

**MINUTES**

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI**  
**DECEMBER 21, 2009**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, December 21, 2009, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER and HOPPE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting of December 7, 2009 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Thornhill and a second by Ms. Nauser.

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

Mr. Wade made a motion to move B354-09 from the Consent Agenda to Old Business and to add B382-09, B383-09, B384-09, B385-09 and B386-09 to Introduction and First Reading. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, as amended, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Wade.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Jeff Stack: Collective Community Response to Homelessness.**

Jeff Stack stated he was the Coordinator of the Mid-Missouri Fellowship of Reconciliation and noted there would be dozens of homeless people weathering the cold this season without shelter. At least two homeless people perished from exposure last winter in Columbia and he wondered how many more would perish if ignored this winter. He asked the citizens of Columbia to offer a bed, sofa or spare room for the homeless citizens within the community. Last night, he had to turn away six people from the St. Frances House because it was full. He stated he wanted to help get a shelter started in cooperation with the City and suggested making the Armory, a church or a business available. He noted he would be willing to volunteer at least one night a week for free and believed there were others who would be willing to help as well. It was beneficial for the City because individuals without shelter became people who might commit petty crimes out of desperation. He asked the Council to help find a solution.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**B368-09      Authorizing the construction of improvements at Paquin Park – Phase III; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted this would authorize the third and final phase of improvements to Paquin Park, and included replacing the gravel surface around the raised planter boxes with concrete, rebuilding the wooden raised garden planter boxes, erecting a security fence, and removing stairs that did not meet ADA requirements. The total project cost was estimated at \$30,000 and would be funded through the 2005 parks sales tax program.

Mr. Skala asked about feedback received from the community regarding the project. Mr. Hood replied there had been several planning meetings since 2004, and they had met with residents of the neighborhood, residents of Paquin Tower, the Paquin Tower Recreation Council and users of the garden area. He noted the Paquin Tower Recreation Council had endorsed the proposed plan.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Nauser asked if the dusk to dawn lights would be removed. Mr. Hood replied no.

B368-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B369-09 Authorizing the construction of improvements at American Legion Park; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this would authorize staff to proceed with improvements to the two baseball fields adjacent to the parking areas at American Legion Park, and included renovation of the large field in its current configuration and a complete reconstruction and enlargement of the smaller baseball field. He believed this was a good start, but noted there would ultimately be other phases. The biggest needs were baseball fields in good, playable shape. The project cost was estimated at about \$200,000.

Mr. Hood commented that the need to do these renovations had been identified in 2004 and 2005. There was some negotiation with Columbia Professional Baseball in 2006, and because they thought the two ball fields might be lost, the funds scheduled for American Legion had been moved to the construction of the two new Atkins baseball fields. He noted that since the American Legion fields received a lot of use and the plans by Columbia Professional Baseball had been put on an indeterminate hold, staff felt it was important to keep the fields in quality condition.

Ms. Hoppe understood fifteen larger trees would be removed in order to enlarge the smaller field and asked for clarification regarding the intent to replant some of the trees. Mr. Hood explained the baseball groups indicated an interest in a field that was about 250 feet down the foul lines, which required a slight expansion of the small field. The trees being removed were a variety of species and not extremely large, so they thought it was feasible to replant a larger number than would be removed and intended to have a strong buffer along the eastern boundary of the park.

Mr. Sturtz noted the staff report indicated a letter had recently been sent to the Mavericks and asked if they had received a response. Mr. Hood replied they had not

received a response. Mr. Sturtz felt a \$200,000 investment that would need to be paid back would be a disincentive with regard to them wanting to develop the land. Mr. Hood stated he felt it would be a consideration, but did not believe the percentage was very high for a multi-million dollar stadium.

Mayor Hindman noted he had received a call from Gary Wendt about a month ago indicating interest and suggested talking to Mr. Wendt prior to starting the project.

Mr. Skala thought they should follow up with Mr. Wendt prior to moving forward due to his contact with Mayor Hindman.

Mr. Wade believed this project was independent of Gary Wendt and the Mavericks as that involved a different decision process.

Ms. Nauser asked what the 2006 agreement with Gary Wendt involved. Mr. Hood replied he believed the document entered into was a three-way memorandum of understanding between the City, Columbia Professional Baseball and the American Legion and was not binding on any party. The City would provide the land through a long-term lease and the Mavericks would build a minor league stadium and make improvements to the American Legion facility. Ms. Nauser asked if there was a deadline associated with the memorandum of understanding. Mr. Hood replied he was not sure.

Mr. Thornhill asked for the timeframe associated with this project. Mr. Hood replied work would begin in late winter if the weather allowed.

Mayor Hindman suggested they authorize this since they would not start until late winter and because it was a needed improvement, but if they found there was a serious opportunity with regard to the Mavericks, he believed they should consider it. He asked if they would be letting contracts for this project or if it would be done in-house. Mr. Hood replied it would be a combination. The first stage would likely involve City crews removing the existing fence. They would then bring in an earthwork contractor. Mayor Hindman asked when the contracting would begin. Mr. Hood replied they wanted to start the earthwork late this winter or in early spring, if the weather allowed. Mayor Hindman thought they should know something from Mr. Wendt within a short period of time.

Ms. Nauser wondered what they might find out. She did not believe Mr. Wendt indicating they were still interested was a strong enough indication of their intentions. Mayor Hindman suggested they follow up to determine if they had financing, etc.

Mr. Watkins suggested they hold the public hearing and then table the issue to the January 19, 2010 Council meeting. In the meantime, he would try to contact Gary Wendt by phone to let him know the City intended to move forward unless they could provide something of interest.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor Hindman made a motion to table B369-09 to the January 19, 2010 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved by voice vote with Mr. Wade, Ms. Nauser and Mr. Thornhill voting no.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

**B354-09      Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish the Public Transportation Advisory Commission.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a request from Council to establish a Public Transportation Advisory Commission. The proposal was for a nine member commission of which one would be designated by the Chancellor of the University and another would be designated by the Disabilities Commission. The remaining seven members would be appointed by the Council.

Ms. Hoppe suggested a member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission be member of this commission as well and noted the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission had requested it be included in an e-mail she received.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend B354-09 by changing Section 2-375.12(a) so it included a member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission to be appointed by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Boeckmann noted Section 2-375.12(b) would need to be changed to reflect the previous amendment.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend B354-09 by changing Section 2-375.12(b) so it included a two year term for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission representative and revised the number of members appointed by the Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B354-09, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:  
VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE.  
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B358-09      Authorizing construction of sanitary sewers in Sewer District No. 164 (Manor Drive); calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a private common collector replacement sewer district, which involved replacing the sewer for two lots along the east side of Manor Drive. The public hearing had been held on October 19, 2009 and the project would be funded with sanitary sewer utility funds.

Mr. Glascock commented that they had looked at going through a different property, but the proposed route was the shortest, least costly and had the least impact on the trees in the area.

Mr. Sturtz asked for an updated report on all of the PCC projects. Mr. Glascock replied he would provide it.

B358-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B359-09      Authorizing acquisition of easements for construction of Sewer District No. 164 (Manor Drive).**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would authorize staff to acquire the easements needed for the sanitary sewer district just approved.

Mr. Wade suggested staff show the Council all of the common collectors within the City on a map and explain why they were an issue in terms of health and public sanitation during a future work session.

B359-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B363-09      Appropriating funds for the Columbia Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility improvement project.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted the original intent was to appropriate funds over two years, but since they were able to get a low interest loan through the State Revolving Loan Fund, all of the money had to be appropriated at once. It was about \$53 million for the low interest loan and \$3 million would be from a stimulus grant.

B363-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B370-09      Adopting the City of Columbia 2010 Medical Plan; establishing new group insurance premiums for employee and retiree/COBRA health and dental care plans.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained that while the City's fiscal year was from October through September, its health insurance year was from January through December. Although the budget included the City's share of the rates for the upcoming year, the Council still had to approve the plan and the rates being charged. This year they were anticipating a seven percent increase in the rate.

Ms. Buckler commented that one big change to the health plan involved a mental health parity as required by federal law and noted it would be treated like any other medical condition, so it was expected to increase the plan cost by one percent. Another change involved the stop-loss limit as it was being changed from \$150,000 to \$175,000. The actuaries felt the City could withstand that, and it allowed the City to forego a \$100,000 increase in premiums. She explained they had adopted the active rates with the budget, so this reaffirmed those and adopted the retiree rates.

B370-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B372-09      Providing for the recovery of costs associated with the formation of community improvement districts.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the City did not have any provisions for requiring any group to pay for the formation of a community improvement district, which included advertising, etc.

This ordinance would set a policy with regard to the cost formation for a community improvement district.

Mr. Sturtz understood the staff report indicated the Keene CID did not put money into an account for advertising and publication and asked how much that cost the City. Ms. Amin replied the cost was \$665.44 for about 30 properties. The North 763 CID had about 10 properties and a cost of \$293.04, but they paid those costs.

Mr. Skala understood the Keene CID was one of the earlier ones before any processes had been worked out and noted it met an untimely and quick end. He was unaware it had accrued \$660 worth of funding and believed this was a much needed adjustment.

Ms. Nauser asked if the Keene CID had been asked to reimburse those fees. Ms. Amin replied they were not asked. She explained it never made it to Council and was withdrawn due to controversy surrounding it.

Ms. Amin pointed out the costs for both CID projects did not include staff time. It only included the actual cost of advertising, mailings, etc.

Ms. Nauser asked for clarification regarding the CID that provided reimbursement. Ms. Amin explained that project went to Council and Council required payment as part of the approval, if she recalled correctly.

B372-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

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

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| <b>B353-09</b> | <u>Approving the Final Plat of Country Farms – Plat 3, a Re-Subdivision of Lot 11 of Country Farms Subdivision, located on the southwest corner of Old Field Road and Old Mill Creek Road; authorizing a performance contract.</u> |
| <b>B355-09</b> | <u>Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to reduce the speed limit along a section of Stadium Boulevard.</u>  |
| <b>B356-09</b> | <u>Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking along a section of Bearfield Road.</u>   |
| <b>B357-09</b> | <u>Authorizing non-motorized transportation intersection improvements at Providence Road and Green Meadows Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.</u>   |
| <b>B360-09</b> | <u>Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission and the Columbia Independent School District for the installation of speed limit signs and roadside flashers along sections of Route E.</u>   |
| <b>B361-09</b> | <u>Authorizing an agreement with Boone Electric Cooperative for the possible relocation of power poles and electric facilities relating to the Mexico Gravel Road reconstruction project.</u>                                      |

- B362-09 Authorizing the City Manager to apply to the United States Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration for airport capital assistance grants.
- B364-09 Authorizing the installation of new electrical transformers and switchgear at the McBaine Water Treatment Plant; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B365-09 Authorizing construction of the Hillsdale Pump Station ground reservoir located on the southeast corner of I-70 Drive Northeast and Hillsdale Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B366-09 Authorizing the installation of backup power generators at two aquifer storage and recovery wells; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B367-09 Authorizing construction of an 8-inch water main along Old Mill Creek Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B371-09 Amending the FY 2010 Annual Budget and the Classification and Pay Plans to reclassify a position in the Police Department.
- R290-09 Setting a public hearing: construction of the North Grindstone Sewer Extension Phase II Project.
- R291-09 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for core public health functions.
- R292-09 Authorizing agreements with Integrity Home Care and The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of MU Adult Day Connection, for homemaker/personal care and respite care services.
- R293-09 Authorizing agreements with various social service agencies; and prescribing the form and content of the agreements.
- R294-09 Authorizing a cooperation and funding agreement with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for the Missouri Building Operator Certification Program.

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

## **NEW BUSINESS**

- R295-09 Authorizing an agreement with Engineering Surveys and Services for engineering services for construction of the 24-inch East Transmission Main Project.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would authorize the beginning of a major water project that was approved by the voters in 2008. The project would connect a 24-inch line, which currently existed on Nifong, to both the Shepard Water Tower and the Hillsdale Pump Station on the east side of town. This resolution would authorize the preliminary design as the route had not yet been determined. Upon completion of the preliminary design, it would be brought to the Water and Light Advisory Board, the Council and others for input. After approval by

Council, a detailed design would be completed. The total cost, which included the preliminary design and final design, was estimated at \$817,000.

Mr. Schmitz showed the area involved on the overhead and explained the Maguire bridges had been designed to support the main, so the creek crossings had already been addressed and that portion of the route was locked-in.

Mr. Sturtz asked for an explanation as to the factors that made this project so important. Mr. Schmitz explained the distribution system was previously primarily used to move bulk water from the Bethel and West Avenue pump stations to the northeast corner of town. The distribution system consisted of 8-inch, 12-inch and some 24-inch mains. They now needed to move larger volumes of water, and as a result, they were designing a water transmission main that would fill the Shepard Tower and the ground storage unit at Hillsdale so they could pump water under I-70 to the northeast pressure zone. The pump station at Hillsdale was causing a larger load on the distribution system and the transmission main would allow them to move bulk water.

Mr. Sturtz asked how much of this was due to the need for fire suppression in the northeast. Mr. Schmitz replied it was more of an efficiency issue with regard to the use of the mains. Moving that much water created a higher velocity in the mains, but this would allow a lower velocity with a high volume. The main along the Business Loop was being pushed hard and if they had a main break, it would impact the water supply. In his mind, it was not as much of a growth issue as an efficiency issue and being able to fill the Shepard Tower and the 1.5 million gallon tank at Hillsdale.

Mr. Skala believed it was ultimately a growth issue because there were issues with regard to water pressure, and filling the tower was a function of the growth that existed for the past 5-10 years in the northeast and the future growth anticipated due to the high school. Mr. Schmitz commented that he could not say it was not due to growth, but pointed out he did not believe it was being pushed by growth as much as reliability.

Ms. Hoppe understood this project would meet present needs as well as future needs. Mr. Schmitz stated it positioned them for future needs. The site at Hillsdale was large enough for two storage tanks, but a second 1.5 million gallon tank would likely not be needed for another 20 years. The pump station could be expanded as well.

Mr. Watkins pointed out that in the early 1990's, the City took over an old rural water district and that area needed substantial improvements with regard to fire flow. He explained the City was constrained by its service territory, and the new high school would actually be served by Consolidated Water District No. 1. The City had a limited area they had a requirement to serve that area.

Mr. Schmitz noted there were substantial projects in the bond issue for main upgrades in the northeast quadrant over the next 3-4 years.

Ms. Hoppe noted item two of the contract scope of services under the evaluation of alignment options indicated documents would be displayed for an informal open house type of meeting for interested parties, and specified the parties as neighborhood associations, affected property owners, affected utility customers, and Columbia Water and Light staff. She felt the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Environment and Energy Commission should be specified as well. Mr. Schmitz asked if item three addressed her concerns. Ms.

Hoppe replied it did not and noted she had a concern with it as well. Item three indicated the draft report would go to staff and would later be provided to the Water and Light Advisory Board and the Council. She felt earlier input was needed from the Water and Light Advisory Board, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Environment and Energy Commission. She believed the draft report should be provided to both staff and the Water and Light Advisory Board for input earlier in the process. Mr. Schmitz stated this was a scope of services for the consultant so they would know how to price the product. He explained that if the Water and Light Advisory Board had a problem with the draft report, it would go back to the consultant before coming to Council. In addition, item two could be changed to include any group they wanted as part of the public meeting process. He pointed out nothing would be done until Council accepted the final report.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted the Water and Light Advisory Board to have early input on the draft report so they had a meaningful final report. Mr. Schmitz commented that they could do that, but noted it was sometimes problematic for an advisory board to oversee the preliminary design. Ms. Hoppe clarified she was suggesting item three be changed so the draft report went to staff and then the Water and Light Advisory Board for further changes prior to it being provided to Council.

Ms. Hoppe explained she also wanted to amend item two so it included contacting the relevant boards and commissions, which included the Water and Light Advisory Board, the Environment and Energy Commission, the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Comprehensive Plan Task Force and the Columbia Vision Commission.

Mr. Skala believed early input from the Water and Light Advisory Board would help the process and asked for clarification on what Mr. Schmitz was suggesting. Mr. Schmitz replied, historically, staff had provided its recommendations to the Advisory Board for discussion. The issue he was struggling with involved the point at which staff took direct comments from the Advisory Board regarding design issues because it had typically not been done. He explained that when they did the 36-inch main from McBaine to Scott Boulevard, they brought forward their recommendation on the route and the design to the Water and Light Advisory Board prior to bringing it to Council. He envisioned the same process for this project. He was concerned about the level of involvement by the Advisory Board with regard to design.

Mr. Watkins explained staff wanted as much input as possible on the route, but after the route was provided to Council, he was not sure what some of the boards would do with the design of the water line as it involved more technical knowledge and was appropriate for staff and the consultants to finalize.

Mr. Wade agreed the Advisory Board would contribute little to the detailed technical design, but understood the draft report was the report in which the criteria would be defined and believed that was the point at which it would appropriate for review by the Water and Light Advisory Board. Mr. Watkins asked what Mr. Wade meant by criteria. Mr. Wade stated he thought Mr. Schmitz had referred to criteria. Mr. Schmitz explained the negotiated scope of services included a portion that dealt strictly with route design, so the criteria he would have referred to involved the location of the route. Mr. Wade commented that he believed that was the appropriate place for citizen input. Mr. Schmitz agreed and noted item two was where they would obtain that input. Item three involved the evaluation of the input received

and they would provide a matrix of the value of the impact to the neighborhood, the location, etc., and that was where he was confused as to what the Advisory Board would do other than review the criteria on the route selection process.

Ms. Hoppe believed a review could be involved with item three as it indicated the consultants would prepare a draft report, to include concept plans showing the possible alignments, a summary of the evaluation, advantages and disadvantages of each alignment and the estimated cost. She thought it would be appropriate for the Water and Light Advisory Board to weigh in on the draft report. Mr. Wade agreed and noted it could then go to final design. Mr. Schmitz pointed out they would not go to final design until after the route was approved by Council.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend item two of the contract scope of services under the evaluation of alignment options by adding all interested City commissions to the list of interested parties and to amend item three of the contract scope of services under the evaluation of alignment options so the draft report was provided to Columbia Water and Light staff and the Water and Light Advisory Board for review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R295-09, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

## **INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

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

- B373-09      Authorizing the issuance of ARRA Revenue Bonds for Sewer System Improvements.**
- B374-09      Approving the Final Plat of ABC Subdivision located on the north side of I-70, west of the I-70 and Route Z interchange; authorizing a performance contract.**
- B375-09      Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to set the speed limit along portions of Broadway (State Route WW).**
- B376-09      Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to long-term lease of off-street parking spaces.**
- B377-09      Authorizing construction of Sewer District No. 167 (Shepard Hills); calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**
- B378-09      Authorizing the acquisition of easements for Sewer District No. 167 (Shepard Hills).**
- B379-09      Accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.**
- B380-09      Accepting conveyances for sewer, utility and access to storm water facilities purposes.**
- B381-09      Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code to allow subordination of certain City deeds of trust received in connection with City energy conservation and efficiency loans.**

- B382-09 Calling a special election to be held on Tuesday, April 6, 2010 to consider an amendment to the Home Rule Charter of the City of Columbia to allow the city manager to designate an assistant city manager as acting city manager in the event of the city manager's absence or disability.
- B383-09 Calling a special election to be held on Tuesday, April 6, 2010 to consider an amendment to the Home Rule Charter of the City of Columbia to eliminate the restriction on transfer of funds within the first six months of a fiscal year.
- B384-09 Calling a special election to be held on Tuesday, April 6, 2010 to consider an amendment to the Home Rule Charter of the City of Columbia to remove the requirement that the director of the Water and Light Department be a registered engineer.
- B385-09 Calling a special election to be held on Tuesday, April 6, 2010 to consider an amendment to the Home Rule Charter of the City of Columbia pertaining to elections and initiative, referendum and recall.
- B386-09 Calling a special election to be held on Tuesday, April 6, 2010 to consider an amendment to the Home Rule Charter of the City of Columbia to allow city funds in any city depository to be secured by the same kinds of securities that secure state funds in state depositories.

## **REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

**(A) Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Requests.**

Mayor Hindman noted this report was provided for informational purposes.

**(B) Report – Chickens.**

Mr. Watkins explained this was a potential ordinance drafted by Ms. Browning with the assistance of the Board of Health. Staff needed Council input as to whether this was an ordinance the Council wanted to move forward, and if not, how and when they wanted to discuss it. If they did want to ultimately consider the ordinance, feedback regarding the timeframe was being requested.

Ms. Browning stated she tried to come up with a reasonable approach for people who wanted to keep chickens in their yards while protecting the surrounding neighborhoods and being neutral in terms of the extra time associated with the investigation of any complaints or the issuance of permits by animal control. She reviewed many ordinances and found the smaller the number of chickens allowed to be kept, the fewer the associated requirements. About 40 percent of the communities she reviewed allowed six or fewer chickens, which was how she came up with six for the ordinance. Kansas City allowed 20 chickens, but required a 50 foot setback from the property line, which would make it difficult for those with smaller tracts to have chickens. She also specified the keeping of chickens was for a non-commercial use. With regard to enclosures, her goal was to create a standard where people had some basic requirements for coops, so they were not an eyesore and would provide adequate ventilation. The ordinance proposed a 10 foot setback from the property line and a 25 foot setback from any adjacent dwelling, business, church, etc. She noted she also tried to address potential odor and noise concerns, so the ordinance proposed that the smell not be perceptible at the property boundaries and the noise not be loud enough at the property boundaries to disturb people with reasonable sensitivity. It would be complaint driven and no permits, inspections or site plans would be required. The ordinance also included standards

for waste storage and removal and provisions for situations where a dog might kill a chicken that was off of the chicken owner's property. She pointed out she was not opposed to this as she believed there were benefits to having locally grown food, but was concerned about the potential of people requesting the ability to keep other animals, such as goats, etc.

Ms. Nauser agreed the request for other animals was possible, especially with the miniaturization of many livestock animals, such as goats, pigs, horses and cows.

Mr. Skala asked if consideration had been given for neighborhood input in the permitting process and if covenant restrictions had been addressed. Ms. Browning replied she understood there was an issue of delegated authority when they required neighbors to give permission to something the Council indicated was acceptable. In addition, if there was a restrictive covenant, it would not be allowed and would be a civil issue. It would not involve animal control if there were no nuisance issues.

Ms. Nauser understood licenses were required for dogs and cats although only a few people complied. Ms. Browning stated that was correct and noted it was enforceable if someone were in violation. Ms. Nauser felt it would be prudent for a permit process with a fee and a leg band requirement to allow an owner to be found if an animal escaped, and asked if that had been considered. Ms. Browning replied she had not seen any ordinances requiring it, but thought it was something they could consider. She commented that less than 30 percent of people had their animals appropriately licensed, so they would only find out the animal was not licensed when there was a complaint.

Ms. Nauser asked if data had been reviewed regarding the potential increase in rodent, predator populations or nuisance animals, such as coyotes, raccoons, possums or feral cats. Ms. Browning replied she had not seen any studies relating to the issue, but had contacted several communities that allowed chickens in order to identify potential problems and that was not identified as a problem by those communities. She believed it was a given that there would be some predators. If this ordinance moved forward, they would need to have a clear policy indicating they would not take wildlife calls associated with chickens.

Ms. Nauser understood chicken would be removed from the definition of livestock and asked how that would impact neighborhood restrictions that might just list the term livestock. Mr. Boeckmann replied it would not affect neighborhood covenants. He explained the reason the language had changed was because another section of the Code referred to livestock and he did not want chickens to be covered in that section because it would be in conflict with this new article on chickens. He noted the City could not adopt an ordinance that would change the meaning of a private covenant.

Mr. Wade believed there were 3-4 issues the Council needed to discuss in a work session to provide staff clear instruction on what to bring back in a final ordinance. He wondered if a work session could be held so the ordinance could be introduced at the second meeting in January. Mayor Hindman asked if this could be discussed at a pre-Council meeting. Mr. Watkins replied some Council members would be absent for the first and second meetings in January.

Mayor Hindman suggested the ordinance be introduced at the second meeting in January and that they hold a work session prior to it coming up for vote at the first meeting in February. He believed the proposed ordinance provided a good base and noted it could

always be continued to the second meeting in February if they were unable to discuss it at a work session or during a pre-Council meeting.

Ms. Nauser thought it would be helpful for staff to hear their comments before introducing the ordinance. Mayor Hindman explained his suggestion was based upon the fact he believed they had a good base of an ordinance already.

Mr. Wade asked if they wanted to hold a separate Council meeting to obtain public comment on this issue alone. If they did that, it would provide more time to schedule a work session. Mr. Skala stated he did not object to a separate Council meeting or one long meeting, except that it put some people at a disadvantage as they had to stay for the entire meeting. Mr. Sturtz noted holding a separate meeting might emphasize an issue in a way that might not be appropriate. Mr. Thornhill agreed and was not sure it justified its own meeting. Ms. Hoppe was in favor of discussing the issue during a regularly scheduled meeting.

Mayor Hindman understood the ordinance would be introduced at the second meeting in January, so it was available for a vote at the first meeting in February.

Mr. Wade suggested the Council provide potential specific changes they wanted to discuss ahead of time as he believed it would help the discussion at a work session.

**(C) Cost of Providing Shuttle Service to MU Games.**

Ms. Hoppe understood the City was charging a fee to passengers for the service, but it was not enough to cover the cost of this service, and asked for the amount charged. Mr. Watkins replied the charge was \$1.00 each way. Ms. Hoppe suggested the fee be raised to cover the cost and asked if that had been considered. Mr. Glascock replied they could look into it and noted they charged the rate set by Council.

Ms. Hoppe understood there were 200 pre-game workers employed by one company and suggested they find out if that company was willing to pay for bus service for its employees.

Mr. Thornhill asked how this shuttle service had started. Mr. Watkins replied he thought the City probably started it as a service for the downtown so people did not have to walk or drive.

Mr. Thornhill stated he would pay \$2 to not have to find parking and not have to deal with the hazards of walking to a game. He thought it would be reasonable to expect people to pay enough so they could break even. Ms. Hoppe pointed out she was not critical of providing the service and thought it should be expanded. Mr. Wade commented that since this was a customized service, he believed it was reasonable to charge a \$2 fee. Mr. Watkins suggested Council allow staff to determine the actual cost and to provide a report.

Ms. Hoppe asked for staff to discuss expansion of the service as well. Mr. Watkins replied they would talk to the pre-game service employer to determine interest in shuttle expansion.

Mr. Sturtz asked if the MU Athletic Department would be willing to contribute to the service as it was beneficial to them as well. Mr. Watkins replied they could check with them.

Mr. Thornhill asked if they could determine a break-even fee. Mr. Glascock replied they would look at the last two years and provide a report.

Mr. Watkins explained part of the difficulty was that the City had to provide buses for this service while maintaining the regular Saturday schedule, and they did not have many extra buses. Ms. Nauser asked if they could use older buses for this service when they purchased new buses. Mr. Glascock replied they intended to keep the old buses because the spare ratio was low.

**(D) Evaluation of Crosswalk Near Keene & Portland.**

Mr. Glascock explained staff was not in favor of this addition because it was located on the crest of a hill and a car would not necessarily see the paint on the ground or the signs when driving up to it. If Council still wanted to proceed, staff would recommend the construction of medians and audible signals, which would make it more costly.

Mayor Hindman asked if there could be a raised crosswalk. Mr. Glascock replied that was what staff intended if Council wished to proceed.

Mr. Skala asked if they could move the crosswalk to a point near the crest where the visibility was good and/or install signage to make drivers aware of the slower and more vulnerable population in the area. Mr. Glascock showed Mr. Skala the best location for the crosswalk on the overhead, and noted it was across from a bus stop.

Mr. Wade asked if the bus could run in the other direction. Mr. Glascock replied that was looked into, but not efficient.

Mr. Skala believed something should be done to make this area safer for the residents as they were more vulnerable.

Mayor Hindman suggested they ask staff to design a crosswalk with safety features for Council review. Mr. Watkins stated staff could provide design alternatives and costs for Council review.

Mr. Thornhill asked if the bus stop could be moved a half a block to the south. Mr. Glascock replied it could, but he believed people would still take the most direct route, and not walk down the street and use the crosswalk, if they felt more comfortable at the crest of the hill.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to design a safe crosswalk for Council review and consideration. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman.

Ms. Nauser asked if a signalized sign could be installed where someone could press a button if they needed to cross the street. Mr. Glascock replied it was being looked into.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mayor Hindman was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(E) Participation with Boone County on a 319 Stormwater Grant Application.**

Mr. Watkins explained the City was working jointly with Boone County and the grant would require a 40 percent match. The projects involved included the Grissum Building and the Armory. He pointed out that while staff wanted to proceed, the matching funds were not in the CIP or the budget, so if the City was successful, staff would come back to Council with ways to potentially fund it.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to proceed with support of the 319 stormwater grant application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(F) Planning and Zoning Commission Comments – 2009 Trail Plan.**  
**(G) Parks & Recreation Commission Comments – 2009 Trail Plan.**

Mr. Wade suggested a work session be held because he believed they were in a different place than they were in 2005. He thought they needed to approve a plan that would provide a solid base for the Parks and Recreation Commission and staff to use in planning for the bond issue. He did not believe there would be a continuation of GetAbout Columbia money, so the bike, road and trail system would have to be moved back into the City's operational budget. As a result, it would be another infrastructure requiring funding decisions. He thought they needed a clear statement of the objective and goals, and a sense of priorities.

Mayor Hindman agreed this should be discussed at a work session.

Mr. Watkins understood Council had also requested feedback from GetAbout Columbia and noted it would be provided.

**(H) Downtown Noise Ordinance.**

Mr. Watkins noted Council had asked staff to work with the downtown organizations and merchants in developing a noise ordinance that would be acceptable to most of the people in the downtown. After meeting with the SBD and numerous bar owners in the downtown, they were not sure there was an obvious compromise. The proposed ordinance was acceptable to the bar owners, but not the SBD. As a result, they were asking the Council to provide further direction. Staff believed it was better than what they currently had, and although it did not meet all of the objections of the SBD, they were suggesting the ordinance be introduced to obtain public comment and for Council consideration.

Mayor Hindman stated he believed the proposed ordinance was a good starting point.

Mr. Wade wondered if they really needed to wait until 2:00 a.m. to begin requiring things to quiet down as he believed midnight was more appropriate.

Ms. Nauser asked if staff had looked at how other cities dealt with the issue. Mr. Boeckmann replied they had not because they had an ordinance that had been working well in other areas. He noted there were basically two types of ordinances. One was based on decibels and seemed to have problems. The other one was similar to what the City had, which was a bit imprecise, but worked well in practice. As a result, they chose to modify what they had to allow more noise within different hours.

Mr. Wade asked if an ordinance was being revised for just one location in the downtown. Mr. Boeckmann replied it would apply to the entire downtown area. Mr. Wade asked for clarification regarding what he referred to as other areas. Mr. Boeckmann replied he was referring to other areas of the City, outside of the downtown.

Mr. Wade asked how many areas in the downtown had problems with the current noise ordinance. Mr. Boeckmann replied he was only aware of the one. Mr. Skala pointed

out there were others with potential problems. Mr. Boeckmann stated that was correct and noted it would get worse as there were more residents in the downtown.

Ms. Hoppe understood staff did not review ordinances for other university towns. Mr. Boeckmann stated he did not believe it would have been useful. He stated he would do so if directed by Council, but believed they would need to look at what the other ordinance stated as well as the enforcement problems encountered.

Mr. Skala commented that they could look at demographically similar areas, but thought it might be better to look at segments of cities as a whole instead, such as areas in Chicago and Montreal that were more representative of what Columbia had in its downtown.

Mr. Thornhill wondered if they were trying to fix a problem they did not have. Ms. Nauser thought they had a silent but stirring problem and believed it would be a greater problem in the future. Mr. Thornhill stated he was in favor of the proposed changes, but did not believe it was keeping people from living in the downtown.

Mr. Wade thought they needed to move forward and did not feel much would be gained by looking at ordinances in other cities. Mr. Skala agreed and noted he was also satisfied with the proposed changes to the ordinance.

Mayor Hindman suggested this be put on a future agenda for discussion and consideration.

**(I) Report Concerning Administrative Guidelines for Implementation of CDBG and HOME Programs for the 2011 – 2015 Program Years.**

Mr. Watkins explained this document would formalize the processes and procedures associated with CDBG and HOME funding. Mr. Teddy noted this would be part of the Council's annual review of the policy resolution for the CDBG program, which provided the funding targets for each category of activity. Mr. Watkins pointed out this had been reviewed and approved by the Community Development Commission.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to introduce the attached administrative guidelines at the January 4, 2010 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(J) Proposed Amendments to City Major Roadway Plan on Scott Boulevard Area Report.**

Mr. Watkins explained this report was from the Planning and Zoning Commission and discussed four proposed amendments to the Roadway Plan. The proposed amendments were requested by the Commission as alternatives to staff proposals that were recommended for denial. The two proposed additions of planned neighborhood collector streets were recommended for approval and the two proposed additions of pedestrian-bicycle accesses were recommended for denial.

Mr. Teddy noted this was provided as report due the controversy with the original depiction. It was modified within the hearing process to eliminate a connection to Arrowhead Lake Drive and the leg between Sinclair and Highland Parkway.

Mayor Hindman asked for clarification regarding the bicycle accesses. Mr. Teddy replied one would have provided a pedestrian only connection between the roadway corridor and Arrowhead Lake Drive and the other would have interconnected two existing roadways,

Sundance Drive and Arrowhead Lake Drive, which were within County jurisdiction. The Planning and Zoning Commission felt this process should not include the pedestrian only corridors.

Mayor Hindman asked if the two bike-pedestrian corridors were on the Plan. Mr. Teddy replied no and explained they were alternatives developed by staff to show the Planning and Zoning Commission after the initial controversy.

Mayor Hindman understood the ordinance the Council would consider would be based on the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission, and if the Council wanted to add the bicycle-pedestrian corridors, the ordinance would need to be amended. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Wade made a motion to accept the report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(K) Steep Slopes/Land Disturbance Report.**

Mr. Watkins noted they had been discussing dirt piles, steep slopes and grading for much of the year, and two ordinances had been prepared. He suggested the Council send the ordinances to the Planning and Zoning Commission for review and comment.

Mr. Skala suggested it be sent to the Environment and Energy Commission as well.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to send the two ordinances to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Environment and Energy Commission for their review and comment. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman.

Mr. Wade asked if they wanted to indicate when they wanted to move forward as he thought that needed to be communicated to the Commissions so they understood the Council's time intention. Mr. Watkins suggested mid-February.

Mayor Hindman thought the sense of the Council was for development to conform to the present land formation, but believed the ordinances would still allow for a lot of cut and fill. Mr. Wade agreed the Council wanted development that would fit the land rather than forcing the land to fit the development, and he believed this was an intermediate step. He thought what they were talking about was a broader philosophy that went beyond these two ordinances.

Ms. Nauser suggested they move forward so they could address the issue of dirt piles by spring.

Mr. Watkins asked if it would be appropriate for the Environment and Energy Commission to provide comments to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Wade stated he would prefer the Environment and Energy Commission report to the Planning and Zoning Commission instead of receiving two reports.

Mr. Skala altered his previous motion so it was now a motion directing staff to provide the two ordinances to the Environment and Energy Commission and the Planning and Zoning Commission for review and comment with the understanding the Environment and Energy Commission would provide its comments to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Planning and Zoning Commission would report back to Council. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(L) Board and Commission Self Evaluation.**

Mr. Watkins explained Council had indicated they wanted additional feedback from boards and commissions and a motion directing staff to proceed was suggested with a change in the deadline to the end of February instead of March.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to proceed with sending the surveys to the boards and commissions with a February response deadline. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(M) Columbia Visioning Commission – E-mail Communication with Boards and Commissions.**

Mr. Watkins explained that the Vision Commission had asked for the ability to communicate with individual boards and commissions, and staff's concern was providing individuals' personal e-mails. A more reasonable approach would be to set up an e-mail address for each board and commission.

Mr. Wade suggested the staff liaison be copied on the e-mail as well.

Mr. Skala asked if those e-mails would go through the City Clerk. Mr. Watkins replied they would not. They would go through the staff liaison. Mr. Skala asked how correspondence would be kept for the permanent record. Mr. Boeckmann replied the staff liaisons were the record keepers for the commissions, so each board and commission had their records in one place. Mr. Skala asked if the staff liaison was responsible for giving the City Clerk a copy. Ms. Amin replied the City Clerk was not involved. The policy on records indicated the department head or his designee was charged with the record keeping duties for the board or commission.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to proceed with creating e-mail accounts for each board and commission chair to access and to include the staff liaison as a recipient of any e-mail correspondence to a board or commission. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(N) EEC Commission Memo to Building Codes Commission.**

Mr. Wade commented that the charge to the Building Construction Codes Commission specifically stated that special attention be paid to the International Building Code Council's high energy efficiency standards even though the International Building Codes Council did not include them in their recommended standards. Since the high efficiency criteria was to be part of the deliberation of the Building Construction Codes Commission, he was unsure as to why the EEC was providing input now instead of a review of the recommendations at the end.

Mr. Watkins stated he hoped the EEC would continue to be involved as they moved through the various codes. Mr. Wade stated he wanted to ensure they remained involved.

Mr. Watkins noted staff planned to bring in an outside expert to work with the Codes Commission and other advisory commissions in crafting a proposal for Council review.

Mayor Hindman asked when they might expect this to come to Council. Mr. Watkins replied he understood the Codes Commission was working through the various codes and noted they would explain the Council was anxious to get it done. Mayor Hindman asked if

they had to wait until all of the codes had been review. Mr. Watkins replied he thought they would because the codes were inter-related.

## **APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

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

### **COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION**

Duncan, Khesha, 3800 Saddlebrook Place, #207, Ward 2, Term to expire December 15, 2011

### **COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMISSION**

Ford, Stacy, 2701 Andy Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire December 31, 2012

Hessler, Richard, 411 Westmount Avenue, Ward 4, Term to expire December 31, 2012

### **MAYOR'S COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL FITNESS**

Martin, Robin, 2211 Shepard Boulevard, Ward 6, Term to expire November 30, 2012

Oates, Carolyn, 1363 S Mesa Drive, County, Term to expire November 30, 2012

### **POLICE RETIREMENT BOARD**

Aten, Frank, 3405 Ridgeview Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire December 31, 2011

### **PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Dunn, Michael, 1225 Sunset Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire December 31, 2011

Hurt, Carol, 4800 Melissa Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire December 31, 2011

Lawson, Ewell, 109 Gondolier Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire December 31, 2011

Youmans, Julie, 2101 Rock Quarry Road, Ward 6, Term to expire December 31, 2011

### **SPECIAL BUSINESS DISTRICT BOARD**

Ott, John, 212 Bingham Road, Ward 5, Term to expire January 1, 2013

Walther, Skip, 700 Cherry (business address), Ward 4, Term to expire January 1, 2013

Wilkerson, Mary, 1404 Fir Place, Ward 1, Term to expire January 1, 2013

## **COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Ken Midkiff stated he was speaking as the Conservation Chair of the Osage Group of the Sierra Club and provided the Council a handout. He explained an open records request had been sent to the City about a month ago with regard to sanitary sewer overflows and he had received numerous documents, which he was now analyzing. To date, he had reached several conclusions which he wanted to share. Since 1976, there had been a problem with inflow and infiltration (I & I), and while infiltration might be difficult or impossible to fix since sewer lines were not sealed, the inflow was due to wet weather and was a major problem. He commented that inflow came from roof, storm and basement drains and sump pumps illegally hooked up to the sanitary sewer system. In addition, the problem was not due to only older private residences, but newer ones and public properties as well. For years, the City had dealt with it on an individual basis as opposed to a systemic problem, and many of the

problems that existed in 1976 still existed today, to include properties on Sexton Road. He believed the problem was primarily in an area bounded by Hinkson Creek to the east and south and I-70 to the north and commented that sanitary sewage overflows were a significant threat to public health and the environment, and could cause the contamination of lakes and streams.

Mayor Hindman requested a report on a few crosswalks to include one involving Stephens College across Broadway in the area of Dorsey, another for College Avenue at the end of the sidewalk that went to Memorial Tower, another for Providence Road in the Grasslands area, and one for Providence Road at Hickman High School and Hickman Avenue.

Mayor Hindman stated he received a call regarding the traffic signal on Forum at the street that went to Forum Theater and the complaint was that there was a left turn arrow, which worked fine when there was a lot of traffic, but since it was also active when there was little to no traffic, it resulted in traffic being backed up on north bound Forum. He asked if the left turn arrow on south bound Forum could be turned off during low traffic volume times.

Mr. Skala stated he wanted to start the discussion of a charter amendment involving the relationship between the Council and City Manager with respect to the idea of advice and consent for the hiring and firing of City department heads. He thought it could be patterned after the federal template of the advice and consent of a final candidate or slate of candidates by the City Manager with confirmation by the Council.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to draft an ordinance regarding a charter amendment for the advice and consent of the hiring and firing of department heads. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting no.

Mr. Wade commented that there was an accident Chapel Hill Road last week, which required a new utility pole, electrical box and associated landscaping. He thought he and Ms. Nauser had requested a report a year ago with a set of strategies or action plans to address speed and safety issues on Chapel Hill Road and connectors and arterials in general, and asked for the status of that report. Mr. Watkins replied he did not know of the status, but would find out.

Ms. Nauser asked for a staff report to see how they could move forward in collaboration with the Juvenile Office and the County in terms of tracking juvenile crime issues with GIS mapping services. She noted it was free and could provide data and statistics.

Ms. Nauser commented that the City also had the C.A.R.E. program, which she believed kept kids out of trouble, and thought it was a wonderful showcase for the National League of Cities. She asked for a staff report on how they could introduce this program on a national level in case other communities wanted to implement it.

Ms. Nauser provided a handout with those and other goals she had for the 2010 year.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to move forward with those two initiatives, which were the Smart Tracking program and the introduction of the C.A.R.E. program at the national level. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe suggested the board and commission summary include the chairs of boards and commissions so the Council knew when they were up for reappointment.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to identify the chair of each board or commission on the summary sheet when they were up for reappointment. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe stated she attended an evening event at the house facility available for rent at Rock Quarry Park and attendees had approached her because they had missed the entrance turns since nothing was lit. She asked staff to determine if they could light the sign or do something else so people could see where to turn regardless of whether they were coming from the east or west.

Ms. Hoppe noted she had mentioned the need for pedestrian lights and a better crosswalk for Stadium and Ashland Road, and asked about its status. Mr. Watkins replied he would provide a status report.

Ms. Hoppe asked about the status of the report regarding the speed limit on Forum Boulevard near Wilson's Fitness as it was prone to accidents and she wanted a reduced speed at that location. Mr. Watkins recalled it being discussed and thought staff had reviewed it, but was not sure of its status.

Ms. Hoppe understood the preferred method for commission members was to go through the commission chair if they wanted to request specific information, but that they could go through Council members if the chair was not receptive.

Ms. Hoppe asked that staff provide Richard Parker, a member of the Water and Light Advisory Board, information on Columbia's thermal storage rider off-peak discount industry with a load factor of 75 percent and other information. She noted she would provide the written request to staff. Mr. Watkins thought Mr. Parker had brought the issue up and it would be on the next Water and Light Advisory Board meeting agenda. He commented that his concern, in general, was that in the past, individual commission members had requested very time consuming research of staff. As a result, the approach was that it would be done if the entire commission felt it was appropriate and was why they asked for it to go through the board or commission.

Ms. Hoppe thought that was a reasonable approach, but also felt there should be a relief valve if for some reason it was not approved and was important. Mayor Hindman stated that if the board turned it down, the person could go to a member of the Council, who could bring it up, and if the Council felt the person should have the information being requested, the Council could vote to ask staff to provide the information. Mr. Watkins agreed and suggested they receive communication from the chair or review the minutes if that situation arose.

Ms. Hoppe asked how many homeless people were in Columbia without shelter.

Mr. Wade understood the City had recently received a grant to help address the homelessness issue. Mr. Watkins explained the City was the conduit and the grant was passed on to the shelters.

Mr. Watkins noted he would try to get an estimate from staff regarding the number of homeless people within the City. Ms. Hoppe clarified she was interested in the number of homeless people not using existing shelter services. Mr. Watkins thought the only way to get a good estimate was to determine how many people were turned away from shelters due to capacity problems.

Mayor Hindman made a motion to hold a closed meeting on Monday, January 4, 2010 at 5:30 p.m. in the Fourth Floor Conference Room of the Daniel Boone Building, at 701 East Broadway, Columbia Missouri, to discuss a personnel matter as authorized by Section 610.021(3) and (13) of the Revised Statutes of Missouri.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala with the vote was recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE.

VOTING NO: NO ONE.

Mayor Hindman explained that he and Mayor Pro tem Nauser would be absent from the January 19, 2010 Council meeting.

Mayor Hindman made the motion that Ms. Hoppe be appointed Acting Mayor Pro tem for the January 19, 2010 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved by voice vote with Ms. Hoppe abstaining.

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk