

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
JANUARY 4, 2016**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, January 4, 2016, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS and PETERS were present. Council Member NAUSER was absent. The Deputy City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting of December 21, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Trapp.

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

Mr. Thomas asked that B376-15 and B377-15 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B376-15 and B377-15 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Thomas.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

**SI1-16      Swearing in of Steven Sapp as the Director of Community Relations for the City of Columbia.**

Mayor McDavid asked Mr. Sapp to join Mr. St. Romaine, Deputy City Manager, and Ms. Amin, City Clerk, to the podium.

Mr. St. Romaine introduced Mr. Sapp as the Director of Community Relations, and noted Mr. Sapp had worked in many capacities for the City of Columbia, to include the Public Safety Joint Communications Department, a Battalion Chief for the Fire Department, and the Public Information Officer for the Public Works Department. He stated he looked forward to working with Mr. Sapp in the future.

The City Clerk administered the oath of office to Mr. Sapp as the Director of Community Relations.

Mayor McDavid stated it seemed odd to welcome Mr. Sapp since he had worked for the City for 36 years already, and welcomed him in his new role.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

None.

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT****SPC1-16     Annette Triplett – Introductory information on Vision Zero policies.**

Ms. Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition, which was an advocacy organization for the most basic forms of transportation, which included walking, biking, utilizing a wheelchair, and public transit. She commented that policies that made it safer and more convenient for people to use active forms of transportation often made transportation safer for those that chose to drive a car, and one such policy was Vision Zero. It was a policy goal and data driven strategy to achieve zero traffic fatalities or serious injuries across all forms of transportation, and was based upon ethical principles and the foundation that all traffic fatalities and injuries were preventable and ethically unacceptable. While traffic crashes might never be completely eliminated, she believed crashes that led to serious injury or death could be prevented. Vision Zero challenged the culture of acceptance associated with motor vehicle travel, such that traffic fatalities and injuries were inevitable and the cost of doing business. She noted this was in stark contrast to other modes of transportation, such as air travel, where zero fatalities were tolerated. Vision Zero placed responsibility for safety on system design and the people that influenced the design of policies, which she believed included everyone, and caused them to think about how they could account for human error. Every crash with serious injuries or fatalities was an opportunity to look at the road system to determine what was wrong and what should have been done to prevent it. She stated Vision Zero was comprehensive in that it considered all road users, and valued the safety of people walking, biking, or using a wheelchair just as much as people driving. Since Vision Zero was data driven, it forced them to take a hard look at why crashes were happening and what type of transportation users were involved in those crashes, including vulnerable road users, which were those walking or biking, as they were most likely to be killed or injured if there was a crash. In Columbia, people walking and biking were involved in three percent of the crashes, but accounted for 25 percent of the fatalities. She noted PedNet saw this type of policy as a way to make transportation safer for people walking and biking, but those most likely to benefit from the Vision Zero policy were those traveling by car because they made up the majority of the injuries and fatalities due to crashes. Implementing this policy did not mean they would have to overhaul every intersection or spend massive amounts of money as it relied on proven strategies that could be no or low cost, such as reducing speed limits, offering safety education through ticket diversion programs for traffic offenders, and increasing fines for unsafe transportation behaviors. She pointed out Boston, Massachusetts, New York, New York, Washington D.C., Portland, Oregon, Seattle, Washington, and San Francisco, California had all recently passed Vision Zero policies. In the first year New York City had implemented its Vision Zero policy, they had their lowest pedestrian fatality rate since record keeping began in 1910. Data from Sweden had shown a 73 percent reduction in fatalities since the 1990s when it began implementing these types of policies. She explained the Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety had voted to use Vision Zero as the basis for its upcoming pedestrian safety recommendations to Council and the PedNet Coalition felt strongly that Vision Zero was the next step the community needed to take to improve

transportation safety in Columbia. She stated she looked forward to exploring this policy with the City in the near future.

**SPC2-16     Lynn Maloney – The value of community policing.**

Ms. Maloney thanked the City Council for its responsiveness to the concerns of Race Matters in the past few months, and noted she looked forward to their continued support in making racial justice a priority in Columbia in the New Year. As racial disparities continued to increase, she believed it was important for everyone to be willing to discuss race explicitly as they strove for racial and social equity. She thanked Mr. Skala for his comments at the end of the prior Council Meeting where he referenced the many excellent resources for discussing race. She referred to one of those documents entitled *The Application of the Racial Equity Tool Kit in City Government*, which was published by the Government Alliance on Racial Equity, and explained this tool kit was based on asking six questions during the creation of proposals. They were questions that needed to be asked during the implementation of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. She noted the recommendations had primarily been written in race neutral language, but they needed to be implemented with racial equity in mind. She commented that one question involved what the proposal was and what was its desired outcome, and explained the question was meant to be answered using data disaggregated by race. She listed the other five questions, which the Missowhat did that data tell them, how had the affected communities been engaged and how could they expand their engagement, who would benefit and if those benefiting were not racially diverse, what strategies did they have for creating racial equity, what was the implementation plan for those strategies, and what accountability and commitment did the proposal have in place for meeting racial equity. She stated the report went on to say that while most government agencies would argue they did not have time to answer all of these questions, there were at least three questions that needed to be included in every product and project, and those included what were the racial equity impacts of the particular decision, who would benefit, and were there strategies to mitigate unintended consequence. She felt those that identified as white had to overcome a reluctance to discuss race. She noted they were more comfortable talking about economic disparities, and pointed out the divergences in economic equity were growing among racial lines. Understanding the variety of factors that contributed to disparities among economics was essential in creating equity. She stated the racial equity tool kit was a method for exposing the many causes for disparities that were very often invisible to them as they made plans to improve the City. She believed it was time to hold themselves accountable for racial equity, and this tool kit was a resource that could help them all in that effort.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PH1-16     Construction of the Rollins at Rockcreek culvert replacement project.**

PH1-16 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Glenn Chambers, 807 Cornell, commented that the three speed bumps that had been installed on College Park Drive had been extremely effective in reducing traffic speeds in that area, and asked if it would be possible to include a similar speed bump on Rollins Road as a part of this culvert replacement project. He thought this would assist in keeping kids in the area safe, and pointed out many people traveling through there were going in excess of 50 mph. He reiterated his request for a speed bump as part of this project.

Michelle Windmoeller, 705 E. Rockcreek Drive, understood a house had been flooded due to the failure of the culvert in 2010, and stated her support for this project. She commented that while she agreed with Mr. Chambers in that speeds were too high, she would prefer to not move forward with the speed bump if it would slow down the culvert replacement, as that needed to be done as soon as possible so there were not any other catastrophic failures.

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

Mayor McDavid stated he viewed the speed bump as traffic calming that needed to be seriously considered, but he did not feel it was a part of this project. He thought the issue needed to be placed on the list of constituent concerns for evaluation. Mr. Johnsen stated this information would be relayed to the Street Division. Mayor McDavid noted he planned to support the culvert replacement project.

Ms. Peters asked for the timeframe for constructing the new culvert. Mr. Johnsen replied the project still needed to be designed. He understood the engineers were moving as fast as they could on the project and were hopeful there would not be any changes to help the process. He thought they would try to meet the spring construction season.

Mr. Skala asked if anything had happened during the last heavy rainfall at this location. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not believe so, but noted staff had done on-site, temporary repairs which would not last long. This project needed to be completed as soon as possible.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed this was a very much needed project and underscored the struggle of the stormwater utility in that staff needed to focus on immediate concerns where there could be a catastrophe. He noted an increase in the stormwater utility fee that would be phased-in over the next few years had been passed by the citizens, and he hoped that would allow staff to get ahead of catastrophic projects and be more proactive. He stated he supported the request of Mr. Chambers for speed management on Rollins Road as there had been a series of serious crashes slightly east of this location. It was a difficult street since parts of it encouraged fast speeds while there were sharp curves or double curves just east of Russell Boulevard Elementary School in other parts.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for the Rollins at Rockcreek culvert replacement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**PH2-16 Construction of improvements to the Albert-Oakland Family Aquatic Center to include replacement of the bathhouse roof and exterior lighting, installation of a cantilever shade structure on the southeast corner of the pool deck, and replacement of interior bathhouse plumbing, fixtures and lighting.**

**B379-15 Authorizing construction of improvements to the Albert-Oakland Family Aquatic Center to include replacement of the bathhouse roof and exterior lighting, installation of a cantilever shade structure on the southeast corner of the pool deck,**

**and replacement of interior bathhouse plumbing, fixtures and lighting; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.**

PH2-16 was read by the Clerk, and B379-15 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Skala stated he was in favor of this project and felt it was another example of the fiscal responsibility of the Parks and Recreation Department as it pertains to maintenance. He pointed out one of the reasons the Parks and Recreation Department had the capacity to do this was because there was a dedicated revenue stream endorsed by public referendum. He appreciated the public for supporting it as these kinds of improvements and maintenance were vital to the City's excellent parks system.

Mayor McDavid understood this was one of the last projects from the 2010 park sales tax, and felt one of the reasons the Parks and Recreation Department was held in such high esteem in the community was because the staff kept the promises it made. Staff provided detailed lists of the project that would be completed with the money and kept their promises.

B379-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**OLD BUSINESS**

**B356-15     Levying a special assessment and authorizing the issuance of a special tax bill as it relates to the reconstruction of the sidewalk along the south side of Broadway, from Eighth Street to Ninth Street.**

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked for the reason they could not settle this dispute. Ms. Thompson replied she did not know the details as another member of her staff had been handling the issue. The concern at this time was that they had reached an impasse and considered the sidewalk assessment as a separate issue from the claim.

Mr. Thomas understood there was a 50-50 cost share when sidewalks were repaired in the downtown, and asked who initiated the project. Mr. Nichols replied the property owners generally brought sidewalk issues to City staff, and worked through the process for the 50-50 cost share. Mr. Thomas understood sidewalk maintenance and repairs in other parts of the City were generally expected to be paid 100 percent by the property owners. Mr. Nichols stated it was dependent on location. There had been a downtown policy for the 50-50 share for as long as he could remember. Mr. St. Romaine pointed out there were certain areas of the City, such as CDBG areas, whereby the City paid 100 percent if they were able to receive a grant. The central city policy had always been a 50-50 split with the property owner, and they generally came to the City asking for it. Mr. Thomas asked if the City could go to the property owners. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes, and provided the businesses along the Avenue of the Columns as an example. He noted that project had also included tax credits. Mr. Thomas asked if it also included the installation of sidewalks if there were places

in the downtown that sidewalks did not exist. Mr. St. Romaine thought the same policy could be used.

Arnold Fagan, 810 E. Broadway, provided a handout and explained, in 2010, the City had replaced a sidewalk on the south side of Broadway, between Eighth Street and Ninth Street. He explained he had worked with the previous City Manager and had convinced the neighboring property owners to assist with fixing the sidewalk as it was in bad shape. After the street and sidewalk had been torn up, the north side of his building adjacent to the construction work started flooding. He commented that he used to say he had the only dry basement in all of downtown Columbia, and had used the shelves on the north wall to store more than 100 boxes of paper files and records for the previous eleven years. He had addressed the leaking issue with various members of City staff and to the contractors, and had documented the problems. He noted he had been personally assured by City staff, to include Mr. Glascock, that they would not allow the work to damage his building. He stated he believed the contractors had cut corners to complete the project because they were fined for each day the project was late in completion and because they were under political pressure to finish the project before the start of the Roots N' Blues N' BBQ Festival, which had been sponsored by a bank on the same block. In areas, the work was performed correctly and there were no leaks, but in the areas the work was not completed to City specifications, water was channeling under the sidewalk into his building and continued to do so to this day. He explained the groundwater flowed around the adjacent waterproof building to find a way into his building, and he had to run a dehumidifier for 24-hours per day to keep the wall dry. He noted an engineer had indicated effervescent calcium was forming on the walls due to continued moisture penetration from street water. He stated Mr. Matthes and former council members, Mr. Kespohl and Mr. Schmidt, had visited his building due to this issue. He commented that the City had agreed it had damaged his property, and had directed staff to work out a deal with Mr. Fagan to make it right. It had been several years, and City staff had not felt the need to act. He stated he wanted the City to fix the problem and asked that the Council direct the City Manager to do what had been called for in the plans where there were vaults, which was to cut the section of sidewalk out, remove the debris from the vaults, close the openings with masonry blocks, waterproof the walls of the vaults adjacent to the building, pour a flowable fill into the old vaults, and repave the sidewalk per the specifications in the original construction documents. He felt this was work that should have been done in the first place, and if this work was done, he would be willing to accept the original tax bill. He commented that he would not seek reimbursement for attorney fees or damages either, if this could be resolved. He asked the Council to solve the problem created by the City.

Mayor McDavid commented that he had been on the Council when this issue had come up five years ago, and noted he did not recall the Council determining the City was at fault. He understood 4-5 property owners had benefitted from this sidewalk. He did not believe the Council had the expertise to determine the cause of the wet basement. He stated he would support this bill, and urged Mr. Fagan to go through the proper channels for determining who was at fault. If the City was at fault, the City would have to fix it like it did with any other project.

Ms. Peters asked what had been done to address whether the City had caused this problem or not. Since it had been five years, she thought they would have likely looked into this. Mr. Nichols replied Mr. Noce had been working with Mr. Fagan's attorney, and there had not been a satisfactory resolution to date. Ms. Peters asked if they knew whether there had been an engineering problem when the sidewalk was completed. Ms. Thompson replied that had not been determined at this point. Ms. Peters asked if it had been reviewed. Mr. Nichols replied staff was recommending a claim be filed so the investigation could occur. Ms. Peters understood this had not been investigated even though it had been five years. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala asked if this tax bill payment could be deferred until such time as there was a potential settlement reached. Ms. Thompson replied she thought the reason this was back before the City Council was because this issue could not be negotiated with Mr. Fagan at the staff level. She noted City staff believed a claim needed to be made for damages, and that this was separate from the tax bill. She explained City Code provisions mandated how tax bills were to be assessed. This particular tax bill had been lingering in the City Clerk's Office because staff had been directed to not assess it pending an attempt at a resolution or compromise between the parties. This had not been possible based upon those discussions and was the reason this back in front of the City Council. She believed the decision of Council was to either assess the tax bill or to not assess tax bill.

Ms. Peters asked if Mr. Fagan then needed to sue the City. Ms. Thompson replied he would need to file a claim, and this could be done against the contractor that performed the work or the City. The City could not really advise him as to what to do, but he had many options for resolution or remedy. She reiterated it had nothing to do with the tax bill. The issue regarding damages had become clouded with the tax bill issue, and the tax bill was a City Code requirement. In addition, every other property along that stretch had assisted in participation of the construction cost for the sidewalk. Ms. Peters commented that every other property owner did not have water in the basement. Ms. Thompson explained the City did not know that as they had not asked nor had they received any other complaints. Negotiating the tax bill based upon claims of damage put the Council in somewhat of an untenable position, and this was another reason staff felt the two issues needed to be separate. Staff thought Council should leave the claim issue up to the administration and claims process, while only addressing the fairness of the tax bill as it related to the cost of construction and processes and procedures in place for assessing those tax bills.

Ms. Peters asked who hired the construction company. Ms. Thompson replied the City had, pursuant to a bid award. Ms. Peters asked if the City was responsible for ensuring the contractor did what it was supposed to do. Ms. Thompson replied yes, and explained construction inspectors monitored the work and checked the construction activity. Ms. Peters asked if that was done and if the inspectors felt the work was adequate. Ms. Thompson replied she believed that to be the case.

The vote on B356-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: PETERS. ABSENT: NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B374-15 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to off-site parking facilities in C-2 zoning districts and for fraternity and sorority houses.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the 1,000 foot distance exceeded the limit of the longest peer site, and asked if that was because the City already had a 1,000 foot measurement in place. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He thought the original request of the representative of Delta Gamma was 500 feet or 600 feet. Staff had taken it upon itself to suggest 1,000 feet to the Planning and Zoning Commission since that measurement had already appeared in the ordinance for commercial uses. He pointed out the off-site parking area had to be within the Greek Town area limits as defined, and it could not be on the west side of Providence Road.

Mr. Thomas understood not all of the required parking would need to be on-site for the R-3 and R-4 zoning districts within Greek Town if this passed, and asked if any amount could be up to 1,000 feet away as long as it was within Greek Town. Mr. Teddy replied yes. Mr. Thomas understood outside of Greek Town, those properties within the R-3 and R-4 zoning districts would continue to require all parking be located on-site. He asked if there was any reason to not allow this flexibility to all R-3 and R-4 zoned properties. Mr. Teddy replied that was given some thought, but this was the area where they were seeing the demand for this type of solution. He thought the homogeneity of the area with over 24 fraternity and sororities in the area created less concern than a multi-family user generating parking in a more mixed density residential area.

Ms. Peters asked for an explanation of C-2 residential development. Mr. Teddy replied any new residential building in C-2 required parking at a rate of one space for every four bedrooms, and this requirement could be met off-site. It was part of the interim C-2 zoning amendments done about two years ago. In addition to the rate of one space for every four bedrooms, there were locational standards indicating the requirement could be met off-site, and this was the portion of the requirement that was being moved from Section 29-30 (b), which was the table of parking requirements, to Section 29-30(g), which was location of facilities. Ms. Peters asked if this applied to downtown as she understood there were no parking requirements for C-2 zoned properties. Mr. Teddy replied the one exception in terms of a parking requirement was for new apartment buildings, and those requirements could be met on- or off-site. New residential in an existing building would not have a parking requirement in the C-2 zoning district. It only applied to new buildings.

Mr. Thomas understood the Shakespeare's building planned to take advantage of the 1,000 foot rule. Mr. Teddy stated they had provided documentation indicating they had purchased reserve spaces in two different parking garages. He noted they were required to have 50 parking spaces.

Tom Harrison, an attorney with offices at 1103 E. Broadway, stated he represented the Delta Gamma sorority, and noted he and other representatives of Delta Gamma were present to answer any questions. He thanked the Council for its consideration of this bill.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, commented that while she recognized and appreciated this was confined to Greek Town, she feared this could become a creeping solution for the other side of campus. She explained the East Campus neighborhood hosted



at least eight fraternities and sororities and did not want to see this transposed in the future to all fraternities and sororities. She hoped stating this on the record would help prevent it from happening in the future.

Mayor McDavid stated he viewed this as a local solution to a local problem as Greek Town was fairly homogeneous, and the east side of College Avenue was not. He would think any future Council would view it in the same framework as Ms. Hammen had presented. He noted he would support this bill.

B374-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B376-15 Authorizing a joint funding agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if this had passed through the Water and Light Advisory Board. Mr. Johnsen replied there had been a lot of discussion on the Water and Light Advisory Board with regard to monitoring, the water quality samples, and the results, and the siting of wells had been reviewed with the Water and Light Advisory Board.

Mayor McDavid stated he viewed this as a requirement of service.

Mr. Thomas suggested they refer this to the Water and Light Advisory Board before moving forward with the contract as he had received a request from a member of the Water and Light Advisory Board to be able to review it. He understood there was a recommendation under source water protection monitoring to identify a chemical fingerprint of the water treatment in the wetlands, and there was an opportunity to modify the scope of work of this contract to address it.

Mr. Glascock stated the contract scope of work was from October 1 to September 30, and asked if they could proceed with the monitoring while the contract was reviewed. He thought any changes could be added later. He felt the monitoring needed to continue so they had the same data set they had for the last 20 years.

Mr. Thomas asked if this was a new contract for another five year period. Mr. Glascock replied this was for the second year. Mr. Thomas did not feel anything needed to stop at this time. He suggested they allow the Water and Light Advisory Board to review the scope of work before signing another contract.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to table B376-15 to the March 7, 2016 Council Meeting so the Water and Light Advisory Board could review it and recommend changes to the scope of work. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Thompson commented that the City could not authorize any action under the contract until the contract had been approved and funding was available. Mr. Glascock noted the contract was from October, 2015 to September, 2016. Ms. Thompson pointed out they were already in January, 2016.

Mr. Thomas understood they were already working under this contract that had not been approved by Council. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know if or when monitoring had started.

Ms. Peters asked if this could be approved while still allowing the Water and Light Advisory Board to review it so they could weigh in before it came to Council again. Mr. Johnsen replied that would be his preference, and noted staff could bring forward the recommendation of the Water and Light Advisory Board in terms of what changes they would like to see in the contract.

Mr. Skala suggested this be provided to the Environment and Energy Commission as well since they might have an opinion.

Mr. Thomas withdrew his motion, and Mr. Skala withdrew his second of Mr. Thomas' motion.

Mr. Thomas understood this would be on the Water and Light Advisory Board meeting agenda for February. Mr. Johnson stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid commented that he thought it was important for the monitoring to be done seasonally and timely as they did not want seasonal variations affecting monitoring.

B376-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B377-15     Appropriating funds for integrated water resource planning services.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if an RFP had been issued for this contract. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. Mr. Thomas asked if the contract had been awarded. Mr. Johnsen replied no. Mr. Thomas asked if the RFP had been provided in the supporting documentation. Mr. Johnsen replied the scope of services had been included in the supporting documentation. Mr. Thomas asked if staff had decided to whom the contract would be awarded. Mr. Johnsen replied the City was still in the evaluation phase, so they could not disclose who had bid or who the leading candidate was at this time. Staff had provided the Council the scope of services so they knew what staff expected to achieve with the contract. The funding estimate was based upon who they thought would be the successful bidder. Mr. Thomas understood the purpose of this bill was to make the money available so they could award the contract. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Johnsen to summarize the specific skills and experience a consultant would bring to this particular work. Mr. Johnsen replied a lot of plans and studies had been completed, and they were looking for a firm that was proficient with interfacing and communicating with the public and preparing a concise plan based upon all of the input from staff, the community, etc. This would be a fairly long and extensive project, and they would need someone that had done something like this previously. He explained this was the first time the City would go through this process related to water.

Mr. Thomas understood the committee they had approved by resolution at the last meeting would work with the consultant and oversee the scope of services. Mr. Johnsen

stated they would work directly with the consultant. It would be similar to the process they had done for electric, so staff, the committee, and the consultant would work together. Mr. Thomas asked how long he anticipated the project taking. Mr. Johnsen replied they were hoping the plan document would be completed by the end of the year.

Mr. Trapp stated he liked the idea of an integrated resource plan (IRP) as it had worked well with electric. He noted he had received constituent feedback regarding the perception that the City tended to hire a lot of consultants and that \$450,000 was a lot of money. He explained he understood it was a huge undertaking to look at the total system, and that they were putting themselves in the position to save even more than that amount of money if they could avoid building another expensive water treatment plant or even expanding the existing plant. He believed the scope of work was good, and that this was a thoughtful approach in determining how they could position themselves for the future. He noted he planned to support it.

Mayor McDavid commented that the City had been criticized for the lack of planning, and although the City had highly professional staff, third-party, outside expertise was needed on complex items. He stated he thought this was a great proposal.

Mr. Skala stated he believed great outcomes had come from the IRP for electric. He noted his support for conservation and the use of gray water as it could save taxpayers money.

B377-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B385-15 Authorizing a property transfer agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri relating to City-owned property located at the corner of Fifth Street and Locust Street.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid explained he had been contacted by Gary Ward, Vice Chancellor of the University of Missouri, because their legal team preferred a warranty deed as they wanted a guarantee the City actually owned the land in clear title. He understood this was a time sensitive transaction, and on that basis, he suggested they amend the item per the amendment sheet as it would transfer the land via a warranty deed.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B385-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala asked for the distinction between a warranty deed and a quit claim deed, and whether it would expose the taxpayer or the City to any liability. Ms. Thompson replied the City would warrant and defend the title with a warranty deed, but the City would pass along the title it currently had with a quit claim deed without making any warranty or insurance as to title. Since this was not a cash transaction, and was simply the transfer of title, the suggestion was to transfer what the City had in the property via quit claim deed. She understood the University wanted a warranty deed, and if the Council was so inclined, a warranty deed could be granted. She pointed out this was a bit complicated in terms of transferring the alley because the City needed to go through a street vacation process as the

City did not currently have fee simple title to the alley. She noted the amendment would provide for the transfer of both properties via a warranty deed and that the transfer would be subject to any existing utility easements. Mr. Skala understood it meant more work. Ms. Thompson stated it was not only a matter of more work as it put the City at more risk. The City had not completed a title investigation to know the history of these properties. She explained there were one or two pieces of the parking garage tract that had been taken by condemnation, and the City did not have any warranties from the prior owners they could pass along. The warranties only transferred for the pieces by which the transfer was done by a warranty deed. They did not have warranty deeds for those pieces transferred by condemnation or for the alley. Mr. Skala asked if a warranty deed was common. Ms. Thompson replied yes and explained a warranty deed was how one would typically transfer property. She noted quit claim deeds were also common. She commented that special warranty deeds were used to transfer and warrant title for the time the property had been owned by the particular entity transferring it. The title history was not warranted in that situation. She stated the question was who bore the risk and responsibility, and who bore the burden of showing the title was good in terms of costs.

Ms. Peters asked why a title search had not been done when this had been on-going for about four years, and why it needed to be addressed today in terms of time sensitivity. Mayor McDavid replied it was time sensitive due to the bond sale, which had to be done within the month. He commented that this was a fragile process with many people involved in putting this together. Ms. Peters stated she did not believe a title search was fragile, and there had been four years to get it done. Ms. Thompson explained the City did not have a legal description for the property either as it had never been subdivided. The lot with the parking garage involved a series of tracts, and the garage had been constructed over lot lines on a series of tracts and partial tracts. The commitment via a non-binding memorandum of understanding signed four years ago involved the remainder of the tracts, which had not had any title work or survey work done on it. Today, they were in a rush due to funding obligations from the State of Missouri for the State Historical Society project.

Ms. Peters stated she had heard about this last month, and asked why there had not been time to do this properly. Ms. Thompson replied it had come to her as a parking transfer agreement, and she had not been aware of the actual transfer of real estate until mid-December. The title search had not been part of the process or examination for the purposes of the transfer. She explained they first needed to work out the transfer and determine whether the Council actually wanted to transfer the property. Afterward, the other details would be worked out.

Mr. St. Romaine explained the original memorandum of understanding was non-binding and was an attempt to find a way to accommodate the loss of parking at the University. The initial negotiations in December between the City and the University were to accommodate parking in other ways than this lot. He stated they thought they might have had another solution by accommodating some parking at the Fifth Street and Walnut Street parking garage and the Sixth Street and Cherry Street parking garage. It was only recently that the discussions had turned into an agreement to transfer property. Mayor McDavid stated he was not sure that was accurate as he thought the transfer of property has been

clear when the memorandum had been agreed to in March of 2011. Mr. St. Romaine explained that was true, but noted recent discussions had changed the focus.

Mayor McDavid noted the memorandum of understanding had come up out of the blue when the City had an interim city manager. He understood the former city manager had negotiated it. He also understood it had been a sensitive situation as the location would be on University land, and the University did not want to give up their land. They ultimately had agreed to give up some land if the City would backfill the other portion. He commented that the City had basically said it was dismissing the value of the property because the City as a whole was better off with the Missouri State Historical Society structure. He explained he had agreed to it on that basis, and pointed out it was not certain in 2011 that they would receive funding. He noted the funding came through, but it was not clear the funding would stay.

Ms. Peters agreed it was an advantage to the City to have the State Historical Society structure in Columbia, but stated she was frustrated the City would be liable because they had not had time to do the title search. Mayor McDavid noted the garage was built on portions of these lots so there would be an issue with the garage if there were any questions regarding ownership of the lots. Mr. St. Romaine stated he thought the question was who would do the work. A quit claim deed was a valid way to transfer property. The question was whether the City or the University did all of the necessary work to provide title.

Mayor McDavid stated he had not been involved in negotiations, but those he had spoken to at the University had told him that their Legal Department was requiring a warranty deed for this transaction.

Mr. Skala commented that there were several time sensitive issues involved. In addition to the bonding piece, there were political issues as they wanted to ensure this happened. He commented that the State Historical Society, which was in the University of Missouri library, was consistent with the Sasaki Plan and other plans with regard to a museum district in that area. As a result, he thought it was reasonable to assess the risk for this property, and that it needed to be balanced with the risk of this not happening. He believed the economic benefit outweighed the risk.

Mayor McDavid noted they needed to vote on the motion to amend B385-15 per the amendment sheet, which basically indicated the City would convey a warranty deed. Ms. Thompson pointed out it also added the description of the two pieces of property in B-1 and B-2. She noted the University still needed to provide a legal description for the University property.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B385-15 per the amendment sheet was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid asked if this transfer was contingent upon a culmination of the State Historical Society building being constructed. Ms. Thompson replied it provided for the transfer of property no sooner than 90 days and no less than 30 days prior to the construction commencement date. Since the State Historical Society was not a party to the agreement, it did not specifically address occupancy and operation. It only discussed construction of the building. Mayor McDavid asked if the City was protected. Ms. Thompson replied she thought the City could be better protected, but this was what was before the Council and it met the terms of the memorandum of understanding for transfer.

Gary Kremer stated he was the Director of the State Historical Society and explained there was urgency involving this as the Missouri Development Finance Board (MDFB), which would ultimately issue the bonds, was insisting they have everything to them by the end of the month. He noted they had been talking about this for a long time, and what had prompted this discussion four years ago was the suggestion the State Historical Society be moved from Columbia to Jefferson City to the prison as part of the prison redevelopment. He explained he felt the State Historical Society needed to be situated in close proximity to a major research institution, and pointed out they had been here since 1898. He stated he did not want to get into the issue of warranty deeds and quit claim deeds as he only wanted to move forward. He reiterated the MDFB would not proceed until they had signed agreements from all of the parties involved on all of the issues involved. He asked the Council to approve the resolution.

Mr. Thomas asked if there would be a public museum as part of the new facility. Mr. Kremer replied yes, and explained it was currently a public museum. In addition, they were prohibited from charging admission per state statute. He stated he thought there would be a dramatic increase in the number of people coming to use the facility and it would become a destination. He pointed out they could display less than one-quarter of one percent of art in the current facility. Also, since parking was horrendous, school kids were unable to visit. He thought this new facility would benefit the citizens of Columbia and of the State of Missouri.

Brian Burnett explained he was the University of Missouri System Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, and noted the Curators of the University of Missouri had given him permission to execute a 99 year lease on the property for this project subject to the City of Columbia following through with the deal made in 2011. He stated he came from the State of Colorado, and the building they had built similar to this had been phenomenal for the history of Colorado. He encouraged the Council to think about what this meant for Columbia, the State of Missouri, and the students of the future in understanding the history of Missouri. He commented that time was of the essence as there were four separate agreements between the Mizzou campus, the State Historical Society, the Curators, as the fiscal agent of the State Historical Society, and the City. He noted the Curators were the intermediary with the State and the Mizzou campus.

Ms. Peters asked about the size of the building, how much would be able to be displayed, and a time frame for when the building would be completed. Mr. Burnett replied programming with the architects had just started today. The lot the Curators were dedicating to this would be about twice the size of the land the City would be giving back to the Curators. He stated they were hoping for 100,000 square feet as they had 35,000 square feet at Ellis now, but it was dependent on the cost. The State bonding authority was at \$35 million, and they were looking at a budget of \$35-\$40 million.

Mr. Thomas asked if it would be a multi-story building. Mr. Burnett replied he thought it would be multi-story, and noted they would try to fit it in with the architecture of campus. He reiterated they would not be able to get the MDFB to execute the bonds if they could not show they had all of the agreements in place.

Mayor McDavid stated he would enthusiastically endorse this as he believed this was a generational opportunity. He looked forward to the completion of the museum.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not on the Council when this non-binding promise had been made, but believed it was important. He understood there was some risk, which had been described, but felt it would also be risky to not move forward with this as there would be economic and cultural benefits. He stated he was happy to support it.

Mr. Trapp commented that he was pleased to see the State Legislature had come through with this funding. He noted the State Historical Society had given the Council a tour and had explained their vision for the building a few years ago. He thought they would be amenable to doing the same for anyone interested. He believed it was important to keep this resource in Columbia and felt it would add to the ambiance of downtown. He understood the desire to do what was best for Columbia in terms of alternatives to the transfer of this property as it would allow for the State Historical Society building to proceed while still owning a valuable piece of land, but it was most important for them to honor their relationships and move forward to ensure the project occurred.

Mr. Ruffin stated he thought they needed to remember this was an important aspect of economic development for the community as it was bound to generate an increase in income, tourism, etc. He noted he had used the Historical Society resources for many years, and could attest to how difficult it was to navigate and access the collection. In addition, now that he had retired, parking was an issue. He championed the project and looked forward to seeing its completion.

B385-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B386-15 Amending Chapter 9 of the City Code as it relates to fire sprinkler systems in fraternity and sorority buildings.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Chief White provided a staff report.

Tom O'Neal commented that in his spare time he assisted the Kappa Alpha Order Fraternity, which was on the corner of College Avenue and University Avenue. He explained they had conducted a feasibility study right before the market had crashed to determine if they could raise enough money to renovate the house and include sprinklers as it would cost about \$1 million. Due to the recession, their fundraising had been put on hold. Last year, they updated their feasibility study, and thought they could still raise \$1 million. As a result, they had started construction plans and were hopeful they could start renovations in the summer of 2017. He commented that he had yet to meet with a banker so there was a chance the project would not start until 2018. He pointed out they had installed a central alarm system when they realized they would have to delay the fundraising campaign. He asked the Council to pass this bill, and noted he looked forward to working with the Fire Department.

Scott Evans explained he was the Chapter Director for Sigma Pi Fraternity and thought most of what he had planned to discuss might be more appropriate to discuss with the Fire Department should this proposed bill pass tonight. He stated they needed a variance to their annex as they rented from a landlord that had not planned on installing a sprinkler

system. The fraternity had placed 18 people in the annex, and this exceeded the 16 person limit for the sprinkler system requirement. They thought they would not have an issue getting down to 16 people, but they had not had any attrition this year. He noted they had plans in place when renegotiating the lease for the landlord to install the sprinkler system and would increase rent to help offset some of the costs to the landlord as this was important to them, but that would not be done until August. He stated their fraternity house was compliant, and they only needed a variance for the annex until August of 2015.

Mayor McDavid understood it was a challenge for some houses to come up with the money to meet the fire code, and this would create a process whereby they could talk to the professionals to work any issues out. He was confident this process would work.

Mr. Skala stated he was willing to agree to these options as they had been recommended by the Fire Chief for an interim time period until they were compliant.

B386-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

- B373-15      Approving the Final Plat of Bear Creek Vistas – Plat 1 located on the east side of Creasy Springs Road and north of Prairie Lane (3628 N. Creasy Springs Road); granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction.**
  
- B375-15      Authorizing construction of upgrades to Boiler 8 at the Municipal Power Plant to reduce nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.**
  
- B378-15      Accepting conveyances for utility, sewer, temporary construction and drainage purposes.**
  
- B380-15      Appropriating funds for parks projects at Atkins Baseball Complex, Douglass Park, Gans Creek Recreation Area, McKee Street Park, Nifong Park and Southeast Regional Park.**
  
- B381-15      Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding a cashier position in the Finance Department – Treasury Division; transferring funds.**
  
- B382-15      Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for the Live Well Boone County pilot program; amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding positions in the Public Health and Human Services Department; appropriating funds.**
  
- B383-15      Appropriating funds from the 2015 Poster Party for the Arts event.**
  
- B384-15      Accepting a donation from the Missouri Division of Tourism to be used by the Convention and Visitors Bureau to offset expenses associated with travel writers attending the 2016 True/False Film Festival; appropriating funds.**
  
- R1-16        Setting a public hearing: construction of the Manor Drive stormwater improvement project.**



- R2-16      Setting a public hearing: determining if the Regency Hotel tax increment financing redevelopment plan and project is making satisfactory progress under the proposed time schedule contained within the approved plans for completion of such project.
- R3-16      Transferring Council Reserve funds to support the Room at the Inn program that provides emergency shelter services for unsheltered homeless persons.
- R4-16      Authorizing an operations agreement with Ragtag Programming for Film and Media Art for the 2016 True False Film Festival.

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

- B1-16      Accepting conveyances for street, sewer, utility, drainage, sidewalk and temporary construction purposes.
- B2-16      Accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B3-16      Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation for a Tree Resource Improvement and Maintenance (TRIM) grant to provide advanced forestry training and education for Parks and Recreation Department employees; appropriating funds.
- B4-16      Calling a municipal election for Council Member-at-large (Mayor) and Council Members for Wards 3 and 4.
- B5-16      Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for physician services.
- B6-16      Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for child care health consultation.
- B7-16      Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B8-16      Appropriating funds for Share the Light Program.
- B9-16      Rezoning property located on the west side of Peach Court and approximately 600 feet south of Nifong Boulevard from District C-1 to District C-P; changing the uses allowed on C-P zoned property located on the west side of Peach Court and southwest of Peachtree Drive; approving the C-P Development Plan of Mill Creek Substation; approving less stringent outdoor lighting requirements.
- B10-16      Amending Chapter 23 of the City Code as it relates to the attachment of banners to city street light standards.

**B11-16      Authorizing a banner attachment agreement with the Business Loop Community Improvement District for the installation of banners along Business Loop 70, between Poplar Street and Creasy Springs Road.**

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

**REP1-16      Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Directors - Membership Change Due to Resignation.**

Mayor McDavid made a motion to appoint Steve Guthrie to the Downtown Community Improvement District Board of Directors to a term expiring in February 2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP2-16      Correspondence from the Parks and Recreation Commission regarding Liaison to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission.**

Mr. Thomas commented that as he had read this, it appeared as though a Parks and Recreation Department staff member would actually be a member of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission. Mayor McDavid thought that person would be a non-voting member. Mr. Thomas asked if there were other examples of staff members being non-voting members of commissions. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes, and pointed out there were three ex-officio non-voting staff members on the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to draft legislation approving the change requested by Parks and Recreation Commission in terms of membership on the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission.

**REP3-16      Text Amendment pertaining to Private Outdoor Swim and Tennis Clubs.**

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if the structure on the east side of town, south of I-70, was an air inflated building. Mr. Teddy replied he had been in that structure and understood there was a superstructure to it. It would have been built in accordance with the International Building Codes. This one would be limited to 180 days so it would be a seasonal structure and would involve the same part of the Fire Code that dealt with tents. There was a tiered approach to the construction requirements. The dome structure was required to have a minimum of two exits and more exits as the occupancy level increased, self-closing doors to limit air leakage, etc.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to prepare necessary text changes and to refer the matter to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP4-16      Smart Growth Parking Recommendations Follow-Up.**

Mr. Thomas explained the City had received free technical assistance from Smart Growth America, a well-respected non-profit organization, in September. It included a study of parking in the downtown and adjacent neighborhoods, and a visioning of how they wanted to handle parking and transportation as downtown Columbia grew in density. He commented that they found there was enormous availability in the ten-hour spaces, which were further on the edge of downtown. In addition, there was over-occupancy in the East Campus and

Benton Stephens neighborhoods as there were more cars were parked on those blocks than could be accommodated. He thought the overall message of the consultant was that there were a lot of things they could do to reduce parking demand before they needed to increase parking supply. Recommendations included forming a parking commission, conducting a mode-share analysis, setting mode-share goals for the City, expanding the existing transportation demand management programs to encourage and reinforce behaviors of not using single occupancy vehicles, and developing an access and circulation plan. He felt the City should move forward in some way on each of the recommendations, and believed the most important one was to set up a parking commission or task force to oversee the implementation of all of these recommendations.

Mr. Trapp commented that if they moved forward with a parking task force, it would provide them time to review and update the report they had previously received regarding boards and commissions. He did not believe they wanted to expand the footprint of boards and commissions, and should consolidate or eliminate boards and commissions if they were going to add more so they did not continue to add staff time to boards and commissions. He pointed out some of the building trades commissions historically had a lot of openings, and recalled a recommendation to consolidate them. He understood there had been push back from those on the commissions and they had indicated they would do more in terms of recruitment, but he had not seen it. He suggested staff update the report so Council had time to weigh the overall board and commission structure, and to create a task force instead of a permanent commission in the meantime.

Mayor McDavid stated he agreed with the point made by Mr. Trapp regarding boards and commissions as some did not meet very often or have a full slate of members. He thought they should question the existence of those boards and commissions that could not meet quorum or had continual vacancies. In terms of this parking issue, he thought they might benefit from a commission because parking was very dynamic due to technology. He commented that 20-years from now, they would look at their smartphones to determine where parking spots were located, pay for parking, and be reminded of when time at that space was expiring. He believed the decisions they made today would likely not be relevant 3-5 years from now. He stated he thought some of the information from the audit was interesting. It appeared they had enough parking capacity except for Friday and Saturday nights when the City did not charge for parking. The utilization of the parking garages was low. He felt a commission was justifiable since there were enough current issues and because there would be on-going issues as downtown continued to change, and believed the difficulty would be determining who should be on the task force or commission.

Mr. Thomas commented that he believed the technology opportunities mentioned by Mayor McDavid were important, but he wanted to ensure they did not lose track of traffic management and parking, which was main focus of the workshop. They needed to determine how they would address the demand for parking, which involved transit, pedestrian connectivity, etc.

Mayor McDavid reiterated he thought how the commission was populated would be a challenge because they had very different local interests. The neighborhoods had specific issues, and those issues were different than the specific issues of the downtown. He

suggested they ask those groups for recommendations for how they would populate a commission. Mr. Thomas stated it needed to clearly represent all of the relevant stakeholders. Mayor McDavid thought the Missouri Students Association, the University of Missouri administration, the East Campus neighborhood, the Benton Stephens neighborhood, the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID), and others needed to be involved. Mr. Thomas commented that he thought the initial focus of the group, whether a task force or a permanent commission, needed to be to study and follow-up with these recommendations. He suggested they call it a parking and traffic management commission. Mayor McDavid asked if they could ask these diverse groups for their recommendations on the composition of the commission. Mr. Thomas replied he thought staff could communicate with the stakeholders and provide a proposal for how the commission would be populated.

Mr. Skala agreed with Mr. Thomas in that the focus should be on demand instead of supply. He commented that he did not agree with the Mr. Trapp with regard to boards and commissions, and felt they should establish a permanent commission if there was a good reason for its creation. He believed the issue of parking and traffic management might be a good reason to create a commission. He understood the City planned to address parking in neighborhoods, such as Benton Stephens soon so he did not believe there was a rush to establish a permanent commission. He commented that he agreed with Mayor McDavid in that smartphones would likely be involved in the future, but pointed out they could not forget those people that did not utilize that technology. He thought they should take these considerations seriously, but felt they should proceed cautiously instead of endorsing the recommendations outright.

Mr. Thomas suggested creating a twelve month parking and traffic management task force to work through the recommendations from the workshop, and noted they would create a proposal for a permanent commission later if necessary. Mayor McDavid suspected the task force would see the value of a long-term commission.

Mayor McDavid asked if they should contact the stakeholders he had previously mentioned to recommend how they would constitute a task force. Mr. Thomas replied he thought the step should be for staff to interview different stakeholders to come up with a proposal for the make-up of the task force. Mayor McDavid pointed out the initial proposal of the Downtown CID was for them to have four seats on a seven member commission. Mr. Thomas agreed they needed to find a balance. He suggested e-mailing all of the people that had participated in the workshop, which had represented most of the groups that had been mentioned. Mayor McDavid thought they could use the last task force as a template as well.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to provide a report to Council on the constitution of a parking and traffic management task force. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Trapp understood they would leave the other recommendations to the task force. Mr. Thomas stated he thought that would be best.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought a system for measuring mode share consistently was an important part of this, and that goals should be set for the future in terms of those mode shares. He thought this could be done by the transit consultant, and asked if

this could be added to that contract. Mr. Nichols thought this could be discussed with the consultant once they got underway with the scope of work of the existing contract.

Mr. Thomas stated GetAbout Columbia worked to encourage and educate the use of alternative modes, but he did not think they worked with the University, its students association, or other large employers, and felt the task force should look at other communities with these types of programs to see if it was something that could be done. He commented that he did not believe the access and circulation plan needed to be implemented immediately, but he thought it would be important to obtain data with regard to how many of the people that moved and lived downtown brought cars with them and how many might not bring cars if there was a better public transportation systems, etc. He felt this was something the task force needed to explore as well.

Mayor McDavid commented that one of his biggest disappointments over the past six years in office was the failure to engage the University students and administration with transit. He felt the task force or commission with representation would be a way to invite them to the table. Mr. Thomas agreed and noted students were very concerned about parking as it was a hassle for them as well. He understood the survey completed by the University a few years ago had indicated the majority of students wanted a better bus service and were willing to pay more for it. Mayor McDavid thought they were willing to pay \$25 per semester, which was virtually insignificant as the market was \$80 per semester per student. He felt the job of the next administration, the next council and this task force was to address that issue and to try to engage them. He noted they were paying a lot more than that for parking.

**REP5-16     Interim Report from Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety.**

Mr. Thomas commented that there were 30,000 traffic deaths and four million serious injuries nationally, and Vision Zero was a strategy that indicated these deaths were not necessary, safety should be the number one factor in designing the transportation system, and this could be done without unduly slowing down mobility. He stated the Task Force had been impressed by Ms. Triplett's presentation, and he suspected there would be a recommendation to adopt a Vision Zero policy and strategy when the Task Force submitted its report to Council in March.

**REP6-16     2015 Infrastructure Report.**

Mayor McDavid commented that he thought this report was well done and was a great starting point for future council members, those on boards and commission, etc. He thought it was an essential learning tool.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed. He viewed it similarly to the Budget 101 video in that it was a high level view. At some point, they needed to get to how much it would cost and how it would be paid for, which was a charge of the Task Force on Infrastructure. He felt this was a tremendous interface between the public and the City in an attempt to explain a complicated issue.

**REP7-16     FY 2015 Volunteer Hours to the City of Columbia.**

Mayor McDavid commented that the amount of volunteerism in Columbia was great. This report showed hours associated with the City of Columbia, but citizens volunteered for other organizations throughout the City as well.

Mr. Trapp stated it would be helpful to have historical context with regard to volunteer hours. Mr. Teddy understood a five or ten year summary was wanted. Mr. Trapp stated that would be great.

**REP8-16     Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification with regard to a transfer of \$50,000 associated with the widening of Forum Boulevard to five lanes. He wanted to know which project this was in reference to and why the money was being transferred. Mr. St. Romaine replied he did not know at this time, and would get back to him.

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Tom Leuther, 104 Dene Drive, asked how much money the City was giving Room at the Inn. Mr. Ruffin replied \$3,500.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, explained Columbia had lost another member due to cancer in the last few days that had fallen into homelessness. She had been able to pass away in her own bed as she had been provided a place to live three weeks earlier.

Mr. Elkin asked if income from the natural gas station and the airport could be reported to the public in the future.

Mr. Elkin thanked all of the volunteers in Columbia, and stated he believed volunteerism was important.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he believed the community had the right to decide what kind of policing it wanted. He thought the community should be involved on an equal basis with the Police Department in setting a mission, a vision, strategies, goals, policies, methods of oversight, budget allocations, etc. as he felt that was the definition of community policing. It was a philosophy and approach that emphasized shared decision-making authority over core structures, goals, etc. He believed the presentation made by the Police Department during the pre-council meeting was not shared as it did not have any meaningful input, and felt this was their way to keep control over policing, policy, etc. He reiterated the community had the right to decide the kind of policing it wanted. He suggested the Council reject the approach presented by the Police Department and adopt a philosophy and approach to community policing as he had outlined. He thought they should ensure community input, and believed this would improve trust, long-term public support, recruiting, retention, moral, etc. Community policing was not only about the on the ground people, and the money was in the budget to get started on this approach now.

Ms. Peters commented that the number of volunteer hours had been impressive, and congratulated those involved.

Mr. Thomas commented that he endorsed everything Mr. Clark had stated regarding community policing in that the entire community needed to be engaged in the strategic planning process. He thought the fact the Police Department had responded to the 21st Century Policing report by the President's Task Force was a good sign. He stated he would have appreciated knowing that was in process, and asked staff to keep the Council informed of similar things that were in the works so they could answer questions from the public more accurately.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been a change in the federal government's treatment of the Missouri driver's license, and asked if that would impact people getting through the security at airports. Mr. St. Romaine replied they did not know at this time. He noted he had read that the federal government would give states a 180 day notice so those affected could get passports.

Mr. Skala asked for staff to provide a report regarding homelessness. He explained he had distributed several resources to Mr. Matthes and the Council through Ms. Amin. He commented that Salt Lake City, Utah, had reached a remarkable level with regard to homelessness, and communities that became involved in the issue tended to start out from the view of veterans, which then morphed into general homelessness. Columbia had achieved some measure of success with homeless veterans as the Columbia Housing Authority was involved in constructing a building in that regard. He noted he had received data with regard to homelessness and listed those numbers. He urged everyone to watch a video he had shared with them and had posted on his Facebook site as it discussed a public-private partnership and start-up homes. He reiterated his request for a report and asked that related information be made available to the public as he suspected there was a desire to help some of Columbia's less fortunate citizens.

Mr. Trapp commented that a series of meetings had been held regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. The fourth meeting had been scheduled to January 12, but a room was not available so it needed to be rescheduled. He asked the public to keep an eye out for information regarding the revised meeting date, and noted a press release would be issued.

Mr. Trapp stated he appreciated the attempt of the Police Department to digest the recommendation of the President's Task Force. Since each chapter had been written by a different lieutenant, the voices were very different. He appreciated Chief Burton allowing divergent voices with regard to administration as it allowed for a healthy dialogue about community policing. He understood there were inherently controversial items associated with community policing. He noted a lot of progress had been made, but a lot of work was left to be done. He believed there was a huge disconnect between where Columbia was and where the community expected Columbia to be. He explained there had been some efforts to involve the community, but not to the extent as described by Mr. Clark. He noted he loved the idea of increasing public participation. He stated they had involved the community in the interviewing of the community outreach officers, and had heard some willingness in the report

to involve community members with regard to training, which was referenced in one of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. The report showed a good cognizance of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence and the process of working toward accreditation as a lot policies and procedures needed to be reviewed, developed, and implemented. He thought a lot of good things were happening. He pointed out it was not a top down directive-based approach as there were a lot of initiatives that were percolating through the Police Department. He understood the Police Department was re-tooling the way they communicated, and he believed this would improve how they did things and how they told their story.

Mr. Trapp noted his appreciation for Mr. Skala bringing up the issue of homelessness as it was an important issue. He pointed out he was involved with those efforts, and the cities that had ended chronic and veteran homelessness had done so through the leadership of the Veterans Administration. The Truman V.A. Hospital was leading a similar community-wide effort in Columbia, and the Functional Zero Task Force had met this morning. He explained Functional Zero was the idea of what it meant to end homelessness. It meant there would be a shelter bed for anyone in need, and that no one stayed in a shelter bed for more than 90 days. Another way to look at it was to determine how many people needed housing and how many housing opportunities had been created, and if the number of opportunities exceeded the number of people needing housing, they would be at zero. He pointed out shelter services would likely always be needed, and there would likely also be people in the streets due to choices made. He noted they could do better, and noted they were working to do better. He explained they would like to create a list of chronic homeless people, homeless veterans, etc. and try to move them quickly into shelter or permanent housing by using the resources that already existed within the community. He commented that Steve Hollis in the Health and Human Services Department was representing the City with regard to these efforts and had been pushing independent service providers that had State of Missouri funding to address issues around housing and homelessness to work together for a community-wide coordinated outreach program. He noted more shelter services were coming online, and people would be living in the Patriot Place in March. He understood the Welcome Home capital campaign was doing well also. He pointed out Room at the Inn was in need of volunteers if anyone was interested. He commented that the fundamental driver of family homelessness was the lack of affordable housing, and they were working on some long-range items in that regard also.

Mr. Ruffin stated he believed 2016 would be a great year as many initiatives with lasting impacts on quality of life would come forward and move them closer to social equity. He commented that he was pleased to hear the Police Department's report regarding the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing today, and his only disappointment was that the presentations seemed to be rushed as he had lots of questions regarding the implementation of some of the initiatives. He commented that the three strategic areas that had been identified would benefit from community policing initiatives and would result in engagement in those areas at the same level of dialogue as recommended by Mr. Clark. He



thought that would create an opportunity to have many of their questions answered, and it would hopefully move Columbia closer towards its vision of what this City should become.

The meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk