



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, June 17, 2019
5:30 PM

Work Session

Conference Room
1A/1B
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:56 p.m.

Present: 7 - Ruffin, Trapp, Thomas, Peters, Treece, Skala, and Pitzer

Growth Impact Study

Attachments: [Growth Impact Study June 2019](#)

[Impact Fees Study Presentation - Ian Thomas](#)

Councilperson Ian Thomas stated that it's very important that costs of infrastructure are allocated correctly for fairness sake. This includes sewer, roads, public safety, etc. Costs in these systems can be broken down into two categories: one-time capital construction cost to add capacity which can be covered with a one-time fee on new development; and ongoing operations, maintenance and service delivery costs which can be recovered by combining with ongoing per unit of consumption cost of service delivery. He reviewed FY 2015-18 Capital Projects for the Electric Utility. Based on the costs of these projects and the number of current customers, each customer is paying a subsidy of approximately \$10 per month. He highlighted a few components of the Strategic Plan which focus on social equity and noted that current practices do not necessarily align with social equity when some of our poorest citizens are paying these subsidies.

Mr. Thomas provided estimated costs for the development of a new home in Austin, TX and Bloomington, IN. Construction costs total \$23,000 in Austin and \$15,000 in Bloomington. Assuming a typical figure of \$30,000/home, costs equates to around \$12,000/resident. He felt that it's important to understand why the cost is so important and that a consultant should be hired to study fees on electricity, roads, police and fire. Once there is data, there should be a community conversation about growth and what should be subsidized. Councilperson Pitzer stated there was an electricity fee study done recently. Mr. Thomas stated that study was flawed and based on data that could not be justified or explained. Councilperson Peters asked about redevelopment. Mr. Thomas stated that redevelopments would not incur these fees.

Director of Community Development Tim Teddy stated that staff would like to know how Council would like to move forward with a Growth Impact Study and what might be included in an RFP for that project. There are multiple types of studies that could be done, but a blend of techniques can be requested. Mr. Teddy felt that it would be helpful to know the key deliverables Council would like and scope of work including citizen input checkpoints, etc. There is a budgeted amount for this totaling \$75,000. He reviewed a sample introduction for the RFP for Council to review and consider.

Mr. Teddy continued that new buildings do bring in new taxes and a growth in sales tax

and new assets are brought into inventory for ongoing maintenance. He reviewed some fiscal impacts to analyze including traditional fiscal impacts, the return on capital investments, and simulation/scenario models. He reviewed some of the limitations of a fiscal impact analysis including the attribution of cash flows to land use categories which can be misleading, and changes in tax structure. Councilperson Trapp asked if the analysis would look into lost opportunities. Mr. Teddy stated that there are ways to look into areas outside the city limits that rely on our services and that could be considered in an analysis.

Mr. Glascock stated that staff will bring back an RFP on the Growth Impact Study for Council review. Mr. Thomas added that if roads are studied, exactions should be considered on other road improvements that would then be needed such as lane changes, etc. Costs could be amortized or built into property taxes to make it manageable costs for developers.

Sewer - Annexation Policy

Attachments: [Annexation 101](#)

[PR 155-97A Annexation Policy](#)

[August 1997 minutes](#)

[Annexation Policy June 2019](#)

Mr. Teddy stated that annexation leads to more infrastructure needs. The only policy piece we have on annexation is PR115-97A. There have been over 50 ordinances approving annexations. There are some that are currently contiguous annexations which have not been moved on yet. Mr. Skala asked if the Council can act on the contiguous parcels or if property owners must initiate. Mr. Teddy stated that there is a process for city initiated annexation. He reviewed the annexation map noting color coding is done to indicate annexation by year. He also reviewed the annexation agreement map showing tracts that have not yet been annexed, but there is an agreement in place. Mr. Teddy stated that he is seeking Council feedback on how to proceed with the annexation agreement tracts. He added that notifications will be given to property owners and annexation agreements are open ended with no sunset. Some of these areas are now contiguous. Mr. Skala suggested these be reconciled not to be open-ended and that a sunset provision be added. Mr. Glascock added that some of these areas are outside the city limits, but pay 1.5 times that rate to receive city services. Mr. Thomas added that Council should consider whether services be offered outside city limits for contiguous and non-contiguous parcels. He is concerned we will become an unsustainable community and these practices will not align with the Climate Action Plan. The long range plan for the sewer system may be problematic and smaller scale operations should be considered. There was a general discussion among Council on annexation. Mayor Treece stated that he is generally against pre-annexation agreements and he would also like to separate the sewer policy from the annexation policy. He would also like Council to receive a cost benefit analysis for areas proposed to be annexed so potential revenues could be considered. He asked when the agreement with Boone County Regional Sewer District can be renewed. Mr. Glascock stated that these are done on an individual basis but amendments come forward as needed. Mayor Treece felt that the connection fees in that agreement could be reviewed. Mayor Treece asked what the political climate is for forced annexation. Mr. Teddy stated that there are usually some conversations initiated by residents in the area proposed for annexation. There is usually resistance when the city is moving completely into an area. Council has in the past waived the annexation requirements in situations where a sewer is being built. Sooner or later, there are issues with parcels blocking other parcels.

II. ALL OTHER ITEMS THE COUNCIL MAY WISH TO DISCUSS

None.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:55 p.m.