

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
FEBRUARY 3, 2014**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 3, 2014, 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 TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID and SCHMIDT were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, Deputy City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Hoppe asked that the minutes be adjusted to note that Mr. Glascock had been agreeable to holding off on any action involving the Wilson/Ross Sewer project associated with REP9-14 in order to allow time for her to discuss the issue with the neighbors.

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 21, 2014 with the change requested by Ms. Hoppe were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Trapp requested B27-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Ms. Nauser requested B26-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B26-14 and B27-14 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Monta Welch – Funding mechanism for public needs, infrastructure.

Ms. Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, commented that she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and explained People's Visioning had formed in part to fight Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and Enhanced Enterprise Zone (EEZ) projects. These funding mechanisms privatized profits for developers while socializing the costs and risks, and passed the burden of paying for infrastructure onto taxpayers and the community. She believed a better balance was needed. She explained they were told the City would lose development without an EEZ during the EEZ process, but felt those corporations that indicated they would not come to Columbia without it had come, as had others. She stated they had the same community concerns with the City Manager's TIF proposal involving

downtown infrastructure as they wanted to know who would pay and how much they would pay. They were also concerned with blight and eminent domain abuse. She pointed out these mechanisms were unpopular with taxpayers. She commented that a TIF was only supposed to occur if developers would not develop in economically depressed areas where a TIF did not exist, and noted downtown Columbia was already attractive to developers. She also did not believe the overdevelopment of a luxury student housing bubble should be encouraged as it was unwise, short-term thinking. She stated the City's core was not distressed and agreed with the Boone County Commission in that private development was clamoring to build downtown and private capital had to be a part of the solution to fund the infrastructure private development required. She noted the School District would lose funding as a result of a TIF, which would cause a downward impact on the City's vital public education. In addition, these mechanisms required a blight designation, which opened the door to abuse and threatened affordable neighborhoods, lower-income families, homes and properties. She understood Mr. Matthes estimated sewer and electric upgrades at \$21 million, and the People's Visioning recommended upgrades to all building codes to reduce costs for present and future utility infrastructure. She stated they had offered proposals to make new and existing netzero energy homes and buildings affordable and possible. She felt these steps would reduce the \$21 million needed for upgrades, positively impacting future consumer costs for utilities and demand. In addition, they were suggesting a development model based on trip generation and a user fee structure. She commented that many of them had been involved with the City's earlier vision process that mentioned density at 4-6 story buildings. She did not believe a 25-story high-rise that would change the character of the downtown was wanted by the public, especially when the profits would go out-of-state. She thanked the Council for its time and serious consideration in rejecting the proposed TIF and other types of regressive funding mechanisms, and hoped they would adopt favorable solutions with stronger support instead.

Curtis Soul Brown – Crime prevention and task force.

Mr. Brown was not in attendance.

Dee Dee Strnad – Changing the wording of Section 5-56 of Columbia Code of Ordinances (Barking, annoying dogs).

Ms. Strnad, 803 Cornell, commented that Section 5-56 of the Columbia Code of Ordinances indicated no person should own, keep or harbor any dog, which, by loud, continual or frequent barking, howling or yelping, shall annoy or disturb any neighborhood or person, and she understood this section of the Code was being reviewed by staff at the request of Council. She explained she lived in the College Park area, which was a family neighborhood filled with many dog owners and dog walkers, and noted she had been a dog owner for over 35 years and had never had a problem until this past November. She described a couple of encounters with a neighbor that had initially been unsure as to whether she had a dog, and that neighbor had contacted Animal Control, who had issued her a warning. In December, she was approached by this same neighbor who indicated her dog was keeping him from sleeping, and when she asked how he knew it was her dog, he stated he had stood on the other side of the fence recording the barking. She commented that she

would hope her dog would bark if someone was on the other side of her fence. She believed the existing ordinance was too subjective as it allowed any individual to harass anyone with a dog as had been done to her. It did not address her rights as a citizen with regard to pet ownership, and implied her dog was automatically guilty. She was hopeful her concerns would be addressed.

Rob Alongi – Assistance with drain commons.

Mr. Alongi, 713 Lyon Street, provided a handout and commented that he had approached the City in the winter of 2009-2010 regarding a problem with a sewer common backing up on his property from his neighbors. Since he could not go onto his neighbor's property, he and the neighbor petitioned the City, as advised, to repair the common. He learned, however, the petition had been lost when he contacted the City in 2012. As a result, he had another petition signed by his neighbor, Donna Kessell at 715 Lyon Street, but this pushed the project back in the timeline as sewer commons from 2009 were being repaired now. He pointed out he had sewage in his bathtub five times due to that common in 2013. The common was underneath an old portion of Brown Station Road that no longer existed and had houses on it now, and it jumped over Lyon Street and to the Columbia Housing Authority properties. He was not sure who to contact to get a petition signed for this portion of the common as it was creating sewer back up at the property he owned at 313 N. Eighth Street. He understood staff could not move the project up so he was asking Council to direct staff to approve and move the project up in terms of timing. He noted it was not fun having to clean up sewage that was not due to his property on a regular basis and asked the Council for assistance.

Mayor McDavid stated staff would contact Mr. Alongi and provide a response to the Council with regard to how to address the issues mentioned.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

B372-13 Rezoning property located northeast of the Stadium Boulevard, Cinnamon Hill Lane and Maguire Boulevard intersection (1202 Cinnamon Hill Lane) from A-1 to PUD-9; approving the Statement of Intent with conditions; approving The Avenue at Columbia Preliminary Plat and PUD Plan.

The bill was read by the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe referred to item (j.)(2.) of the statement of intent and assumed the word "feet" had been omitted between "175" and "south." Mr. Teddy agreed that word was missing.

Mayor McDavid explained he had received an e-mail from a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission who felt this issue should go back to the Planning and Zoning Commission due to the changes. He understood this plan was more restrictive and provided more concessions than the one considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and asked if that was a fair characterization. Mr. Teddy replied he thought that was a fair

statement. He noted the ordinance did not provide clear guidance on when to remand an issue back to the Planning and Zoning Commission other than when there was a request for something less restrictive or if the land area increased in size as those would require a new application. He pointed out the Council had remanded a few cases back to the Planning and Zoning Commission for reasons of its own when they wanted input from the Commission. It was at the discretion of Council in this situation, and not a strict requirement.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B372-13 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Matthes explained one of the reasons this item had been tabled for two weeks was to try to reach an agreement on transit. An agreement had not been reached, but the developer would provide a transit system, and would provide a \$25,000 contribution to the City's transit system for each of the first three years as indicated in the statement of intent.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the statement of intent included a provision indicating the applicant would provide its own transit system. Ms. Thompson replied it was not currently in the statement of intent because those details had not been worked out. She noted an additional amendment to the bill could be added indicating the applicant would provide its own private transit system, and explained she could come up with suggested language if Council wanted to move in that direction.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Council only referred issues back to the Planning and Zoning Commission when the Commission recommended denial and the applicant had made significant changes since that meeting. This was done to ensure the Planning and Zoning Commission was treated similarly to the City Council by the applicant in terms of effort. She felt this situation was different since the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of a less stringent development.

