and a public hearing had been held, at which time, it appeared the neighborhood, MoDOT, the City and the University of Missouri agreed. She suggested a pause in proceeding with Phase 1 in order to allow time for the Grasslands
neighborhood to discuss the issues amongst themselves and come back with input. She did not see the need to undo the process at this point, and suggested they only slow it down.

Mayor McDavid understood the issue would not be rescinded tonight, and that the motion of Ms. Nauser would require this to be discussed at a public hearing prior to a vote for rescinding it, so there was inherently a pause. The pause would allow some of the questions raised to be addressed, and if they were answered satisfactory, the Council could vote against the rescission. Ms. Hoppe was concerned about whether the Grasslands neighborhood would have enough time to discuss the issue prior to it coming before the Council again. Mayor McDavid asked if two months would provide the Grasslands neighborhood the time it needed. Ms. Nauser stated she would be agreeable.

Ms. Nauser commented that the proposal that had been recommended on November 19, 2012 had been so different than any of the other proposals that had been previously brought forward that it deserved a new interested parties meeting. The scope had changed from a $1-2 million project and the change in some traffic signals to the use of eminent domain.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend the motion made by Ms. Nauser and seconded by Mr. Kespohl so the public hearing was held in two months. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Dudley asked if there was a way to ensure the University of Missouri would participate in any meetings regarding this issue as he understood the Historic Preservation Commission had indicated there had not been much input from the University of Missouri or MoDOT. He noted he thought the University needed to be involved because they had more room on their side of Providence to accommodate any expansion of Providence. Mr. Schmidt stated he thought they had been involved in the discussions.

Mr. Kespohl commented that Mr. Glascock had shared information regarding the potential of changing the center lane on Providence to a southbound lane so there were three southbound lanes, and one of those southbound lanes could be a right turn only lane. There would not be a center left turn lane so left turns could not be made on or off of Providence. Ms. Hoppe understood some communities switched up the lanes depending on traffic flow in the mornings and evenings as indicated by a speaker earlier in the meeting.

Mayor McDavid pointed out the City would have at least two months to look at other solutions due to the motion made by Ms. Hoppe and approved by Council. Mr. Glascock asked if the Council wanted pricing for all of the solutions. He wondered if the public hearing would be with regard to whether to rescind the previous action or if they wanted it to involve more. Mayor McDavid replied the public hearing would be to discuss whether to rescind the previous action.

Mr. Schmidt commented that he believed people had been involved in the process as it had been going on for ten years, and most of those saying they were not involved in the process likely did not like the outcome. He stated Providence would be widened some day, and the question was how it would be done. He believed Phase 2 was addressing the long term problem to some extent. He commented that three problems would be solved, and those were the traffic flow on Providence, the traffic flow in and out of the Grasslands and the traffic flow in and out of the southwest corner of the University. He understood the University
and MoDOT had been involved and believed the procedures had been followed even though some people did not believe the procedures had been followed. He pointed out this was not only about the Grasslands, and noted Birch had been discussed it the past. He did not believe its use would eliminate the need for eminent domain and the people in the neighborhood did not prefer that route. Mayor McDavid stated Birch did not require eminent domain because the City already had a fifty foot easement.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser, seconded by Mr. Kespohl and amended by Ms. Hoppe directing staff to prepare the necessary paperwork to hold a public hearing in two months to rescind the motion made by Council at the November 19, 2012 Council Meeting involving the Providence Road improvement project was approved with only Mr. Schmidt voting against it.

Mayor McDavid commended Mr. Matthes and City staff for their financial performance during the last fiscal year as they had completed the fiscal year with a $1.9 million general fund surplus. He believed this represented the commitment of staff to expense management and productivity enhancement. He did not think they wanted to treat this as found money, which was spent quickly, and they could not initiate programs that required future funding when they did not know if the surplus would occur again. He understood there were many unfunded needs. He pointed out the priority of the last citizens survey was roads and substantial improvements were needed if his neighborhood was any indication. He asked staff to come to Council with a recommendation of using a substantial amount of the surplus funds to enhance road maintenance as he believed it was a need across the City.

Mayor McDavid understood the City purchased the historic Blind Boone Home in 2000 and had about $500,000 into it. It was not yet renovated or opened to the public, and plumbing, electrical wiring, heating and air conditioning was needed for the inside. He noted they made a commitment in 2000 and did not feel they had an option to ignore it now. He asked staff to present to Council a plan to use up to $500,000 of the general fund surplus to restore, renovate and reopen the Blind Boone Home.

Mr. Dudley understood there was an agreement for funding to be collected to help with the renovations when the Blind Boone Home was purchased and asked how much had been collected so far. Mayor McDavid replied he thought about $18,000 had been collected.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she would like suggestions from staff and the commissions with regard to how the Blind Boone Home would be used.

Mr. Dudley asked if it would be possible to use Percent for Art funds since it would be a museum. Mayor McDavid replied Percent for Art funding came from a construction project. Ms. Hoppe agreed and noted that funding had to be tied to a construction project.

Ms. Nauser asked about the possibility of moving the Forum Boulevard project forward. Mr. Schmidt understood at one point the project was to be funded with GetAbout funds. Mr. Glascock stated staff was waiting to see what happened with the Grindstone Trail project, and noted they had five other projects to fund with GetAbout money and would need to bring them all forward. Ms. Nauser asked if this project would be included. Mr. Glascock
replied yes. Ms. Hoppe understood the Council had not decided on the alternatives for the Forum Boulevard project. Ms. Nauser stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked about the process for allocating the surplus funds for the Blind Boone Home as she felt an inclusive discussion would be needed since many things were cut during the past budget process. Mr. Schmidt agreed, and noted it could also be rolled into FY 2014 budget. Ms. Nauser commented that she did not want to put all of the money into roads, etc., when there might be other needed uses.

Mr. Schmidt stated they had drawn heavily on the surplus of the general fund for several years, so they might just want to allow the surplus to remain. Mayor McDavid understood the general fund already had over 30 percent in reserves, so they were well over the requirement.

Mr. Matthes stated he was proud of staff as this had been done two years in a row. They did not spend more than what had been received and had also been diligent about returning money. He pointed out the upcoming budget was the last year the City would have to cut the budget in order to reach equilibrium.

Mr. Trapp commented that some using the Garth Nature Area Dog Park had created a wind break, which had been removed twice. As a result, they now wanted the City to install a more permanent wind break before next winter. He asked staff to look into providing this as it was a well used facility.

Mr. Trapp asked about the status of revisions to the tree protection ordinance to protect trees instead of just canopy forests.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had walked through the Grasslands neighborhood this past weekend, and understood why people had objections to the two-phased solution. He stated it did not set well with him, but he understood it might be the least worst solution to the problem. The Grasslands was a unique neighborhood in that it was planned based upon the topography of the land, and it was built for permanence, which was why it still held its value and was an amazing place people wanted to live. He thought they might have been hasty in tampering with it and understood it still might be affected since they needed to allow for more cars to travel on Providence Road. He stated they had some design challenges, but cities with interesting topography and historical assets had to wrestle with these issues regularly. He thought it might be good for them to review the process as he was uncertain as to what to do since the Grasslands was historically important and unique as a whole. The things currently being built did not have the quality, interest, etc. of the eight homes that could potentially be demolished.

Mr. Trapp noted he also walked the Clark Lane to study the sidewalk gap and pointed out two things were needed in order to increase walkability. Those included infrastructure in terms of sidewalks, safe streets and a reduced traffic flow, and places for people to walk. He thought they really need to prioritize sidewalks for this area as there were places for people to walk to and traffic traveled fast on the road, but also believed some things could be done now. He suggested the organization of a clean up for the area as there was a lot of litter and
Mr. Kespohl stated he would like staff to contact MoDOT regarding a reduction of the speed limit on Clark Lane until the sidewalks were installed. He understood the speed limit was 45 mph and thought it should be 30 mph, and suggested it be reduced to that on Clark Lane and on Ballenger as Ballenger was also a narrow road.

Mr. Kespohl commented that he would like the Clark Lane sidewalk project to be moved to the top priority of the City. It was currently the second priority.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion directing staff to make the Clark Lane sidewalk project the top priority instead of the second priority as it was currently. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley.

Ms. Hoppe asked what project would be pushed back. Mr. Kespohl replied he did not know.

Mr. Schmidt suggested this be discussed when they review the CIP and budget this year.

Mr. Glascock stated he was unsure as to what the top project was at this time, but noted Clark Lane was also on the list for GetAbout funding.

Ms. Hoppe asked if staff could provide a report regarding this issue.

Mr. Matthes pointed out the sidewalks were being actively designed at this time and close coordination was needed with MoDOT. Mayor McDavid understood it was a priority.

Mr. Matthes replied it was.

Mr. Kespohl withdrew his motion, and Mr. Dudley, who seconded it, was agreeable.

Mr. Kespohl commented that he had seen a truck carrying a huge piece of pre-cast concrete knock over the delineators when turning on to Ash Street, and suggested the delineators at College and Ash be removed until the garage was built as they would be run over again if replaced. Ms. Hoppe noted the delineators were integral to the bike lane and crossing at College. She suggested the trucks use a different route. Mr. Kespohl stated he was not sure they had another way to get to the construction sites.

Mayo...
Ms. Nauser commented that if they knew it was the trucks delivering the concrete that were damaging the delineators, the City should hold them responsible for the cost of replacing the delineators. Mr. Glascock stated someone would have to take a picture to prove it. Ms. Nauser asked if there were security cameras in the area that might capture it. Mr. Glascock stated the City had cameras watching the Short Street garage, but he was uncertain about any cameras watching the private garage.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted a report with a legal opinion regarding the issue with the interested parties meeting for Phase 1 and Phase 2 for the Providence Road improvement project.

Mr. Matthes stated he thought it would be helpful for staff to provide a timeline. He commented that he thought the process had been followed, but there was a question as to when an idea was so different that another interested parties meeting might be necessary. He noted a similar issue was when the Historic Preservation Commission was consulted as they were currently only consulted when there would be a demolition.

Ms. Hoppe understood B51-13 involved improvements on College and Garth, and asked if the projects had been designed and for the process that would be implemented as she wanted to ensure public input was gathered, especially in terms of the East Campus neighborhood. Mr. Glascock replied it had not yet been designed, and they would follow the same process they always followed. The City would hire a consultant and hold an interested parties meeting. Ms. Hoppe understood the consultant would include the East Campus in the process. Mr. Glascock stated all interested parties would be included.

Ms. Hoppe commented that the public had raised the question as to whether the City needed to consider instant run-off voting in situations where a council member was not elected by majority vote, so a first and second choice was required, and the second choice was considered in computing votes. Currently, someone could win with ten percent of the vote if ten people were running in a particular ward. She explained she had started looking into the issue and understood there were some problems with an instant run-off as the Boone County Clerk had indicated the current machines could not accommodate it. In addition, there were concerns as to whether this would increase the margin of error or deter minority candidates. She noted she would continue to look into it, but it was a complex issue and she did not have enough information at this time.

Ms. Nauser stated she did not believe this issue would have been raised if the outcome of the Fifth Ward election had been different, and also did not understand why they would want to inhibit three, four or five people running for a particular public office in a local race. Ms. Hoppe commented that it did not have to do with inhibiting anyone from running. Ms. Nauser stated she believed it did since there was less likely the opportunity for a majority vote in those situations.

Mr. Dudley asked for an increase in police patrol on Grant Lane as he had been told people were speeding. Mr. Matthes asked if there was a particular time of day this occurred. Mr. Dudley replied he understood it was during the late afternoons and early evenings.
Mr. Dudley commented that he had been contacted by people that had indicated they had not received their trash vouchers, and when they contacted the City, the response from City staff was to provide the number of an outside agency, and the residents were told they would have to handle it themselves. He thought another approach was needed. Mr. Glascock asked if he had a name of who these people had spoken with at the City. Mr. Dudley replied he did not, but would try to get a name for him.

Mr. Schmidt explained there had been some discussion regarding alcohol in Douglass Park and asked for an ordinance to be drafted to start the public debate on the issue. He understood alcohol was not allowed in some of the other intercity parks, but was allowed at Douglass and other parks.

Mr. Matthes asked if he wanted this to come from the Parks and Recreation Commission. Mr. Schmidt replied he thought the Parks and Recreation Department and the Parks and Recreation Commission should provide input. He understood this had been discussed with the Police Chief, and he thought it was a good idea. Mr. Matthes asked if he preferred to start the process with the Council and to then send it to the Parks and Recreation Commission or if he wanted to start with the Parks and Recreation Commission. Mr. Schmidt thought they should get feedback from the Parks and Recreation Department and the Parks and Recreation Commission first.

Mr. Schmidt stated a neighbor had canvassed some of the people in the Park and they already thought an ordinance was in place that was not being enforced.

Mayor McDavid made a motion for the City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri to meet on Monday, March 4, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1A/1B of City Hall, 701 E. Broadway, Columbia, Missouri, for a closed meeting to discuss personnel matters as authorized by Sections 610.021 (3) and (13) of the Revised Statutes of Missouri. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl and the vote was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDavid, SCHMIDT, TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

The meeting adjourned at 10:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk