

Mini-Retreat Minutes - February 18, 2006
Sanford-Kimpton Building
8:30 a.m.

Council Members present: Mayor Darwin Hindman, Almeta Crayton, Chris Janku, Bob Hutton, Jim Loveless, Laura Nauser, and Brian Ash (late arrival)

Staff Members present: Bill Watkins, City Manager
Paula Hertwig Hopkins, Assistant City Manager
John Glascock, Public Works Director
Tim Teddy, Planning Director
Stephanie Browning, Health Director
Carol Rhodes, Assistant to the City Manager

Bill Watkins described the format for this morning's public work session which is a time for Council to ask questions and make comments about the items being presented. Decisions will not be made at today's meeting. Information will be brought back to the Council and decisions will then be made at a Council meeting.

Mr. Watkins thanked everyone for attending this morning's meeting. He thanked Carol and Stephanie for handling the meeting arrangements. He indicated Paula Hertwig Hopkins and John Glascock were present and would be participating in part of the presentation. In addition, Tim Teddy is present. He indicated that Mr. Teddy prepared the map (History of Residential Development) and will be available to talk about growth/planning.

Mr. Watkins indicated that with every retreat we try to give something of benefit to the Council. Bill distributed easy buttons to the Council members.

Mr. Watkins reviewed this morning's agenda items: community visioning, nonmotorized transportation pilot program and 2030 sewer master plan introduction.

Community Visioning

Mr. Watkins reviewed several slides which included the definition of Community Visioning and this morning's goals.

Mayor Hindman stated that he feels timing is everything on these matters and he thinks the timing is right. He also stated that he feels this process would ease a lot of concerns. In addition, we need to do something to keep up with technology.

Ms. Nauser stated that she feels there would be better community perception if the city develops a vision, which would also allow us to act less in reactive mode.

Mr. Watkins indicated that five years ago the city completed the 2020 plan which envisioned Columbia's population for 20 years. He pointed out that we're already 44% there. Mr. Watkins stated that (1) we know where we want to go, and (2) where are we right now? What's the city's current population? What's cohort? Mr. Watkins stressed the need to think about where we are right now and make projections.

Mr. Janku asked how this process would compare to the 2000 study.

Mayor Hindman indicated that most of the goals outlined in the 2000 study have been met. One of the unmet goals is architectural standards. He also pointed out that the 2000 study was performed by a small committee.

Council discussed what the needs are. The following issues were discussed:

Assessment – where are we in terms of numbers?

Projected outcome if continue on same path of growth

Housing patterns – single family homes, duplex, multi-housing

Need for: (items listed on flip chart)

- (1) Assessment – current condition (where are we in terms of numbers?)
- (2) Recognize this is a never ending process
- (3) Time frame ?
 - a. Long-term vision versus shorter term strategic plan
- (4) “GEO-SUB” – geographic and local/sub city plan
- (5) Has to fit
- (6) Community buy-in

Paula Hertwig Hopkins reviewed models used in three cities – Springfield, MO; Chattanooga, TN; and Charlotte, NC. Ms. Hopkins also reviewed the tag lines for each city, which is different from the vision statement.

Mr. Loveless indicated that he reviewed the Santa Fe model.

Mr. Janku commented that Springfield’s model was very successful. Springfield’s model included community input/buy-in.

Mr. Loveless expressed the need to evaluate individual location/geographic area and develop a plan for that part of the city that would fit into the overall plan. See item #4 listed above.

Ms. Crayton expressed concern regarding a previous plan that was done which hurt a lot of the older neighborhoods, because it did not fit.

Mr. Loveless asked how the focus groups were appointed in the Springfield model.

Ms. Hopkins explained how the groups were appointed. Bill added that the committee chairs were selected; a vision fest was conducted and members were self-appointed. Citizens attended the vision fest and signed up for what they were interested in doing. Bill indicated that it was a two year process in Springfield.

Ms. Hopkins reviewed the three decision making styles – (1) top-down (Charlotte), (2) bottom-up (Springfield), and (3) group decision, which is a hybrid of number 1 and number 2.

Mr. Janku pointed out the population of Charlotte is much larger than Springfield which may have driven the decision making style used in the process.

Ms. Hopkins pointed out commonalities in the three cities that were reviewed –citizen buy-in, focus groups, and coordinating committee.

Mr. Watkins asked if the Council had a feel for the kind of decision making process that might work in Columbia.

Mr. Loveless indicated that with the nature of the community and the perception of unplanned growth (growth without a strategy), the bottom-up would be a better strategy for Columbia at this time. With the bottom-up style, elected officials/Council would make final decision.

Mr. Hutton raised the following questions – Who sets the assumptions? Who establishes the goals?

Mr. Janku indicated that Springfield used the bottom-up style which included broad participation.

Mr. Loveless indicated that he liked the idea of organizing a vision fest which would include subject driven committees with tables set up for citizens to sign up for focus groups.

Flip Chart

- (1) Who sets givens?
- (2) Needs structure
- (3) Vision fest with opportunity to sign up for focus groups
- (4) County Commission/staff actively involved

Mr. Watkins pointed out that the City Manager in Springfield, MO made commitments before seeing end results and working toward implementation.

Mayor Hindman asked how involved Greene County was in the process and Bill responded that Greene County was extremely involved.

Mr. Loveless stated that the County Commission/staff must be actively involved in the process.

Council discussed the tag line and its need to include city and county. Some ideas include: Columbia area or Columbia metro.

Mr. Watkins asked who would drive the process – is it the Council and the County Commission or is it the Council with an invitation to the County to participate in the process. Mr. Watkins indicated that this was not something that needed to be decided today, but it was certainly something that Council needed to think about.

The Mayor suggested that a community meeting be scheduled at which time representatives from these three cities could attend and describe their experiences to

us. He feels their experiences would be valuable to Council and he would like an opportunity to ask them questions directly.

Mr. Watkins indicated that he thought that was a good idea. A possible meeting location is the ARC. He indicated that the Springfield officials indicated that they would be interested in coming to Columbia and talking to Council. These folks could discuss their experiences with us and provide community education.

Mr. Loveless returned to the County question raised earlier in the meeting. He suggested that we contact the County Commission and advise them of what we're going to do. We would indicate to them that we would like for them to be involved and ask them how involved they would like to be. The city would extend an invitation to them to be as active in this process as they would like to be.

Ms. Crayton brought up Columbia's economy. She pointed out that Columbia has not been economically challenged, yet. Crisis has not occurred yet.

Mr. Watkins stated that he thinks the market will determine the city's growth and an assessment will assist us with this.

Mayor pointed out that compared to most cities Columbia is being proactive. We're not waiting for a crisis to take action.

Mr. Watkins moved quickly through the possible components.

Mr. Janku noted on active groups – it appears to include our usual suspects. He would like all citizens to feel that they can participate in this process.

Mr. Watkins indicated that he sees the opportunity for a 1-2 week charette which could be used to educate committee members, staff and the public.

Mr. Watkins pointed out that as we move forward, we need to understand this will require a major commitment to resources – both internal (staff) and external (consultant).

Ms. Hopkins pointed out that interim documents were issued half-way through the process – Springfield model.

Flipchart:

- (1) Talk to the County Commission and Boone County cities
- (2) Community meeting with other community representatives
- (3) RFP consultant services
- (4) Staff – what might be in current conditions assessment? And include periodic updates
- (5) Citizen survey ?

Nonmotorized Transportation Pilot Program

Mayor Hindman provided an update on this topic. Two handouts were provided to Council – bill passed by Congress, including explanation of the bill and a press release naming committee members.

Mayor Hindman stated that \$100M has been appropriated to four places in the U.S. and Columbia, Missouri is specifically referenced in the bill. He indicated that Senator Bond is very interested in this as well as many others.

Mayor Hindman indicated a name had been inadvertently omitted from the list – Brad Eifert, Boone County Lumber Company. There are 35 committee members.

Mayor Hindman indicated that Tim Teddy, John Glascock, Ian Thomas and himself attended a meeting in Washington, D.C. He indicated that Columbia will receive \$25M/year less a certain amount that will be skimmed off the top. He explained that this happens to all appropriation bills. Therefore, it comes down to about \$22-23M for four years. He stated that the money will be coming soon to the state. The Federal Highway Administration and MoDOT are the conduits for this money. He indicated that it's up to us to spend the money. We must come up with the money and then we will get reimbursed.

Mayor Hindman indicated that we must pick projects that meet certain objectives. Those objectives include: interconnection, measure (must show where we are now and the amount of change from driving cars to other modes of transportation.) Report in 2010 – what has happened. After that, Council will be required to make a lot of decisions. This is a big deal and will create staffing issues; however, it's plausible to use these funds to hire staff to work on this project.

Mayor Hindman indicated that we need to be thinking about projects we can do fairly quickly. For example, Rock Bridge High School students have expressed strong interest in a certain area – outer roadway – no sidewalks; ditches; would like a bike path – Rock Bridge elementary to Hinkson Creek Trail.

Mayor expressed the need to set up a web site. Its purpose would be to provide progress reports.

Mayor Hindman encouraged Council members to look at areas in their ward where we should be doing something and bring those ideas forward.

Mr. Loveless indicated that he would like some of this money used for 763.

Mayor Hindman explained the purpose of the program – reduce traffic congestion and get people to use bike/pedestrian facilities – referred to as modal shift.

Mr. Watkins stated that he asked Mr. Teddy to prepare a map showing where residential development has occurred in the last several years.

Sewer Master Plan Introduction

Mr. Watkins indicated that in the 1970's and 1980's, the city received a lot of grant money to fund sewer improvements. He indicated that this funding is no longer

available. He stated that our plant is 30 years old and the last comprehensive sewer plan was completed in 1973. He indicated that Council directed staff two years to proceed and we're calling it the 2030 sewer plan. He indicated that John Glascock will give Council an overview today and staff will be bringing more information to the Council for consideration in the next several months.

Mr. Glascock provided a handout of presentation (see attached). He indicated cost \$84.1M for collection and \$160-\$170M for both. He pointed out that the master plan covers more depth and includes larger numbers. He also pointed out that this is today's costs and the numbers do not provide for inflation.

Council discussed the need to look at ballot issue items in next 5 years – electric, water, sewer, other.

Mr. Watkins pointed out that as we look at rates and policy/procedures, we also must review what our competitor's charge. If we get out of line, we'll force development outward. We need to coordinate with other providers. We're looking at how we compare to others. In vision process, we may want to look at coordinating policies across artificial city limit lines.

Council discussed how fees are established – fees for service, ie rec fees, etc. and other things that can't exceed target per state statute. Council discussed provisions of Hancock amendment.