Robert Hollis, an attorney with offices at 1103 E. Broadway, stated he was present on behalf of the applicant and provided a handout. The plan revisions were substantial in regard to the effect the development would have on the adjacent neighborhood, but they were insubstantial in terms of veering from the path recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission. He pointed out the development would be at a PUD-8.3 even though this remained a PUD-9 rezoning request. In addition, the density was slightly over a PUD-6 north of the road, if the road was used as a divider, so it provided a more gradual transition. He noted the statement of intent currently included three payments of \$25,000, but the applicant would be willing to modify it to indicate a purchase of 200 passes per semester per student for the first three years and an obligation of providing their own transit services if it was more amenable to the Council. He understood many student housing developments had recently been constructed or proposed, but the City was still behind, and all of these developers were aware of one another. They were not making decisions based on lack of information. He commented that he believed not approving a site for student housing development that was consistent with the plan, had infrastructure, and complied with most of the neighbors' requests would set a negative precedent for Columbia because student housing needs had to be addressed as the University continued to grow, and it would not all fit in the downtown area.

Ms. Nauser asked for clarification regarding the number of bedrooms per unit.

Paul Levine, 461 Park Avenue, New York City, stated he was a partner and principal with Park7 and explained they would have a variety of unit mixes from studios to four bedroom units. He noted Park7 was a national housing developer that focused on student housing, and over the past 15 years, they had developed over 7,000 units throughout the United States. He pointed out they employed a “build and hold” philosophy, which was reflected in the quality of their construction and management style. He explained they tracked enrollment and occupancy rates at all schools with an enrollment of 10,000 or greater, and the occupancy rate was 98.6 percent in Columbia. In addition, rent had increased over 50 percent in the last six years in some markets. They understood the University had indicated it would be best served at an enrollment of 40,000 and believed this would happen in the next 5-6 years. In terms of transportation, they had found students really did not want to drive to campus or the downtown due to having to find a place to park, and as a result, they were proposing to have their own private transportation system that would provide a level of service that would keep ridership at about 80 percent. He noted they were offering to purchase 200 passes per semester for the first three years to help the CoMO system grow. If that system provided the level of service they wanted in the future, he was sure their tenants would be interested in riding it.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with offices at 2608 N. Stadium, stated this development would have a unit mix of one bedroom efficiencies and standard one, two, three and four bedroom units. In addition, the mix was fairly evenly distributed amongst those types of units. He described the changes that were the result of moving four buildings from the north side of the site to the south side, which included an increased tree preservation and buffer. He noted the statement of intent included a 175 foot building line, and within that area was a 125 foot buffer in excess of 20-30 feet in height. As a result of the height and terrain, the neighbors would not see the buildings on this development.

Mayor McDavid asked about the buffer when this development was before the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Crockett replied he thought the buildings had been 100 feet off of the property line at that time. Mayor McDavid understood the building line would now be at 175 feet. Mr. Crockett replied the buildings themselves would be in excess of 200 feet in some locations.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the trash compactor, which was proposed to be located on the closest roadway in front of 919 Timberhill, could be placed elsewhere. Mr. Crockett replied he thought it could probably be relocated if necessary. He noted they worked with City staff to place those in locations trash trucks could easily access them.

John Hancock, an employee of Maly Commercial Realty with offices at 213 N. Stadium Boulevard, Suite 203, explained he had assisted Park7 in identifying sites for development and believed this development was in conformance with the comprehensive plan. This nine-unit per acre, multi-family development was located at the intersection of an expressway and a major arterial street access, and was closer to campus than other projects that had been approved by Council in the past. City staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission had cited this development’s conformance with Columbia Imagined and the East Area Plan as it was consistent with the neighborhood district designation and provided a transition between commercial and lower density residential uses. The Columbia Imagined

Plan designated the land as being a Tier 1 growth priority area where growth and infill should be encouraged in order to prevent sprawl and to take advantage of the existing infrastructure. The future land use map identified the property as being within the neighborhood district, which was home to a variety of housing densities, styles and neighborhood-oriented services. He pointed out the Columbia Imagined Plan made a number of references to the Metro 2020 Plan, which was the plan it replaced, and page 16 of that plan indicated the residential component of neighborhood districts were made up of single-family detached homes, duplexes, townhomes and multi-family housing, and that the overall density should range from 2-10 units per acre. Both plans made it clear these broad land use categories were dependent upon ensuring there was a measure of compatibility among uses. This project took that into consideration by preserving the large areas of buffer. In addition, they had tried to address the connectivity objective City staff wanted and the neighbors had concerns about, as well as the twelve compatibility items that had been identified by the neighbors. He urged the Council to find the project in compliance with the plans and to approve this request.

Shawn White, an engineer with Crawford, Bunte and Brammier (CBB) with offices at 12400 Olive Boulevard, St. Louis, stated CBB had prepared a traffic study to address the impacts of the proposed student housing development. She noted they had met with the City of Columbia, Boone County and MoDOT at the commencement of the study to develop a scope of work to ensure any questions those entities had would be answered. Based on direction from those entities, the study included an analysis of the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours for the existing, baseline, forecasted, and 20-year conditions for the area, and the baseline conditions assumed the full build-out of the Crosscreek commercial development in the northwest quadrant of Highway 63 and Stadium Boulevard. She pointed out the intersection of Stadium Boulevard and Audubon Drive had been added to the study based on neighborhood concerns. She explained an evaluation of baseline conditions, which included the full build-out of the Crosscreek development, had found all of the study intersections currently operated at acceptable levels of service. The study intersections were re-evaluated assuming the full build-out of this student housing development and minor signal-timing adjustments at some of the intersections, and the study intersections continued to operate at acceptable levels of service. The eastbound left-turn on Stadium at Audubon was shown to operate at a level of service of "A" with minimal delays during peak hours. She commented that although it was not recommended as part of the traffic study, the developer was agreeable to extending the left-turn storage length for that eastbound left-turn lane and modifying the traffic signal to provide a protected and permissive left-turn movement. She reiterated the study found sufficient excess capacity on the existing roadway to accommodate the proposed student housing development with minimal impact to the roadways within the study area.

Madge Minor, 919 Timberhill Road, stated she was speaking on behalf of the Timberhill Road Neighborhood Association and the Shepard Hills Improvement Association, and explained they strongly opposed this rezoning request and the development of luxury student housing because of negative impacts it would have on their neighborhood, the surrounding neighbors and the City. This would be the second largest student housing

development in Columbia at 899 beds and the parking was designed for over 1,000 cars and 60 bikes. They felt this was a large-scale development and a major land use change. They urged the Council to review the impacts this development would have, not only on the immediate neighbors, but the City at-large. Columbia Imagined was a wonderful road map for Columbia's future and articulated the citizens' and community's vision and values, which included encouraging downtown density, preserving the personality and character of neighborhoods, prioritizing infill development downtown, giving funding priority to the maintenance of existing public infrastructure and services, promoting community safety, supporting diverse and inclusive housing options, and accommodating non-motorized transportation. They did not feel much in this project related to these values. She commented that the nature of the bottom line was financial for the developer, but there were multiple bottom lines and constituencies for Columbia that had to be taken into consideration. She understood enrollment at the University had stalled this year, and projections for the future pool of college freshmen were dropping. She noted the capacity for student housing complexes in Columbia had increased since Mizzou's high enrollment in 2012. Last fall, 2,000 beds were added with The Domain, Aspen Heights, The Lofts on Ninth, Brookside and Mizzou housing. Another 1,700 or so would open next year, and included The Den and downtown projects by American Campus Communities, Collegiate Housing Partners, etc. In 2015, the University planned to add 337 beds and Park7 was planning a 25-story housing complex. In addition, this development would add 900 beds on top of all of those listed. She understood Mizzou had a goal of 40,000 students, but felt they knew that would not be easy to attain at this point. She commented that they also questioned whether occupancies were as high as Park7 had indicated because publicly traded companies with properties in town, including Campus Crest Communities and American Campus Communities, had been hit with falling share prices. Campus Crest Communities noted in its public reports that The Grove in Columbia was one of their worst performing properties. The Cottages were offering a \$200 reduction per month in rent from now to July, and if a lease was signed for next fall, they would decrease the monthly rent by another \$55. She stated she did not doubt students would flock to The Avenue in the first years as there was marketing money to draw them in and kids loved new and shiny things, but it did not mean enrollment at Mizzou would increase. She noted this change in land use would create a sprawling network of student housing complexes where cars were needed. She commented that the citizens worked hard on Columbia Imagined, and the goals articulated were clear in that they wanted a thoughtful development process. This development would not benefit the City because there would be more roads and more issues for police and staff to address. She thanked the Council for their time and noted they did not feel this project was in the best interest of Columbia or their neighborhood.

John Prenger, 2611 Mallard Court, explained he was the President of the Shepard Boulevard Neighborhood Association and noted they were opposed to this development. He urged the City to not provide any permits until the changes to traffic had been made. He commented that they already lived with an unusual traffic situation due to The Domain and did not believe it would get any better with this development. He stated his two older children had been on a school bus that was almost hit about a month ago. He believed this was a

lose-lose situation for the neighborhood as all of this development would either create a bottleneck in getting on to the highway or the north end would be opened up to assist with the bottleneck, which meant more people would travel through the Timberhill area. He pointed out the students living in these developments had to have cars because there were no grocery or retail stores in the area. He asked the Council to deny this request. He pointed out they were not against development, but felt this development was too intense.

Diane Suhler, 902 Timberhill Road, commented that she believed an economic analysis of this project needed to consider private and social costs and benefits. She noted the private gains from this transaction outweighed the costs as the sellers of this property and the developer would reap significant monetary profits from the proposed development. She explained the tasks of weighing social costs and benefits fell to the City Council, and she believed any decision in favor of this had to definitively determine the City and its citizens would be better off as a result of the development. She felt this development had negative consequences as it would overstress the City's existing infrastructure, specifically in terms of roads and parking, and would contribute to urban sprawl. These 899 students would compete with others to access the inner city as they would be unable to walk to campus. She understood the City was in the process of designing a comprehensive transportation plan and felt that should be the leading factor in determining where and when new student housing development took place instead of requiring the City to react to housing developments in designing a transportation system. She noted only 57 percent of students living in distant housing developments used the City's transit system, and those that used it were using it at a reduced cost. She wondered whether it was the responsibility of the citizens to bear the brunt of these costs for students. She also believed distant housing developments increased the demand for limited public safety resources beyond the inner city and reinforced the perception of the University of Missouri as a commuter campus. She commented that she had taken a poll of her students and they had indicated there was not a shortage of luxury housing units, but there was a shortage of affordable housing close to campus. She reiterated she believed the negative externalities of this development outweighed positive spillover for the City.

Philip Rabbitt, 1415 Godas Drive, commented that this could be a real opportunity for the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Water and Light Advisory Board and the Boone Electric Cooperative to come up with sustainable ways to develop, such as with the use of photovoltaic cells. He thought the developer could consider this project as the new archetype for housing developments in college communities. He suggested the development include a three-acre community garden or dog park for those interested. He felt sustainable ideas needed to be considered for new construction.

Anne Minor, 919 Timberhill Road, stated she opposed the request of Park7 to rezone this property to a PUD-9 and to construct a student housing complex, and noted she was concerned about the crime and safety issues this type of student housing complex would bring to her neighborhood, the surrounding community, and the students residing there. She explained Aspen Heights was the most well-known example of the problems associated with this kind of complex. The Tribune reported police had been dispatched to Aspen Heights 221 times within the 167 days between August 17, 2013 and January 31, 2014. In addition,

last fall, Aspen Heights had been in the news for violent crimes, such as an armed robbery and a rape. She commented that drug dealing brought another type of concern to these complexes and did not believe Aspen Heights was an isolated case in Columbia or other college towns. In September, the Columbia Police Department had posted signs and issued crime alerts due to increased burglaries on the south side of Columbia where the majority of student housing complexes were located. She noted the City's crime analyst had indicated the lack of background checks and the behavior of young people were reasons for the problems. In addition, complexes where management and ownership remained the same for years did not draw such attention. Most of the new complexes were not locally owned and were often sold after the first few years. Columbia Imagined addressed how to build safety into communities as it indicated places that were highly walkable and had mixed-uses offered inherent benefits for public safety because they generated activity and eyes on the street at various times of day. This project would bring a transient student population of 899 along with their friends, thirty buildings, many cars and uninvited guests. She stated the neighborhood was concerned crime next door would reduce their property values and spill into the neighborhood.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commended the developers for responding to the concerns of the neighbors, but pointed out they were inadequate in terms of the overall interests of the City. He felt the University of Missouri had unilaterally imposed huge, unfounded, mandated costs on the City and thought they should transfer \$10-20 million per year to a combination of governmental entities. He hoped the University administration was listening to the issues created, and that the Council would not approve this request.

Gary Kass, 712 Timberhill Road, explained most of the people in his neighborhood of Shepard Hills had lived in Columbia for decades and understood the land surrounding their neighborhood would be developed, but had hoped the development that would occur would be true to guidelines outlined in Columbia Imagined, which called for integrated neighborhoods, a mixture of single-family homes, townhomes, light commercial student housing, transition densities, and neighborhood planned development through neighborhood land use plans ahead of development and redevelopment pressures. He stated they would welcome and support an integrated, diverse development in the area surrounding their homes, such as single-family homes adjacent to the neighborhood that transitioned into multi-family student living facilities integrated with commercial development, and would like an opportunity to plan the use of this land ahead of developers. He asked the Council to look at the big picture and to imagine what they wanted Columbia to look like in 10-30 years instead of reacting to developments from out-of-state developers.

Vicki Carstens, 712 Timberhill Road, commented that as a faculty member of the University of Missouri, she believed the downtown benefited greatly from housing, shops, restaurants, etc. that were within walking distance from campus as the connectedness allowed Columbia to thrive. She felt the creation of new housing that could not be accessed on foot or bicycle would bleed the vitality of the downtown, and because the market for student housing was finite, projects such as this would bleed the potential for future housing within walking and biking distance. She noted the University was trying to increase its enrollment with out of state recruiting, but it was also adopting policies to permit degrees to

be pursued with on-line courses. At this time, they did not know the consequences of those actions, but they could impact the student housing market. As a resident of Timberhill Road, she did not believe a 900 bed complex was an appropriate use of land adjacent to their quiet, single-family, wooded, private area. She also did not believe it was in line with Columbia Imagined, which proclaimed a commitment to maintaining historical neighborhoods and promoting successful transitions. She felt the property was an undervalued resource that could be used for family housing closer to the center city.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, stated he agreed with those in opposition to this development and asked the Council to vote against it.

Mike Kane, 909 Timberhill Road, explained he and his wife were strongly opposed to this rezoning request. He noted the project now referred to as The Domain had been passed with significant controls, conditions and changes, and this proposed project would require the excavation of tons of earth and bedrock and the removal of the climax forest, which would expose the fragile environment to the erosion of soil into the surrounding stream. He pointed out his neighborhood had participated in the development of the East Area Plan, which described the area of having highly erodable soil due to steep slopes, and the land the developer was ceding to the neighbors was essentially in the unbuildable portion of the tract. He felt replacing trees with impervious roads, parking areas, etc. would overwhelm any adherence to the stormwater ordinances. This site was at the highest point in Columbia, and any runoff water that was not contained would eventually travel downhill to the Grindstone Creek and Crosscreek development.

Greg Suhler, 902 Timberhill Road, thanked the Council and developers for working with the neighborhood even if they did not agree. He noted the overall preference of the neighborhood was for no development at this site, at the very least, or not this development. He agreed this development would likely be well done by these developers, but felt it was probably not a good development for the City at this time.

Vicki Curby, 1201 S. Rustic Road, explained her property was located directly east of subject property and noted she had the same concerns as those from Timberhill in terms of transportation, traffic, the environment, safety, etc. She pointed out that due to its location, those residing in the development would rely on cars. It was not near a trail system either so those walking or biking would have to travel Stadium. In addition, as a former member of the Planning and Zoning Commission, she did not see how this type of development would fit within the vision of the City's future in terms of what the citizens wanted for Columbia.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, commented that she believed many in the community would support the residents in opposition of this development as there were many reasons this was not the right development for this location at this time. She noted this development, if approved, would likely cause other development around it. She reiterated she felt commercial building codes should be upgraded as efficient buildings would reduce the costs to taxpayers. She urged the Council to vote against this proposal.

Ms. Hoppe stated she did not believe this development was appropriate for the neighborhood or the City, and did not feel it fit with Columbia Imagined, the comprehensive plan or the East Area Plan. She explained this area, known as Crosscreek, had been a very lush area with trees and slopes, but was cleared and flattened in 2006 prior to any rezoning.

It was eventually rezoned and the dealership use was ultimately changed to The Domain use in 2010. She noted the Timberhill Neighborhood Association had anticipated a buffer in this area, and she agreed. She did not believe this site should be developed in a similar manner and noted the provisions of the Crosscreek agreement did not apply to this area. She referred to the staff report and noted the vision impact indicated the City's development planning process should promote socio-economically diverse, mixed-used neighborhoods that were supported by citywide bicycle, pedestrian and transit systems to reduce the need for automobile commuting, and pointed out this development did not promote that as it was not diverse and did not include mixed-use. She believed sprawl could be prevented and an economically diverse use would be a mixture of single-family and family-type housing. She noted Shepard Boulevard was next to Highway 63, but it was a thriving neighborhood, and Bluff Creek, a beautiful family subdivision, was just down the road. As a result, she did not believe it could be argued that it was not a vibrant, family, mixed-use area just because it was near Highway 63. She commented that there was a big demand in Columbia for mixed-use residential housing, and that would fit within the neighborhood, the City's vision process, and the comprehensive plan. She stated she was disappointed that the Planning and Zoning Commission did not look at the East Area Plan. She explained it included a land use plan that showed this area should be residential, but pointed out that not all residential was equal and referred to the goals included in the plan. Goal 1 was the establishment of land use policies that promoted a mix of development that complimented and enhanced each other. The proposed development was more of the same and not a mixed-use development. Goal 3 was to promote a diverse and adequate supply of affordable energy efficient and accessible housing. This development would not meet that goal either. She commented that this development did not prevent sprawl either and noted many families and professionals wanted to live closer to the central city area, and this location was perfect for developments accommodating them. She stated this area, as shown in Map 5-3 of the East Area Plan, was within a sensitive area in terms of tree growth, stormwater, erodable soil, etc., and thus called for a development that started with the lay of the land and then proposed a development based on the lay of the land to preserve the sensitive areas. This development would have more than 1,000 vehicle spaces, and since it would only house students, they would all be going in the same direction, which would be down Stadium and past Audubon. That was a dangerous intersection that needed to be addressed now, and this development would add to the problems at that intersection. She felt it was irresponsible of the Council to approve a development that would add to safety issues at an intersection that was already too dangerous. She believed the development should go hand in hand with the road improvements as it could be years before the road improvement was completed, if the development was constructed prior to the road improvements. She noted the Bedford Walk development, on the consent agenda, was specific in terms of what future uses were excluded from the development and included building standards, material standards and percentages of how much of the materials must be used. She agreed with the concerns regarding crime as this would be the second largest student development behind Aspen Heights, which had 232 calls to 911 since August 2013. She believed a conglomeration of

students without adequate management created a safety and security issue, and would stress police resources, which were already stretched.

Mr. Trapp stated he supported this plan. He felt this was fundamentally a land use decision and believed the presence of Highway 63 precluded the likelihood this area would develop into single-family residential. In addition, this site served as a buffer to the denser, commercially zoned properties. He thought this would be a tougher decision if downtown were open for development and pointed out Park7 had proposed a large downtown development, which the City could not ensure it could supply with needed electricity. He appreciated the sentiments toward a walkable community and a dense downtown, but noted there seemed to be a feeling that student housing in general was a bad idea. He stated it was hard to have a college town without college students and pointed out Columbia was a city of immigrants. There was also a general critique of growth, which he felt was hypocritical. He understood the anti-growth phenomenon from those that were born in Columbia, but most of them were immigrants. He pointed out he moved to Columbia because it was a college town in terms of cultural amenities and its progressive nature. His preference was for housing for college students to be downtown for a dense, walkable community, but they were not able to provide for that at this time. In the absence of being able to build downtown, he wondered where this type of development was appropriate. This location was by Highway 63 and a highway interchange. He would have liked to have seen a more robust support for transit and hoped they could continue to build a service people wanted to ride, but understood they likely needed to move from a density of 2.6 residences per acre to around five residences per acre, which would not occur without some growing pains. He commented that strict growth concerns would cause this student development to occur in the County or the other seven adjoining counties. He also believed that if they placed a cap on student housing, the students would bleed into the traditional and regular housing market, and this would likely impact affordable housing. He pointed out Columbia's housing prices were significantly higher than regional cities, such as Ashland, Boonville or Jefferson City, due to the wonderful amenities that came with the University. He reiterated that with development downtown being restricted, he could not think of a location this could be placed that would have a lesser impact on traffic and felt this location would allow for an easier way to get to campus when compared to the other fringe areas.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not believe the Council should try to determine where to place a particular proposed development as he believed they should review City plans to determine whether the proposed development fit within those plans. The comprehensive plan and the East Area Plan focused on livable communities, sustainable growth, diverse and affordable housing, increased density, neighborhood planning, integrated neighborhoods, smooth transitions, livable public spaces, reducing automobile reliance, preserving the natural environment and expanding the transit system. He agreed the development was dense and the developers had made sincere efforts to respond to the concerns of the neighbors and the Council by relocating buildings away from the northern edge of the property, providing the private transit service and supporting Columbia transit. He also understood Park7 had been willing to offer a cash incentive to students that did not bring a car, which he felt was a great model. In looking at the entire concept behind the

comprehensive plan and the East Area Plan, this proposal was not consistent, and he did not believe it was what the residents who contributed to these plans had in mind for this location. It was too intense and car-oriented, and there were a lot of other development designs that were less intense, more diverse and provided for better transitions. Mr. Thomas stated he would not support this request.

Mr. Skala stated he felt plans, statements of intent and rezoning requests should be separate and not considered in the same legislation. He understood staff felt if the two were separated the ability to negotiate the plan was lost. With regard to the plan for this development, he credited the developer for trying to address the concerns of the neighbors in terms of the buffer by reconfiguring the layout and increasing the open space area. He commented that he felt the difference between low-density residential and the high-density residential of the PUD-9 was significant as the development had characteristics of a commercial venture. He noted he read the East Area Plan this afternoon and it discussed mixed-uses and environmental issues. He explained there were a lot of different views in terms of the need for student housing and whether that need had been saturated, and as a result, he obtained information from the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis, which indicated there had been a plateau in the student population, although he had not received a final report. He commented that this reminded him of The Links development and pointed out he had criticized that development for not contributing enough in terms of off-site infrastructure when he was on the Planning and Zoning Commission, as the taxpayers ended up paying for 80-90 percent of the associated infrastructure improvements. He was worried about that same situation in this instance as well as the explosive growth of student housing next to residential housing when the plans called for a mixed-use feel. He stated he planned to vote against this on the basis of land use issues.

Ms. Nauser commented that this was located at the intersection of Highway 63 and Stadium, and Stadium was going to be a major commercial corridor that would take people to Interstate 70. In addition, the entire area was commercial as there was a hotel, other student apartments, restaurants, a proposed bank, a furniture store, etc. She pointed out the Council wanted density and she felt this proposal met that desire as the area was not lacking infrastructure in terms of roads, electric, sewer, water, etc. She noted the developers had provided the neighbors with everything on their twelve point list other than complete control over the connection. They had also fulfilled the requests of the Planning and Zoning Commission and city ordinance and zoning requirements. As a result, she thought they should be able to build at this location. She did not feel they could determine whether student housing was at its capacity as they could not see into the future. She was hopeful the University of Missouri could increase their population to the level they wanted, but did not feel City government could determine the market forces either. She pointed out they were there to initiate policy and determine what they felt was the best for the community. Since the developer had met the requests of everyone involved, she stated she planned to support the proposed request.

Mr. Schmidt commented that he tended to believe the numbers provided by Madge Minor, but agreed with Ms. Nauser that it was not the purview of the Council to determine supply and demand. He understood the Planning and Zoning Commission had

recommended approval of this proposal, but the neighborhood did not want this development. He stated he believed Ms. Hoppe and Mr. Thomas had made some convincing arguments in that the development was not consistent with the East Area Plan or the comprehensive plan. In addition, there were potential issues in terms of whether it would create a nuisance, harm the environment, its intensity and traffic. He noted he planned to vote against this proposal.

Mayor McDavid stated he planned to support this proposal. He noted the comments of Ms. Carstens were telling, and he thought it was imperative of the City to provide infrastructure adjacent to campus. He commented that he appreciated the comments of the neighbors and recalled what it was like to reside in a home that had been encroached upon by development, but noted that had been a land issue and he did not own the land. He felt the role of Council was to determine the best use for the land. In terms of infrastructure, this proposed development was at the confluence of two major roadways. He thought the density argument was interesting as some felt it was too dense and others did not feel it was dense enough. It was unrealistic for this land to remain agricultural and the neighbors had extracted concessions from Park7, and if this was voted down, the neighbors would have to confront the issue of rezoning again in the future. He commented that he did not believe it was the job of Council to manage the housing supply market, and thought those willing to put their money at risk should be the arbiters of demand. He pointed out an increase in supply meant lower costs for consumers while less supply meant higher costs for consumers. He stated he would support this proposal as it met the requirements of staff, had a recommendation for approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission, provided for concessions to the neighbors and had a commitment to transit. He reiterated he would prefer this development to be located next to campus, but that was not possible at this time due to capacity issues.

The vote on B372-13, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, NAUSER, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: SKALA, THOMAS, HOPPE, SCHMIDT. Bill declared defeated.

B19-14 Approving the Final Minor Plat of Stevenson Addition, a Replat of portions of Lots 137, 138 and 183 and all of Lots 136, 181 and 182, and part of a vacated alley in the Original Town and the west 17-feet of vacated Fourth Street, located on the southeast corner of Broadway and Providence Road; authorizing a performance contract.

The bill was given second reading by the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood this was not a rezoning so Council did not have the discretion that was associated with rezonings. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He pointed out the City had not received any plans for a drugstore or any other use at this time either.

Mayor McDavid asked if the Council was compelled to approve this plat as long as it met the requirements. Ms. Thompson replied yes. She pointed out the vacation request that would come forward in the future was not a ministerial act and would allow for discretion so it was up to the Council as to whether or not the vacation was in the best interest of the City.

Mayor McDavid commented that he understood the downtown was at capacity and asked if this proposed development would have to get in line behind the other proposed

developments in the downtown area. Mr. Matthes replied yes in terms of physics. Ms. Thompson explained Mr. Matthes was talking about the fact they did not want to lose any sewer capacity through any kind of relocation. She understood three existing buildings were tied to the sewer, so if those buildings were removed and a new structure was constructed, it would have the same access as the existing structures to the system unless there was increased demand based upon the new structure. Staff would have to conduct an engineering analysis once the plans were submitted.

Mr. Skala agreed this was essentially a ministerial act since it was a plat, but believed the Council had discretion if there were public safety or access issues. He understood the boundaries of the two lots had changed causing two separate zoning categories and asked how that would work. Mr. Teddy replied the zoning boundaries had been delineated. He understood the question at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was whether it was proper to have one lot with two different zoning designations, and he did not feel it was ideal because they would prefer a unified site, but there were examples of this throughout the City. Mr. Skala asked if the uses would be nested. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it would likely be a use that was permitted in both zoning districts, and pointed out they would have to follow the uses allowed for the zoning of that portion of the parcel. He described some of the differences between the M-1 and C-2 zoning districts in terms of uses. He reiterated it was not ideal, and he believed that was part of the reason they had previously come before Council with the C-P request.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification regarding the additional easements provided and how they interacted with the future vacation of easements. Mr. Teddy replied general utility easements were normally used, and this provided the City the right to access facilities, such as underground electric, sewer, drainage, etc., but it could be more specific in that it could strictly be a drainage easement. He thought the easements delineated on the plat were primarily for sewer purposes.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Council was not vacating any easements at this time. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She pointed out the property owner was adding easements to the property and dedicating right-of-way, but the City was not vacating any easements. Ms. Hoppe understood the vacation would have to come back to Council for consideration because once an easement was vacated, it was vacated forever. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Mr. Schmidt asked if any plans had been submitted. Mr. Teddy replied the City had not received any plans for construction for this site.

Robert Hollis, an attorney with offices at 1103 East Broadway, explained he was present on behalf of the applicant and noted the easements were new and indicated where the new system would be constructed.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and felt this location was an important gateway to the downtown. She wondered if historic preservation should be considered for the site since it was part of the old town of Columbia and an ice house had been located there. She pointed out the economic benefits of historic preservation and the fact it added to the community character.

Mayor McDavid suggested Ms. Welch talk to the Historic Preservation Commission as this issue only involved the approval of a plat. This did not grant the property owner the permission to build anything.

Mayor McDavid stated he viewed this as an administrative act. He understood City staff would review plans before anything was built on the site, and that the issue might come before the Council again as well. As a result, he would vote to approve this plat.

Mr. Skala understood there would be two separate zoning designations within the single lot on the plat, and whatever was built would have to conform to rules of both designations. Mr. Teddy replied that was correct in those areas, so the northern portion would have to conform to C-2 and the southern portion would have to conform to M-1.

Mr. Skala commented that the Council voted 6-1 to not allow the planned development to occur, and he understood the developer was likely disappointed with that vote, but noted he was disappointed in the reaction of the developer to place the development on this site regardless. He stated the feedback he had received from his constituents was that this was not a good idea, and a more reasonable approach would have been to develop a better plan.

Mr. Schmidt stated he used to go to the ice house when he was a kid. It was a big, thick concrete building with big, thick doors, and was fascinating when he was young, but it was not quite what he remembered as a child now, and he would be surprised if there was any historic value to it. He commented that he agreed with Mr. Skala and wished the developer would have worked with the Council prior to moving forward again.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed the Council did not have any basis to deny this plat.

B19-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B21-14 Approving the Final Plat of Magnolia Falls Plat 3, a Replat of a portion of Magnolia Falls, located on the southeast corner of Route KK and Old Mill Creek Road; authorizing a performance contract.

The bill was given second reading by the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B21-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmidt and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas asked if this was within the City limits. Mr. Teddy replied it was. Mr. Thomas noted Google maps had indicated it was not within the City. Mr. Teddy stated that was Google's error.

B21-14, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B23-14 Appropriating funds from the Glad One Bag Partnership for the purchase of recycling bins to be used at special events.

The bill was given second reading by the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

B23-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. (Mr. Thomas stepped out and did not return until after the official vote was taken.) Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B26-14 Authorizing a school resource officer agreement with the Columbia School District.

The bill was given second reading by the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. Burton provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood the Columbia School District's share of the cost for school resource officers (SROs) was \$168,000, and asked what that covered. She wondered if it was half of the salaries and benefits of the officer. Mr. Burton replied yes, and explained it had evolved over the past few years because the School District wanted SROs to work during the summer as well. He noted that number was 50 percent of twelve months of the cost of the SROs.

Ms. Nauser understood the SROs were City-paid employees who were spending 75 percent of their time at schools, but the City was only being reimbursed for 50 percent of the cost of the SROs by the schools. Mr. Burton stated that was correct. He explained the thought process was that police officers would be at the schools anyway answering calls for service and dealing with things that occurred at the schools. Since they would be there anyway, it was more economical to the City to split the cost with the schools. It also allowed the officers to create relationships with students when they were not doing enforcement-type work. Ms. Nauser stated she was not questioning the benefit of SROs in the schools. She was concerned about the cost share arrangement because the officer would not be at the school if there was not a call for service, and she did not feel there would be continual calls. As a result, she questioned whether the cost distribution was equitable. She noted the arrangement caused fewer officers to be out on the streets and the school had full time security without paying for full time security staff. She commented that she would not vote against this agreement at this time, but hoped a more equitable arrangement could be reached for next year.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification regarding the process. Mr. Burton replied City staff and the CPS staff worked together to come up with the agreement. He pointed out this was the best cost ratio they had since he started working for the City. The percentage the School District reimbursed had increased, but the time they were requesting of the officers had increased as well.

Ms. Nauser pointed out she was not sure she would be as supportive next year if the arrangement was the same as she believed the Columbia School District needed to pay for the time the officers were in the schools.

B26-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B27-14 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 Deputy Clerk.

Mr. Burton provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp explained DOVE was a form of a community coordinated response, and credited the DOVE team as Columbia had not had any domestic related homicides in the last five years, which was a fairly astounding statistic as domestic violence was an incredibly lethal form of crime and likely created the most dangerous situations encountered by officers due to the emotions involved. The DOVE team included two police officers, a designated person at the domestic violence shelter, a designated person at the Family Counseling Center that provided batter intervention for those convicted of domestic violence charges, and a probation and parole representative, and this team approached domestic violence in a proactive, meaningful way. He noted there were two approaches to a coordinated community response, and one was the DOVE approach, which was effective, and the other involved a much broader coalition, which included representatives of all of the social service agencies and hospitals and medical offices. They discussed best practices in terms of routine inquiries about domestic violence for people receiving services and ensuring there was a level of competency throughout the social service system and medical profession. As part of the DOVE grant, he understood they were looking at adding part time ancillary staff to conduct surveys, outreach, etc., and thought that was beneficial. He suggested a policy goal to strive toward would be to come up with another half-time person for a coordinated community response that went much broader than this coalition. He liked the DOVE team as it stood, but felt there was room for a larger coalition to address this issue more comprehensively across the community. He noted Columbia had a lot of hospitals and wondered how they were doing in terms of evidence collection and routine domestic violence inquiries for physicians that routinely saw injuries consistent with domestic violence. He reiterated his suggestion to pursue funding to compliment the successful efforts already being made, and gave credit to the general competency in which the Columbia Police Department handled these difficult situations.

B27-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B16-14 Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Nifong Boulevard and Bethel Street from R-1 to PUD-14; approving the PUD/Preliminary Plat Plan of Bedford Walk Plat 9; setting forth a condition for approval; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations regarding dedication of street right-of-way.**
- B17-14 Rezoning property located southwest of the intersection of Waco Road and Brown Station Road from R-1 and C-P to M-C.**

- B18-14 Approving the Final Minor Plat of Paradise Park, a Replat of Tracts 6 and 7, located on the south side of Old Plank Road and south of Tony Street (350 E. Old Plank Road).
- B20-14 Approving the Final Plat of Westcliff, Plat 3A, a Replat of Lot 309 of Westcliff, Plat No. 3, located on the northwest corner of Perche Pointe Place and Swift Court.
- B22-14 Authorizing construction of the Maplewood Drive PCCE #12 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B24-14 Authorizing an amendment to the supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for highway/rail crossing signal improvements at the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with College Avenue (MO 763); appropriating funds.
- B25-14 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B28-14 Accepting a donation from the Columbia Police Foundation to be used for the Police Department's K-9 Program; appropriating funds.
- R15-14 Setting a public hearing: consider replacement of the current orbital pulse bus system with a networked system of bus routes as outlined in the CoMO Connect transit project.
- R16-14 Setting a public hearing: construction of a 13.8 kV three phase underground electrical distribution line along Ponderosa Street, from Grindstone Parkway to Discovery Park Subdivision.
- R17-14 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families America program.
- R18-14 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for public health services.
- R19-14 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for animal control services.
- R20-14 Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Housing Authority for traffic calming modifications along Elleta Boulevard.
- R21-14 Approving the Final Plat of Trade Winds Park, Plat No. 2-A, a Replat of Lot 6 of Trade Winds Park, Plat No. 2, located in Boone County outside the city limits on the northwest corner of Trade Winds Parkway and Richland Road.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. 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.

- B29-14 Rezoning property located north of Gans Road and west of U.S. Highway 63 (within Discovery Park Subdivision) from Districts PUD-4, O-P and C-P to Districts PUD-4, O-P and C-P; approving the Lot 5-17, Discovery Park CP, OP, PUD-4 Development Plan; setting forth a condition for approval.
- B30-14 Approving the Lot 2, Discovery Park CP Development Plan located on the southwest corner of Philips Farm Road and Ponderosa Street; setting forth a condition for approval.
- B31-14 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to change the speed limit on portions of Clark Lane and Ballenger Lane.
- B32-14 Authorizing construction of roadway pavement improvements on Clark Lane, between Woodland Springs Court and McKee Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B33-14 Authorizing construction of a sidewalk on the east side of Ashland Road, between Stadium Boulevard and East Campus Loop Drive, and a raised island and pedestrian signals at the intersection of Ashland Road and Stadium Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B34-14 Authorizing construction of an equipment storage building at the Columbia Regional Airport; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B35-14 Authorizing construction of a sidewalk along the east side of Garth Avenue, between Leslie Lane and Parkade Boulevard, and a crosswalk with pedestrian activated flashing lights and center median island across the north leg of the intersection of Garth Avenue and Parkade Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B36-14 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of a sidewalk on the east side of Garth Avenue, between Leslie Lane and Parkade Boulevard.
- B37-14 Authorizing the acquisition of land for the expansion of the Columbia Regional Airport, in accordance with the Airport Master Plan 2009 Update.
- B38-14 Accepting conveyances for sewer, utility and temporary construction purposes.
- B39-14 Appropriating funds for the purchase of JustWare Prosecutor case management software.
- B40-14 Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotions and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.
- B41-14 Authorizing a contractor agreement with the National Association of County and City Health Officials for development of a workforce development plan; appropriating funds.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP12-14 Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Directors - Annual Membership.

Mayor McDavid explained he thought it was important to meet with the prospective board members prior to making appointments and noted he would delay these appointments until the next meeting. He pointed out this was an important fifteen member board as it had access to a large amount of public funds through sales tax revenue, but the only accountability the political subdivision had was through the approval of the board members.

He wanted to know what their thoughts were with regard to parking, public safety, public transportation, downtown infrastructure, etc. He noted he wanted an opportunity to interact with them prior to making the appointments.

REP13-14 Hazardous Tree Removal Report: Fairview Park.

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

REP14-14 Ridgeway Cottages Sewer Project - Time Extension Request for Funding.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report, and noted staff was suggesting the developer apply for CDBG funds once they had a better sense of their financial ability in terms of the project.

REP15-14 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he strongly disagreed with part of the presentation made by the City at a recent meeting with Boone County in that it was settled policy to move forward with a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district due to the want to increase density in the central city based on an interpretation of the Charrette process, the Sasaki process, etc. He noted part of the implementation plan identified in the Charrette report indicated the creation and adoption of an integrated funding plan. He believed it was too simplistic to say City policy was to increase density in the central city area, and to take one part of the five part implementation plan and sever it from the document to use as a policy basis to move forward with a TIF. He noted the Charrette also stated the integrated funding plan should identify the various public-private funding mechanisms the City had at its disposal to fund streetscape, infrastructure and public realm improvements, and provided TIF as an example, but pointed out it was only an example and not policy. He thought it was inappropriate to cite that as being the basis of settled policy and needing to move forward.

Ben Jacob, Fifth Ward, understood Des Moines was being looked at as a workable model for the TIF discussions, but noted Des Moines had a different set of TIF laws and was allowing the receipt of \$5 on every \$100 of assessed value compared to only 41 cents in Columbia. He believed development should handle all of the real costs of development, and noted he was concerned that increased development would create increased assessments for those within the TIF district. He commented that the Columbia Vision Commission had been charged to educate the public and encourage historic preservation, and some of the development downtown continued to threaten historic areas, like the southeast corner of Providence and Broadway. They wanted more attention placed on historic preservation and for developments to cover real and projected costs, such as investment payments for infrastructure improvement and maintenance costs. He thought there were many ways to accomplish this to include the suggestion of Mr. Skala in terms of development paying its fair share.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, suggested a display showing the vote of the Council for a couple of minutes after a vote was taken on a particular item as he believed some were confused as to whether the Park7 development had been approved or defeated. Mayor McDavid apologized, and stated he should have pointed out it had failed.

Mayor McDavid understood staff would report back on the issue Mr. Alongi mentioned during scheduled public comment. Mr. Glascock commented that Mr. Alongi could attach to the sewer main in front of his house. There was no way to do a sewer district since the line currently ran under someone's house. Mayor McDavid understood it was the responsibility of Mr. Alongi to fix his sewer issue. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and noted staff would provide a report to Council.

Mayor McDavid credited the City Manager, Police Chief and every police officer for their great work as he understood the violent crime rate last year was the lowest it had been since 1986. He agreed there was still too much crime, but felt this accomplishment with such a small staff said a lot for the work of the Police Department.

Mayor McDavid thanked the Public Works Staff for the work they did this weekend with the ice and snow.

Mayor McDavid read a letter written by Rod Perry of Bent Oak Drive describing how the Solid Waste staff helped him find his wife's diamond ring that had been passed down from prior generations of her family. He noted staff had contacted him to meet him at the landfill and assisted him in searching trash bags to find his trash, and as he picked up one of his trash bags, he found the ring. It was a ring his wife's grandmother, Mrs. Don Faurot, had given her. He stated it was like finding a needle in the haystack, and the three employees that assisted him never complained about the extra time they had to spend helping him or the fact they had to go through the filth. He thanked them for going the extra mile.

Mayor McDavid made a motion for the City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri, to hold a closed meeting on Monday, February 17, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in Conference Room 1A/1B of City Hall, 701 E. Broadway, Columbia, Missouri to discuss negotiations with employee groups as authorized by Section 610.021(9) RSMo. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and the vote was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

Mr. Matthes pointed out that customer-focused government was the City's number one strategic priority. Ms. Hoppe stated she was astounded by how optimistic staff was in terms of finding the ring. Mr. Skala asked if those employees would be recognized. Mayor McDavid replied he thought there was already something planned by City staff in terms of recognition.

Mr. Skala commented that the webpage created to track the plow trucks and the streets that had been plowed was invaluable in terms of responding to those with questions. He wished the Public Works staff luck with the latest storm expected to hit the area tomorrow,

and noted the great job they were doing with snow removal communication as he had not received any complaints to which he could not respond.

Ms. Nauser reminded everyone the website was CoMoSnow.com as it showed neighborhoods that had been cleared, were in the process of being cleared, and those still needing to be cleared.

Ms. Nauser asked for a report from City staff with regard to economic development. She wanted to know what companies or types of industries had been interested in Columbia, which companies the City had missed out on and why, and the types of partnership the City had to promote economic development.

Mr. Matthes pointed out code names were commonly used so those would be used in the response back to Council. Ms. Nauser stated that was fine.

Mayor McDavid suggested they ask REDI to send their coded reports that included prospects to the individual Council Members.

Ms. Nauser commented that she felt the sign boards used to alert people of high-crime areas was very innovative in that it provided public service announcements to citizens in a relatively inexpensive manner. She wondered how much it would cost to purchase additional mobile units to place throughout the community. She also wanted to know how much it would cost to purchase additional mobile electronic speed limit signs to place in high traffic volume areas. She thought that would assist the Police Department by bringing this type of focus to the area without requiring a police officer to be at the location. She asked for a staff report regarding the costs of those two types of mobile units and a recommendation on how they could integrate the purchase of those in the upcoming budget discussions.

Ms. Hoppe commented that the Council received a letter today that had been sent to quite a few property owners informing them of hazardous or damaged trees that would be removed in the next week or so. She felt this process was moving along very fast and asked if this was the only notice that had been sent to those property owners. She wondered if they had personally been contacted as well. She thought the City needed to hold off on removing the trees unless they would imminently fall in order to allow the property owners time to inquire about the need for the trees to be removed.

Mr. Matthes stated he would look into the situation and follow up.

Ms. Hoppe commented that the scenic road ordinance had been revised last year, and it now provided for the creation of an advisory stakeholder group to be formed to create a corridor plan. She noted Columbia's only scenic road at this time was Rock Quarry Road, which had safety issues, and understood the scenic road ordinance allowed for routine maintenance. Anything other than routine maintenance-type issues had to be addressed by this advisory group, and a corridor plan was needed. She thought now was the appropriate time to put the advisory stakeholder group together. Per the ordinance, the advisory group could consist of up to 15 members, and one-third of those members should be residents along the road corridor, including at least one resident property owner, another one-third should be representatives of the general public, who could be from various interested citizen

groups, and the final one-third should be officials, including the affected ward city council member, community development support staff, a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission, a member of the Environment a Energy Commission, a member of the Parks and Recreation Commission and a member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission. She pointed out part of the charge for this group would be to determine where an appropriate pedway could be located and how it would it would fit with the road. She stated she wanted to move forward with the process of the Council appointing members to this group, and recommended residents along Rock Quarry and the general public apply to accommodate the first two-thirds of the group. With regard to the other one-third, she suggested asking those commissions to recommend representatives.

Mr. Matthes asked if the current process of recruiting applicants for boards and commissions could be used for the residents along the road and the general public. Ms. Hoppe replied yes.

Mr. Schmidt stated he liked this idea.

Ms. Hoppe understood there was interest from business owners along Business Loop 70 to underground wires in order to make the area more attractive. She noted there were a lot of payday loan-type businesses along that corridor, and felt it would be a futile effort to spend a lot of money to try to spruce things by undergrounding wires with these types of businesses there. She asked for a report with recommendations on how the City could regulate the proximity of those types of businesses, similar to what they had with regard to adult entertainment.

Mayor McDavid understood there were several members along that corridor that were interested in forming a CID so they could use sales tax to fund improvements. He thought everyone wanted to see that part of Columbia improved and there was momentum to get that done at this time, which would be a great step forward.

Mr. Thomas explained he and Ms. Hoppe would be meeting with Mr. Matthes and Mr. Teddy later in the week to discuss a systematic approach to operationalizing the comprehensive plan. He thought they had a great start in terms of the zoning review and revisions, and stated they would also look at fairly allocating infrastructure costs between new and existing developments.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk