

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
FEBRUARY 17, 2014**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 17, 2014, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT and TRAPP 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 February 3, 2014 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

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

Ms. Hoppe requested R25-14 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

Mr. Skala requested B31-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Mr. Thomas requested B32-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B31-14 and B32-14 being moved to old business and R25-14 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

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

**COLUMBIA LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD**

Westerfield, Mary, 101 S. Glenwood, Ward 4, Term to expire June 30, 2014

**COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

Calcote, Dalton, 2301 Garden Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire March 1, 2017

Miller, Elizabeth, 610 Redbud Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire March 1, 2017

Thompson, Meghanne, 1701 Affirmed Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire March 1, 2017

**PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMISSION**

Peplow, Mike, 2908 Crawford Street, Ward 5, Term to expire March 1, 2017

Quinn, Christiane, 719 West Broadway, Ward 1, Term to expire March 1, 2017

Ruhlen, Rachel, 103 Longfellow Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire March 1, 2017

## SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

### E. Joyce Schulte – Technology Corridor.

Ms. Schulte, 5410 Kelsey Drive, explained the idea of a technological corridor came to her over the last few years as she traveled around the United States. Geographically, she believed the technological corridor should follow I-70 from St. Louis to Kansas City, and include 30 miles on either side of I-70. She suggested terminal points be located in Wentzville on the east side and in Blue Springs on the west side. She noted she had seen technology corridors in Virginia and Maryland, and Maryland was into the genome world, while Virginia was into the IT world. The results were that jobs were plentiful, specific and growing. Revenues had led to specific use of geographical areas and there was added revenue to states, corporations, schools and residents. These technology corridors were also benefiting science, medicine, technology and security to the nation on a daily basis. She envisioned Missouri to be positioned for something similar. She suggested the City Council invite representatives of state and local governments of all types to come together to identify the technology focus of the Missouri I-70 corridor by making requests to the educational institutions to determine what research was being conducted now that would benefit humans for the next 500 years. She felt the focus for this technology corridor would be found based on those responses. She noted it was a matter of setting a vision and following through. She explained she had gathered information from Maryland and Virginia, and understood other states had taken opportunities to form various corridors for various purposes, and those states included Florida, North Carolina, New York and Iowa. She believed Missouri was uniquely positioned due to its location in the center of the nation, and the fact it had roads, some which might need to be enlarged, water routes for the movement of materials, air travel for people and products, space, a stable population and many people desiring better jobs with more stability.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### PR229-13 Adopting a policy relating to the repair, maintenance and restoration of brick paved streets.

The policy resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes explained there was a recommendation to table this to the March 17, 2014 Council Meeting to allow the commissions to communicate further on the issue.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table PR229-13 to the March 17, 2014 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor McDavid continued the public hearing to the March 17, 2014 Council Meeting.

### R28-14 Reserving funding and designating Central Missouri Community Action and Job Point as Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO); approving an amendment to the FY 2013 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased to see the minimum universal design requirements, such as zero step walkways, low thresholds, rocker-style light switches, open base kitchen and bathroom sinks, the 60 by 60 turnaround in bathrooms and zero step entry showers, as this forward thinking aligned with the City's vision.

Mr. Skala commented that these organizations had done yeoman's work in this area so he trusted them implicitly and felt this was a good proposal.

The vote on R28-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**(A) Consider replacement of the current orbital pulse bus system with a networked system of bus routes as outlined in the CoMO Connect transit project.**

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes, Mr. Glascock and Mr. Brooks provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if buses would be going in both directions on the gold route. Mr. Brooks replied there would be two buses traveling in each direction during peak service on the black and gold routes.

Mayor McDavid asked how many buses would be used for the downtown route. Mr. Brooks replied there would be one bus on a 30 minute interval. He thought they might need to add another bus to that route if they could come up with more funding.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the CoMO Connect name would change since a marketing class at Stephens College was looking at rebranding Columbia transit. Mr. Brooks replied he did not know, and noted the class might draw upon CoMO Connect or suggest changes to the brand or logo. He pointed out the City did not have to move forward with any suggestion made by the class.

Ms. Hoppe understood the advertising wraps would be eliminated since they destroyed the brand. Mr. Brooks stated that would be up to City Council. He explained the City had one more year on the contract, and staff would be asking Council for direction this fall since they would have to re-bid the contract. Ms. Hoppe stated she hoped Council would not continue with the wraps as she felt some of the wraps were unsightly and did not help with branding.

Mr. Thomas commented that he was immensely impressed with the redesign and vision of this project, but felt the gold route should go an additional 300 feet to the south so it passed through the intersection of Rollins and Hitt. There were 35,000 students that spent a large portion of their day in the building at that intersection. While students were not the largest segment of riders at the moment, they were the early adopters and would help leverage the growth of the system, which would allow for better service throughout the community. He believed it would make an enormous difference to the success of the system if the City could tell the students they could get on a bus right outside that building that would take them to the east and west parts of town as well as the north and south parts of town. Mr. Glascock explained staff had to ensure the buses could get through Rollins. He stated

staff felt placing two express routes in the same location would create congestion issues, and noted they had those congestion issues today, which was the reason the routes were split. He pointed out Brady Commons was a short walk to Elm Street, and staff was trying to ensure they could cover the entire city, not just one spot.

Mayor McDavid understood the routes were subject to change if necessary. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood the City owned the roads and asked if they could place stricter non-bus restrictions on those roads if congestion was a problem. Mr. Glascock stated there was an ordinance that indicated the City could restrict those roads for its use.

Mr. Skala commented that he liked the suggestion of Mr. Thomas in terms of the critical mass of students in front of Brady Commons.

Mayor McDavid asked how close the City was to having bus passes that could be purchased on a smart phone. Mr. Brooks replied the City was quite a ways away from being able to provide that service. He explained it was expensive because every vehicle had to be equipped with the appropriate technology, and the company currently used by the City for its fare boxes did not provide that service at an affordable rate. He pointed out it did not mean the City would not get there, but was not in the budget now.

Mayor McDavid understood Brookside contributed \$100,000-\$200,000 to the revenue stream and asked if this project had been vetted with them and whether they were satisfied. Mr. Brooks replied yes.

Mayor McDavid commented that the engagement of Stephens College had not been what he had hoped it would be, but understood the City was providing those students direct access on the black route to the recreation center. Mr. Brooks replied that was correct, and stated he felt Stephens College had better access than ever before. Mayor McDavid asked if they had provided any feedback. Mr. Brooks stated the City had not approached them yet, but would reach out if this was approved tonight.

Mayor McDavid asked if staff was confident this was good for the big apartment complexes south of town. Mr. Brooks replied the City had met with all of them and they were very excited. Mayor McDavid asked if that included The Domain, which was the newest complex. Mr. Brooks replied staff had not approached the newer ones yet. He explained they had been reluctant because they were worried about capacity issues because they did not have additional buses for that route at this time.

Ms. Nauser asked for the times of the route that would go by the Reality House. Mr. Brooks replied it had not been completely negotiated at this time, but they were currently looking at two trips in whatever hour block was decided for the mornings and evenings. Ms. Nauser asked what the latest time would be for the bus routes in general. Mr. Brooks replied 8:00 p.m. Ms. Nauser suggested staff contact the Juvenile Office about visitation hours because there were a lot of parents who could not visit their children due to transportation issues, and felt the bus route time should be one that allowed more parents the opportunity to visit their kids. Mr. Brooks stated staff would talk to the Juvenile Office.

Ms. Hoppe understood three bus routes traveled down Conley and two traveled Keene Street, and asked why three routes traveled Conley instead of requiring a transfer and whether the times the buses would travel the road would be varied or if they would converge.

Mr. Brooks replied the goal was to time them as close as possible so the waiting time was only a couple of minutes. At that location, he thought the buses would probably converge close to each other. Staff felt that was a good location due to the large amount of traffic, the wide roads, and the lighted intersection at the Staples entrance, which allowed for a good place for people to cross. There were no lighted intersections on Keene Street, except on the south side. There was good right-of-way at that location as well so staff felt that was a good place for shelters and other amenities.

Mr. Glascock pointed out there would be growing pains when this switch was made if Council decided to move forward, and asked for their diligence and patience when that happened.

Mayor McDavid understood Columbia Transit had offered a free week at the start of school and asked if staff had considered offering a free week at the start of the second semester. Mr. Brooks replied yes. Mayor McDavid asked if staff had considered providing an ad hoc free week when the weather was miserable. Mr. Brooks replied he thought that was a good idea.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Cheryl Price, 511 Parkade Boulevard, stated she was present on behalf of the Services for Independent Living Board of Directors, the Disabilities Commission, and the Public Transit Advisory Commission. Although the Services for Independent Living Board of Directors did not send Council a formal resolution, the full board was in support of this as they felt CoMO Connect was a watershed idea. The Disabilities Commission also fully supported the new orbital system of CoMO Connect and was really excited about some of the added accessibility features. She noted the Public Transit Advisory Commission supported this project as well. She thanked the staff that had worked on this project as it would benefit the citizens of Columbia. She commented that she had attended six or seven of the neighborhood meetings, and almost 90 percent of the people she had spoken with supported this new system, to include the new format for the bus schedule. She believed the City had the opportunity to make this a premier system for Columbia, but noted they had to find more money, and asked the Council to invest as much money as possible. She commented that with the advent of CoMO Connect, the City would need to do more about shoveling snow at the bus stops whether volunteers or others were utilized.

Bill Easley, 705 Cook, commented that a blue route had been removed from Sexton Road and that had hampered him as he relied on the public transit system to get around. He felt the City was catering the transit system to students, and the Council to consider people such as him because the students would only be in town for a short period of time. He understood the Wabash Station, which was built with government money, would no longer be utilized, and wondered what people would do when it was raining, too warm outside, or snowing. He believed the Council did not understand because they did not use the bus system.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not believe the City was catering to just the students, but noted history had shown the student population could bring funds into the system that would allow for it to expand for the benefit of everyone.

Lisa Goldschmidt, 507 High Street, commented that she was representing Columbians for Modern Efficient Transit (CoMET), which was a campaign of the PedNet Coalition that was focused specifically on increasing and expanding public transit in the Columbia area. They commended and supported the efforts of Columbia Transit and other City staff that had designed and would work to implement CoMO Connect, as they felt the new system would further help Columbia take advantage of the many benefits of public transit, including increased economic activity, additional revenue, a healthier population, reduced wear and tear of roads, reduced greenhouse gas emissions by taking more cars off of the road, and an increased access to employment, healthcare, healthy foods, education, shopping and recreation. CoMO Connect would promote the benefits of public transit through an improved, consistent schedule, switching from the current hub and spoke model to a more efficient network model, which would allow for transfers along routes rather than the Wabash Station, expanded coverage to areas of the City that had not previously had access to public transit, real time bus tracking, the future set up for mobile payments, shorter headways, and a system that was designed for growth in the coming years. While they supported these changes and hoped the Council would allow this plan to be implemented this summer, they believed there was more that could be done, and should be done. They asked the Council to consider a reallocation of funds from expensive road projects to public transit while exploring multiple funding sources to sustain and expand the bus system. They wanted to see the addition of Sunday bus service as this was particularly important to retail and food industry workers, longer service hours that could accommodate shift workers, and routes that connected to areas just outside of the City, particularly pockets of low-income that were currently isolated from transportation options.

Christiane Quinn, 719 W. Broadway, stated she was a Co-Chair of CoMET and became involved in 2010 when her son lost the ability to use the City bus to get to Hickman High School due to bus route and schedule changes. Last spring, she assisted in the creation of the Kewpie Express pilot project by speaking with students and faculty, distributing passes, and raising funds for the project. She explained she was also a member of the Public Transit Advisory Commission, and the Commission had worked hard to provide input to City staff with regard to the CoMO Connect project in terms of the survey, the forums and the routes. She believed the proposed CoMO Connect project would make a positive change as the new network was designed to serve, not only the general public, but Columbia Public School (CPS) students as buses would pass by the middle schools and high schools, and the new routes even included the high school colors. This was important as it would allow before and after school programs to be available to all students, and not just those who had access to private cars. She hoped City staff and the CPS would be able to develop time tables that would make the most sense for students to utilize the bus. She asked the City Council to consider the replacement of the current orbital bus system with the new network model. She believed students were vital, and this would allow young people to grow up valuing the use of public transportation.

Jack Cardetti stated he was with Tightline Strategies, which had offices at 122 E. High Street, Jefferson City, and explained he was representing Brookside Properties. He thanked the Council and staff for their hard work on this important project. Every resident of

Brookside Midtown had FastCAT bus passes, and 225 residents of their new complex on Walnut would join next year. He noted they were excited about the new routes, and the route that went down College across Rollins, in particular, as it would take tenants to and from the middle of campus. They also felt the new grocery store downtown would provide the opportunity to increase ridership for their residents. The major drawback with the proposed system was the shorter hours of operation, but they felt that would be outweighed by the benefits the new system would bring to the entire City along with the opportunity to increase ridership. If this proposal was approved by Council, they would work with City staff to make changes to their existing transportation contract. They would also work hard in marketing the bus system to the students of Brookside. He commented that Brookside took great pride in the progress made downtown in recent years, and noted they believed a thriving public transit system was important to the future growth of Columbia.

Sarah Klaassen, 108 Ripley Street, explained she was representing Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA) and commented that she was excited for CoMO Connect, personally and professionally. CMCA had advocated for improved transit for several years and they were excited to support this system change as they anticipated it would improve the lives of the individuals and families they served. She thanked everyone that had worked to make this vision what it was today. As an agency that worked with low-income community members, they consistently saw the lack of transportation as one of the biggest barriers for their clients and felt improving public transportation improved access to employment, healthcare, recreational opportunities, healthy foods, and to places like CMCA where people could find the necessary support to address other barriers that prevented them from flourishing. Better transportation made a difference in people's lives. She noted she did not believe CoMO Connect would be enough since some places were still not served as some affordable housing had been pushed to the fringes of the City and many low wage workers had jobs that required Sunday work or a late shift that ended after the public transit system stopped running. She felt they would need to continue to improve, expand and prioritize public transportation, even with CoMO Connect.

Jonathan Session, 115 Aldeah Avenue, stated he loved this new proposal as he believed it would be great for Columbia. He also loved the idea of the route colors to match the high schools in the community. He commented that it was clear the routes looked at the high schools, but there were a lot of community members that needed to go to the elementary schools, and there were many elementary schools these routes did not serve, such as Alpha Hart Lewis. He felt it was important to provide services to the families that needed to get to these elementary schools.

John Nichols, 704 N. Williams Street, stated he wanted to advocate for frequent stops at the commuter lots along the Highway 63 corridor since there were a lot of people that commuted to Jefferson City and carpooled from the commuter lots. In addition to a free week during the first week of each semester of school, he suggested providing free routes during some of the festivals, such as True/False or Roots N' Blues, where there was a demand for parking in specific locations. He noted he also agreed with Mr. Thomas's suggestion of bringing the gold route directly in front of the Student Center. As a former student who worked with Sustain Mizzou, he believed as much convenience as possible was the key to

getting people to buy into any system, and expecting students to walk up to Elm Street would significantly decrease ridership based on the lower convenience factor. He noted he was otherwise happy with this plan and supported it.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that he was proud of the effort thus far and noted there would always be some shortcomings. He suggested the educational sessions be held at the Library on a regular basis as there would be constant turnover in ridership. He stated Monday nights had been an issue for the disabled for some time and wondered if that issue could be resolved so they could attend Council Meetings.

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, explained many people liked to go to church, and they would not be able to attend church on Sundays if the buses did not run.

Diane Meeker, 2401 W. Broadway, Apt. 1120, stated she was speaking on behalf of the Columbia Area National Organization for Women and was a regular bus rider. She thanked the City for this proposal and for promoting public transit in this manner as she believed it was important. She agreed it would be better if bus service was closer to the Student Center as there was quite a distance between it and Elm Street. She believed this was a wonderful start and noted she looked forward to the day when all of the buses ran on renewable energy.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he believed the planning for this project along with the COFERS project were wonderful examples of professional long-term capital improvement planning. He noted there was an economic development aspect to public transportation and felt the lack of public transportation was a drawback to attracting businesses. He suggested economic development funding be looked at to expand public transportation services in the downtown during the second year of this project as this would reduce the risk of the entire system failing because the downtown was a destination and a neighborhood. He did not believe one bus every 30 minutes would serve the system. He agreed upgrading the airport had been a significant economic development tool, but felt Columbia now needed to invest in the transit system to support people at work, at play, and those going to school. He did not believe only those with low means were impacted as the current system hindered everyone's ability to get to work or home in a reasonable time. He reiterated emphasizing the economic development aspect of transit and felt it should be the core transportation priority for the next ten years as it would payoff in terms of economic development.

Joe Alder, 511 Parkade Boulevard, stated he believed this was a great start and was hopeful it would succeed, but also felt they needed to expose and encourage every entrepreneurial idea that could make this a success. He explained that last year he had suggested a paratransit vehicle and a bus be included in the Tons of Trucks event at Cosmo Park as it would allow many people to view these vehicles and see how they operated. He thought the City needed to expose those that never rode the bus to the service and the idea of riding the bus. He commented that he had seen some buses in a motel parking lot that were likely in transit to their destination community, and those buses had the sayings of "Need a Lift?" and "Welcome Aboard" instead of wraps. He believed the City also needed to think about commuter bus service from Midway to the campus and hospital area. He understood this would require expanded commuter parking, but noted it would also capture

those that did not want to drive all of the way into Columbia and add riders and revenue to help expand the system.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and agreed with many of the comments previously made. She appreciated many of the aspects of this project and looked forward to the day when the transit buses ran on sustainable renewable energy. Public transportation was important to a lot of their members and for those in different income brackets to be served. She noted this project had a lot of potential, to include economic development, and stated her support.

Arnold, a volunteer at the Wabash Station, thanked the City for this project as it would help move public transportation forward, which he felt was important to the health of the community.

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

Mayor McDavid commented that he agreed with Mr. Thomas with regard to students being more likely to use the bus system if it dropped them off in the middle of campus, and felt the routes could be altered as needed. He stated he believed this was a great start and saluted staff for its creativity, but pointed out Columbia had a long way to go in comparison to other University cities with regard to transit. He understood some felt there was too much emphasis being placed on the students, but pointed out 40 percent of the population consisted of students, and successful transit groups had strong collaborations with universities. This did not exist in Columbia, so the City had to drive transit from a customer service standpoint. Communities that had fare-free transit services, which included student fees paying for buses, had 90-100 riders per capita while Columbia had about 10 riders per capita. He noted he excluded those students who drove to Trowbridge, Reactor Field and Hearnese and took a shuttle bus to Brady Commons as he considered them commuters. He felt they would continue to struggle with ridership until there was a stronger collaboration between the City and the University. He also felt better technology was needed and important. He believed the DoubleMap application was a good start, but felt an application that would allow the purchase of tickets was needed as well. He thought the technology aspect was important in terms of collaboration with the Columbia Public Schools. The Columbia Public Schools spent \$3 per students per day and the City was having trouble selling tickets for \$0.65 per day. The technology would also provide a security aspect in that parents would know when their child would be home. He noted they also needed to continue to ask about transportation when proposed apartment complexes were being considered by the Council, especially when the complex was being built in the periphery of Columbia. He stated the City was providing a below market rate of \$62.50 as the market rate was \$80, but students were an emphasis because they provided the revenue, and successful transit systems were a result of tremendous revenue since more buses and services, in terms of location, frequency, hours, etc., could be provided with more revenue.

Mr. Thomas stated he fully endorsed CoMO Connect and agreed it was a watershed idea to break away from the central hub system as this allowed the buses to travel throughout the community and provided a more efficient and effective service. He noted the planning and public outreach process had been excellent as there had been an enormous effort to hold public forums and communicate with current and potential bus riders, those in the

downtown, and those associated with the University. Changes had been made in response to the input received and something everyone liked had been developed. He thought this proposal provided a good balance in terms of serving those already riding the bus while trying to get more people invested in the system. He commented that the City was trying to create a culture change and more people had to be brought into the transit culture to build momentum. He noted they were integrating this bus service throughout the community through partnerships, to include Brookside, the apartments to the south, Boone County for the morning and afternoon routes in the northern part of the community, and the schools with the purple, blue and green routes. He thought they might see more paratransit riders using the fixed routes if the stops were close enough to their desired locations. He agreed future growth of the system was needed and noted he had suggestions for expansion next year, which he planned to discuss during the budget retreat. He stated the critical point would be the City's relationship with the University, and he was hopeful a better relationship would be built as the students could help drive the expansion of this service for the entire community.

Mr. Schmidt commented that the fact that people were recommending only slight changes showed the success of this proposal. He hoped this would be the foundation upon which growth, such as Sunday service, evening service, service for the elementary schools, etc., occurred.

Ms. Hoppe thanked City staff for participating in this comprehensive year-long process that involved community engagement and obtaining feedback from the Council, various organizations, and service users. It was a great process and model, which provided for a good product that the public appreciated. She understood there would be a need for changes as data was collected, but felt this was the first step in providing a more efficient and expanded cost-neutral system. She agreed it was important for the City to have a good sidewalk clearing system in terms of snow, and thought they would need to be more diligent in that regard in the future. She pointed out the park and ride commuter lot on New Haven Road by Highway 63 that people traveling to Jefferson City used was on the bus route, so she assumed a bus would stop there. She was glad the routes would go by the high schools, and thought it might be useful to put the elementary schools on the map to show how close a route might be to those schools while they worked toward better service to the elementary schools.

Ms. Nauser thanked City staff for developing this plan as it was tremendously better than what they currently had. She was excited there would bus routes in her ward and hoped this previously underserved portion of the community would utilize the bus system. She did not believe this was a student-centered bus system. She felt it was a community-centered bus system as it would allow people in all corners of the community to get to locations of entertainment, medical needs, retail, etc. within 30 minutes. She commented that this showed the type of innovation that could be expected when staff was provided a blank slate. She agreed this was the beginning, and that great things would come in the future in terms of transit.

Mr. Skala commented that it was hard not to be effusive praising the creation of this proposal. The distributed aspect in place of the centralized aspect allowed most of the community to be covered with bus service and even double covered in some instances. The

outreach was also worthy of praise in that a lot of input had been provided in terms of the types of service that was needed and what needed to be addressed in the future. He noted he had recently attended the New Partners for Smart Growth Conference, and the session called “Bosses for Buses,” discussed the fact the two most underengaged constituency groups for transit advocacy were transit riders and transit-dependent employers. It was a real economic development pitch for transit. He stated he felt shelters and extended hours were keys because he believed they would get more buy in if riders were reasonably comfortable in terms of rain, snow, etc. He also felt habits could be created in terms of ridership if they could get the students on the buses sooner. He thanked the staff and the public for participating in this process, and commented that he thought it would be worthwhile even though there might be a few issues along the way.

Mr. Trapp stated he had been pleased with the overall approach to CoMO Connect. He was excited about adding service to Scott Boulevard, along Bethany, the Lake of the Woods area, the Route B industrial corridor, etc. He felt transit impacted public safety as the main determination with regard to whether ex-offenders would return to prison was whether they had a job, and being able to connect residential centers with job opportunities on Route B was a strong point. During an Anti-Violence Task Force meeting, the Columbia Public Schools had indicated an improvement to transportation would assist in addressing issues of truancy and increasing good outcomes with kids. He loved the high school-oriented routes as it would allow a greater participation in after-school activities and a way to get to school for part of the day if the student missed the school bus. He praised staff and the excellent leadership of Mayor McDavid and Mr. Thomas in their efforts to bring attention to transit in terms of how it could greatly impact the community.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to proceed with the CoMO Connect plans of implementing the proposed routes and associated changes by August 4, 2014.

Mr. Skala asked if an amendment was needed to ensure the black and gold routes traveled to Brady Commons. Mayor McDavid thought that could be altered in the future. Mr. Thomas agreed.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas directing staff to proceed with the CoMO Connect plans of implementing the proposed routes and associated changes by August 4, 2014 was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(B) Construction of a 13.8 kV three phase underground electrical distribution line along Ponderosa Street, from Grindstone Parkway to Discovery Park Subdivision.**

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood there was a difference between undergrounding a 13 kV line and 161 kV line and asked for an explanation. Mr. Johnsen replied there was a substantial difference between undergrounding 13,000 volt lines and 161,000 volt lines due to the amount of protection needed so people could not dig into the line. The transmission lines had to be encased in a lot of concrete with more separation between the lines and more insulation on the conductors so it was a completely different type of construction project and had substantially higher costs associated with it.

Mr. Thomas understood the funding for this project was from the reserves of the electric bills paid for by customers. Mr. Johnsen stated he believed this project was funded by enterprise revenue for capital improvement projects. Mr. Thomas understood a developer would have to pay a water equity fee, which was \$500, and \$138 per dwelling unit for the meter for a new development, and asked if there was anything equivalent in terms of electricity. Mr. Johnsen replied there was not a connection fee for electricity and noted the expansion of infrastructure was handled differently between water and electric. He referred to the diagram on the overhead and explained the City was responsible for the solid line. The red dotted line was the portion that would have to be developed on the developer's property, which was a cost share proposal involving the developer. The City was just getting the electricity to the site.

Ms. Hoppe asked for the percentage of this project that would serve new development and whether it included Bristol Lake and the Gans Recreational Area. Mr. Johnsen replied that was the area, but noted some of the costs were associated with bringing it to reliability standards. This area was served as a radial, but the City was now creating a loop feed, which was the standard, so a trip in the loop could be withstood without people losing power. This would not only serve additional capacity, but it would also provide the service and reliability the system was designed to meet. Ms. Hoppe understood this would serve the new Catholic high school. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala asked how this project in this area compared to the Business Loop area. Mr. Johnsen replied development had been less intense and had not existed as long as it had on the Business Loop, so there was less to maneuver around, but there were still overhead lines for the majority of the route, and as a result, they would underground the lines using those existing easements. He noted the Business Loop project was different because they had to get different easements in some situations since they could not necessarily underground in the same place the overhead lines were located. In this situation, they could underground in the same location as the overhead lines.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Hoppe understood this project would serve some new development, including the high school and the Gans Creek Recreational Area, but noted it would also serve some existing development. She thought it was needed and should go forward. She wondered if in the future they needed to determine a percentage for new development so an appropriate fee was paid when new and duplicate loops were needed for reliability. She thought they needed to decide if the cost should be paid by all ratepayers or if a larger percentage should be paid by the new development. Mr. Johnsen explained it was hard to make a direct comparison between electric and water because the electric system was such an interconnected system in that the person served by a piece of line today might not be served by the same line a month from now as the system could be reconfigured, and as the system grew and changed, they did not know who customers of a particular line would be on a daily basis. It was an interconnected system, which allowed them the ability to reconfigure for reliability purposes. Ms. Hoppe thought they could look at the percentage of growth in general on the system and how that cost was borne.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to proceed with the construction of the 13.8 kV underground electrical distribution extension from Grindstone Parkway to the Discovery Park Subdivision. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

## OLD BUSINESS

### **B31-14 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to change the speed limit on portions of Clark Lane and Ballenger Lane.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the speed limit from Hanover to Clark Lane was 45 mph and 50 mph from Clark Lane to Ballenger, and asked why the speed limit on the Ballenger portion was higher than the speed limit on the part of Clark Lane that was to be improved. He noted the speed limit was even lower in the commercial areas of Clark Lane. He thought Ballenger, which was also unimproved without shoulders, was more dangerous at that speed. Mr. Glascock explained MoDOT studied it and utilized the 85th percentile speed. They posted the speed limit based upon what people were actually driving.

Mr. Thomas understood the mechanism of selecting the speed limit was less about what the community or staff felt was appropriate, and more about how fast people drove on the particular road because they posted a speed limit that was based on the speed 85 percent of the people drove under and 15 percent exceeded. Mr. Glascock stated MoDOT felt it caused fewer accidents since people were driving at speeds they were comfortable driving. If a really low speed was posted, most people would break the law. Mr. Thomas asked if these speed limits would be effective without any calming being installed. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it would because he did not believe MoDOT would have agreed to it if people were not driving those speeds. Mr. Skala pointed out calming would be created on certain portions of Clark Lane when the lanes were narrowed.

B31-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

### **B32-14 Authorizing construction of roadway pavement improvements on Clark Lane, between Woodland Springs Court and McKee Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked for the status of a crosswalk at a central point of this improvement. Mr. Glascock replied staff was discussing it with MoDOT to ensure the improvements were made the way they wanted. He thought a crosswalk would be included, but could not guarantee it.

Mr. Skala commented that the suggestion of the crosswalk had been well taken and hoped MoDOT understood it was a desirable option. Mr. Glascock explained MoDOT wanted to ensure it was safe. He thought a flashing beacon or some other identifier would be required. They would not be able to only have two signs and paint on the ground. Mr. Skala

suggested street lighting be installed in the area as well. Mr. Thomas asked if enough funds had been allocated to include that type of crossing with this ordinance. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

B32-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

- B29-14**      Rezoning property located north of Gans Road and west of U.S. Highway 63 (within Discovery Park Subdivision) from Districts PUD-4, O-P and C-P to Districts PUD-4, O-P and C-P; approving the Lot 5-17, Discovery Park CP, OP, PUD-4 Development Plan; setting forth a condition for approval.
- B30-14**      Approving the Lot 2, Discovery Park CP Development Plan located on the southwest corner of Philips Farm Road and Ponderosa Street; setting forth a condition for approval.
- B33-14**      Authorizing construction of a sidewalk on the east side of Ashland Road, between Stadium Boulevard and East Campus Loop Drive, and a raised island and pedestrian signals at the intersection of Ashland Road and Stadium Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B34-14**      Authorizing construction of an equipment storage building at the Columbia Regional Airport; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B35-14**      Authorizing construction of a sidewalk along the east side of Garth Avenue, between Leslie Lane and Parkade Boulevard, and a crosswalk with pedestrian activated flashing lights and center median island across the north leg of the intersection of Garth Avenue and Parkade Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B36-14**      Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of a sidewalk on the east side of Garth Avenue, between Leslie Lane and Parkade Boulevard.
- B37-14**      Authorizing the acquisition of land for the expansion of the Columbia Regional Airport, in accordance with the Airport Master Plan 2009 Update.
- B38-14**      Accepting conveyances for sewer, utility and temporary construction purposes.
- B39-14**      Appropriating funds for the purchase of JustWare Prosecutor case management software.
- B40-14**      Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotions and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.
- B41-14**      Authorizing a contractor agreement with the National Association of County and City Health Officials for development of a workforce development plan; appropriating funds.
- R22-14**      Setting a public hearing: construction of upgrades to Boiler 8 at the Municipal Power Plant to reduce nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions.

- R23-14     Setting a public hearing: consider the FY 2013 Consolidated Annual Performance Report (CAPER).
- R24-14     Authorizing a student agreement with Barnes-Jewish Hospital, on behalf of its Goldfarb School of Nursing at Barnes-Jewish College, to provide health clinical experience for advance practice nursing students.
- R26-14     Authorizing agreements with Special Olympics Missouri and Ultramax Sports for tourism development funds.
- R27-14     Authorizing the City Manager and City Counselor to make federal fiscal year 2014 Certifications and Assurances for Federal Transit Administration assistance programs.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

## **NEW BUSINESS**

**R29-14     Determining projects to be funded through the Central Columbia Tax Increment Financing District, and authorizing certain actions by City officials.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes, Mr. Glascock and Mr. St. Romaine provided part of the staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood there would be a sanitary sewer overflow in the Hinkson Creek Basin if there was two inches of rain today. Mr. Matthes stated the overflow would occur with one inch. Mr. St. Romaine agreed and pointed out two inches would be worse. Mayor McDavid understood this was the current condition, and asked how this impacted Columbia's relationship with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Mr. Glascock replied 2008-2010 were very wet years so there were hundreds of sanitary sewer overflows in the City, and as a result, they stated something needed to be done to address the issue. The City was still in discussions with them in terms of a consent order, but if it got to that point, the City would be bound by a decree to fix the problems. Mr. Matthes explained the City's efforts toward inflow and infiltration (I&I) demonstrated good faith by showing the City was doing something, and this had prolonged that conversation.

Mayor McDavid noted Mr. Matthes had been quoted in the paper saying no more building permits would be approved in the downtown because of this, and asked if he still stood by that comment. Mr. Matthes replied he did. He explained the situation would get worse as they discussed electric and other utilities.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been on the Council when they received the I&I report, and it was awful. He understood the bond issue put aside \$16 million for future I&I efforts and asked how much had been spent on I&I prior to the bond issue. Mr. Glascock replied the City had lined or replaced 45 miles of the system from 1971 to 2011, but in 2012, an additional eight miles had been addressed, and in 2014, staff planned to address another three miles. He noted there was 500-600 miles in the overall system. Mr. Matthes explained the City had accelerated the pace in recent years, and this \$16 million would go a long way.

Mr. Skala understood some existing projects in the downtown were ongoing and there was the potential for other projects that were not high impact to proceed. Mr. Matthes stated the City had approved a number of projects to this point that were small-impact type projects, but they were now at a point they could not accept anymore. Mr. Skala understood construction had not totally ceased downtown except for high impact developments. Mr. Glascock pointed out the problem was how a development would be selected to proceed. He wondered if it would be first come, first served, or if another method would be used. Mr. Skala stated that was the question he was asking as he felt he was receiving mixed messages. Mr. Matthes commented that they could only allow a project that would deliver less sewage or use less electricity due to capacity issues as of three weeks ago.

Ms. Hoppe asked how much of the money in the last sewer bond issue had been allocated for new sewers for new developments or for sewers outside of the City limits. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it was about \$4.1 million. Mr. Glascock thought it had been about \$3.5-\$4 million. Mr. Schmidt understood \$16 million was for I&I. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked if specific projects had been identified for the money that had been earmarked for new development. Mr. Glascock replied the project by Midway was not new development. It would remove a package plant that leaked into the Perche Creek. Ms. Hoppe pointed out that was not located within the City or the urban service area. Mr. Glascock agreed, but noted it was in the City's sewerage service area. Ms. Nauser understood \$4 million minus the cost of the Midway project was left for new development. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and thought another project had been identified as well. Mr. Glascock stated he believed it was the Steeplechase project.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification on the distinction between the urban service area and the sewerage service area. Mr. Glascock replied the Sewer Utility Master Plan that was completed in 2004 identified the drainage area, and this was used to determine the area the City would service for sewer capacity. He noted they had worked with the Boone County Regional Sewer District in the effort. Mr. Matthes explained the topography of the sewerage service area was not reflected in the Comprehensive Plan, and although information had been provided, it was not captured by the urban service area.

Ms. Hoppe asked how the City recouped costs for providing sewer to areas that were not within the City. Mr. Glascock replied the areas outside of the City sometimes involved the Boone County Regional Sewer District, and the City had an agreement with them whereby the Sewer District would be charged for treatment and would be required to maintain the infrastructure. Ms. Hoppe understood they did not pay for the infrastructure, which fell to the City in terms of responsibility. Mr. Glascock clarified the Boone County Regional Sewer District or the developer paid for the infrastructure for those areas outside of the City limits. The City was paid for treatment if the agreement with the Sewer District applied. Ms. Hoppe understood the Midway sewer extension would cost \$3.2 million to construct and asked who would pay for that cost. Mr. Glascock replied the City would pay for that project. Ms. Hoppe understood new and existing development did not pay for the infrastructure, and only paid for treatment. Mr. Glascock pointed out the Boone County Regional Sewer District had approached the City about paying for a portion of this cost.

Mr. Schmidt understood the issue was that the urban service area did not necessarily follow the topography of the land. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Matthes explained the urban service area was largely influenced by their best guess in terms of the likely development over time, while the sewer area was really based upon physics in terms of drainage.

Mr. Glascock explained it was similar to what had been done for Battle High School in that the Boone County Regional Sewer District had paid for removing the package plant. He thought the High School paid for a portion as well.

Mr. Trapp asked if the law allowed the City to assess development impact fees. Mr. Matthes replied that was a tricky question with a lot of different case law. Ms. Thompson stated in certain circumstances the law would allow for it.

Mr. Schmidt asked if developers interested in the downtown had offered to pay for some portion of the infrastructure capacity needs. Mr. Matthes replied they had offered to cover the cost he would attribute to connections. They had not offered to assist with system costs.

Mr. Schmidt asked if any of this had been mentioned in the report completed by the Infrastructure Task Force. Mr. Skala replied he had served on that Task Force, which had produced two reports, the majority report and the minority report, and those reports discussed financing mechanisms for infrastructure but no conclusive recommendations were provided unless one accepted the majority report and rejected the minority report. Mr. Schmidt asked if specific pinch points were discussed. Mr. Skala replied that some of them had wanted to discuss hard and soft infrastructure and sewage, electricity, etc., but the Chair of the Task Force, with support, decided to only focus on roads.

Mr. Schmidt understood the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council had previously produced a report on a proposed downtown TIF, and asked if the lack of infrastructure had been discussed in that report. Mr. Matthes replied he thought the focus of that report had been on cultural issues, such as quality of life and aesthetic projects. It had not addressed traditional infrastructure. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct in that most of the report discussed streetscape, landscaping, cultural projects, etc. He commented that he did not think anyone anticipated the amount of growth and interest they had seen in the downtown when the report was authored.

Ms. Nauser understood the \$4.1 million for sewer extensions in the sewer bond issue had been spoken for in terms of pre-identified projects. Mr. Matthes stated it had been identified as two extensions and had been named. Ms. Nauser commented that she agreed with keeping their promise to the voters.

Ms. Nauser asked for the current balance in the sewer utility. Mr. Matthes replied it was a little under \$2 million the last time he had checked. Ms. Nauser commented that the Statement of Net Position Priority Funds, dated September 30, 2013, had indicated the current assets of cash and cash equivalents in the sewer utility were \$13.9 million. Mr. Matthes explained this was where the reports could be very confusing. He understood the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) showed how much cash was on hand on that particular day without taking into account what it took to make it through the next month. He noted they tried to carry two months of reserves, so the \$13 million would have been how

much the City had that day, but getting through the next month of sewer operations might cost \$11 million or \$12 million. He believed the CAFR measured a different scenario.

Ms. Cannon asked for clarification regarding the information Ms. Nauser wanted. Ms. Nauser replied she wanted to know the amount that was being held in cash reserves in the sewer utility as well as the water utility and electric utility for emergency purposes. Ms. Cannon explained she did not have an official cash balance as of today because they still had to update five months of activity and close out the funds, and to date they were only closed out through November. Ms. Nauser understood there was a requirement to keep reserves in those accounts and asked for those amounts. Ms. Cannon agreed, and noted the reserve was based on 20 percent of the projected expenditures for the next year. Mr. Schmidt asked if known large capital items would be subtracted out prior to determining the 20 percent. Ms. Cannon replied those things were taken into account on the budgeting side, which was why they were seeing a much lower balance. She pointed out there was a difference in cash when looking at the CAFR and the Financial Management Information Supplement because cash was cash in terms of the CAFR, but when trying to determine what they really had, they had to reduce the cash balance by budgeted capital projects, restricted bond payments, etc. Ms. Nauser asked for the amount on the last statement that was completed. Ms. Cannon replied the last official audited financial statement was dated September 30, 2013.

Mayor McDavid commented that the public was accusing the City of having massive slush funds, so they needed to be able to articulate how much cash they had. They needed to know why they could not pay for \$6 million of sewer work at this time. Ms. Cannon explained there was a cash balance, but there were still bills that needed to be paid, and that amount had not been reflected in the reduction of cash at this time, so from a budgetary perspective, they had to look at all of the assets minus the liabilities to know what was available. She pointed out there was a difference between the cash balance and the fund balance. Fund balance was similar to the equity in one's home, which was the difference between the asset and what was still owed, while cash was cash. She reiterated there were obligations already committed for the cash. Mayor McDavid stated he thought they wanted to know how much unrestricted money was in the account.

Ms. Cannon commented that as of September 30, 2013, the unrestricted cash was \$28 million, but that amount did not account for anything that would still otherwise need to be paid. She stated she could not provide a specific cash balance as of today because they had only closed out accounts through November 30, 2013. She explained they had to catch up with five months worth of activity in that particular fund to provide an official cash balance. She noted all of the cash was in one account at the bank so they knew the amount they had available to pay bills, but until they could get caught up on the activity, she could not provide an official cash balance.

Mayor McDavid understood Ms. Cannon did not know whether the City had \$6.75 million to fix the sewers. Ms. Nauser pointed out she just wanted to know what they had. She did not necessarily need to know whether they had enough to solve the problem. Mr. Matthes stated the budget indicated the City would have about \$2 million in the account if everything went well this year. Ms. Cannon pointed out that amount was a projection.

Mr. Skala commented that when they had asked for this information previously, they had received an amount of \$34 million, \$61 million, \$40 million and now \$28 million. Ms. Nauser pointed out those numbers were for the water and electric funds. She wanted to know the sewer as well. Ms. Cannon stated the \$28 million was for the water and electric funds. That was not the amount for the sewer fund. She apologized for incorrectly stating that earlier.

Mayor McDavid understood Mr. Matthes had indicated the City had about \$2 million in non-committed reserve funds. Mr. Glascock pointed out that was budgeted amount. Ms. Cannon stated that was correct and explained it was a projection based on the revenues and expenditures anticipated. Mayor McDavid asked if that included the mandated reserve fund. Mr. Matthes replied he was not sure and thought that might be all of the 20 percent. Mayor McDavid understood the City was essentially at the mandated reserve fund amount now.

Mr. Schmidt asked if COFERS would help with this once it was implemented. Ms. Cannon replied that was the intent of COFERS. Mr. Schmidt felt part of the problem was the current reporting system, which was 20 years old.

Ms. Nauser understood the encumbered funds were for annual projects, and that a list of those could be provided. Ms. Cannon stated that was correct. The projects were in the budget as part of the Capital Improvement Project plan (CIP).

Ms. Hoppe asked what sewer projects were in line to be done that were not as crucial or urgent as this project. Mr. Skala understood some of those projects could be deferred in favor of helping the downtown projects, and commented that he felt there was some precedent from 2005 when one of the tax issues did not pass requiring \$25 million in projects to be removed from the projected list of projects even though they had been promised to the voters. He thought they might need to do something similar now in terms of the infrastructure exigency they had in the downtown. Mr. St. Romaine stated Mr. Skala was correct in that he had indicated one of the ways they could fund this was to defer a project identified in a previous ballot issue, but the other comment he made was to temporarily defer those projects and reimburse them with the proceeds from the TIF district since the downtown projects would need to be completed within the next couple of years. This would allow those projects that had been promised the voters to be completed as well.

Mayor McDavid stated he was not sure the public was satisfied the City did not have the money to do the projects now. Ms. Cannon commented that based on the activity through the end of November of 2013, the water utility had \$4.8 million in cash, the electric utility had \$11.2 million in cash, and the sewer utility had \$6.1 million cash.

Ms. Nauser understood the City would be bonding for the southwest transmission line and asked when that would be done. Mr. Johnsen replied it was scheduled for the November 2014 election.

Ms. Hoppe asked what kind of reserves the City had for sewer emergencies. Mr. Matthes referred to page 484 of the budget, which discussed cash above and below the 20 percent guideline, and noted there was \$1.6 million for sewers in the budget. Since \$1.6 million did not equal the \$6.75 needed, the reserves could not fund the sewers in the downtown. He explained they then looked toward other techniques, such as a ballot or bond.

They had just passed a bond issue, and as a result, staff did not feel there was a reasonably likely alternative to TIF.

Ms. Hoppe understood the City raised the reserve from 16 percent to 20 percent within the last couple of years. Mayor McDavid thought that was only in the general fund. Ms. Hoppe stated she thought it impacted other funds as well. Mr. Matthes agreed it was adopted throughout the funds. Ms. Hoppe understood the Council could temporarily change this percentage due to an emergency. Mr. Schmidt wondered if they really could as he thought it was a Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) recommendation. Ms. Hoppe thought 16 percent had been recommended by GASB. Mr. Matthes stated the industry was moving to 20 percent because a 45 day reserve was considered thin. Mr. Schmidt asked if any of the bond covenants or agencies required 20 percent. Mr. Matthes understood the bond agencies were generally concerned with debt coverage. Ms. Cannon explained a lot of the bonds had a required reserve, which was based on the dollar amount bonded. Mr. Skala asked if the recommendation of GASB was 16 percent and whether the City had exceeded it for the 20 percent goal. Ms. Cannon replied the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) recommended a 20 percent minimum for reserve funds. It was the rainy day fund in case there was an emergency situation to provide for a month or two in operations funding. Mr. Schmidt commented that he felt there was a reason the Council increased the reserve percentage to 20 percent. Mr. Matthes stated it was roughly two months of operation. It was actually a little less than two months. Mr. Skala understood it might be necessary for the water and electric funds to have reserves higher than 20 percent due to the large capital expenditures associated with those utilities. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and noted it was a much more volatile business.

Mr. Johnsen continued with the staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the first step shown on the overhead had been built into the fiscal year 2014 budget. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. It was currently funded in the CIP, and the project was underway. They were hoping to be able to free up that capacity next summer. Mr. Thomas understood those six megawatts would be used by projects that had already been approved. Mr. Johnsen stated he did not believe all six megawatts would be used, but he was not sure how much of it would be used at this time. He thought there would be some room, but pointed out they needed some distance. He explained the second step would need to be done to accommodate the big projects, and that had not been funded or programmed for a future bond.

Ms. Hoppe asked if any analysis had been done on how much electricity would be saved if energy efficiency was improved in the existing buildings in the downtown as many buildings lost energy. She thought that might increase the available electricity. Mr. Johnsen replied an in-depth analysis had not been done, and pointed out they were looking at capacity in this situation. They were not looking at this from the energy perspective, and these types of savings generally showed up in kilowatt hours. He noted the kilowatt hours did not necessarily change much. He provided an example of an air conditioner, and explained used the same number kilowatts when it was on, even though it did not run as much, because that was an energy savings. He commented that capacity savings could occur if the entire system was changed, such as a smaller system that provided the same level of service as

the previous system. Ms. Hoppe explained she was referring to insulation and other items that were not present in downtown buildings. She understood an analysis of this had not been done. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

Mr. Matthes commented that page 465 of the budget projected about \$35 million in cash, so at this point, there was not any extra cash above the 20 percent threshold. He noted they could do Rebel Hill, but could not do all three of the circuits, which was why they were proposed in the TIF.

Ms. Nauser understood the two Hinkson Creek circuits were the estimated \$10 million. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. Ms. Nauser understood some of these downtown projects, if provided approval, would be up and running before these circuits could be completed, even if the TIF was approved. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct because there would be timing issues in terms of being able to relieve capacity on a substation through realignment. Ms. Nauser understood the Rebel Hill station would technically accommodate the demands they had today, but would not accommodate anything beyond those demands. Mr. Johnsen stated that was how it appeared at this time.

Mr. St. Romaine continued with the staff report.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she did not believe the Charrette Report specified sewer, stormwater and electricity should be funded with a TIF district. Mr. St. Romaine agreed it did not specify sewer, stormwater, electricity, etc., but it did indicate cities did not often have the resources to improve infrastructure in a manner that closely coincided with the actual redevelopment. He did not believe they could have ever anticipated the amount of redevelopment that had been proposed over the last few years, and the TIF created an opportunity to fund infrastructure by directly investing the additional taxes generated by the directly affected properties, so as properties were improved, they were able to use the increment or increase in the taxes generated by the property to support public infrastructure and future private investments.

Mr. Skala commented that when the H3 Charrette Report had been adopted, there had been discussion regarding not having to align directly with all of the tenets of the report. In addition, the report provided the TIF as an example. It did not rule out other options. He also felt the Comprehensive Plan had taken precedent over the H3 Charrette, and it was more tepid in its language with regard to district-wide TIFs. Mr. St. Romaine agreed there was discussion during the adoption of the H3 Charrette, and like most plans, it was not regulatory in nature. It was, however, the result of several months of discussion, and TIF was a recommendation of that report and others.

Mr. St. Romaine felt the TIF was a funding source that would not only generate taxes to pay for infrastructure, but it could also improve the amenities, services, appearance and aesthetics of the downtown, which he believed everyone wanted. He understood some of the taxing jurisdictions had indicated they would lose millions, and he was not sure how that would happen. He noted they wanted to ensure every taxing jurisdiction could state they received more money due to the TIF than they would have without it.

Mr. St. Romaine continued with the staff report.

Ms. Hoppe thought an option for the Elm Street extension would be for any new development to help pay for it as that development would be benefiting from it. Mr. St.

Romaine commented that was a possibility, but pointed out the \$5 million cost estimate only included the cost of constructing the street. The cost would increase if they needed to acquire property, and they thought they would have to acquire some property for it to occur.

Mr. St. Romaine continued with the staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if there had been parking studies that had indicated a need for another parking structure. Mr. St. Romaine replied he thought another parking study would be needed as the last one had been completed about 1-2 years before the Short Street Garage had been recommended. He felt the area could support an additional garage due to the proposed projects, which involved an additional 2,000-3,000 residents and more retail spaces, but noted that would need to be verified by a third party. Mr. Thomas commented that he hoped the study would look at the potential for transit for relief because he personally felt \$18 million toward another parking garage would be a step backwards.

Mr. St. Romaine continued with the staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that he planned to amend the list identified in Exhibit A so only \$19.75 million in projects were included in a potential TIF project. He would also ask that the TIF sunset once the \$19.75 million was reached. This was a way to prioritize what he felt were critical needs.

Mr. Matthes asked if Council would be agreeable to including stormwater and sewer in the potential TIF project. Mayor McDavid replied he would defer to Mr. Schmidt since those largely impacted the First Ward.

Mr. Schmidt commented that he thought another possibility would be to obtain input from the TIF Commission to select the projects and the boundaries of the potential TIF.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not plan to endorse moving forward with the TIF as he felt more fundamental conversations were needed regarding the impact of development. He also believed the City needed to do a better job of communication if they proceeded with this mechanism.

Anthony Stanton, 315 LaSalle Place, commented that he understood many communities were dealing with this issue, and the TIF was a tool, but he did not believe a large TIF district was the best approach. He thought a TIF should be used more surgically, and stated he would support it on a more project by project basis. He thought the bigger issue was for the developers to assist with infrastructure funding as he believed developers were getting a great deal in Columbia in terms of development fees and infrastructure costs compared to other communities nationwide. He also was not sure a TIF was needed to entice development as Columbia already had good selling points. He noted the University would remain in Columbia and near the downtown area so there would always be a demand to build in the downtown. He suggested TIF districts be used in a wiser manner, and asked the City to be open and transparent in the process.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyons Street, stated he was speaking on behalf of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association and read a portion of pages 126 and 127 of Columbia Imagined, which discussed neighborhoods and neighborhood planning. He pointed out several policies were recommended to achieve a livable and sustainable community in the implementation table, and noted one of the policies was to facilitate neighborhood planning, which had a strategy of the creation of neighborhood land use plans

ahead of development and redevelopment pressures. He explained R29-14 would commit the Council to use TIF to finance specific projects, which would directly impact his neighborhood, and as a result, he respectfully asked the Council to establish the recommended neighborhood planning process for all neighborhoods that would be affected by the TIF revenue financed projects so they could get ahead of development and redevelopment pressures prior to committing to the TIF or any other financial mechanism. He asked the Council to vote against this resolution.

Peter Yronwode, 203 Orchard Court, commented that he believed this problem existed due to massive new construction in the downtown area and more of this type of development had been proposed. He noted most of the money associated with these developments would leave the community, and the builders of these projects, per Mr. Matthes, had categorically refused to accept higher impact fees. He understood they expected the City to build the infrastructure and he believed that was extortion on the part of the developers. He felt developers should be responsible for the costs of these impacts from their profits. The citizens and non-TIF tax-funded entities should not support these projects. He believed the City needed higher impact fees as developers needed to be assessed the true costs of their developments. He also did not believe the list of projects associated with the resolution should be considered as he felt the TIF process would move forward quickly without further discussion once Council agreed to a list of projects. In addition, he felt this \$20 million in additional infrastructure would continue the current trajectory of unlimited and absurd growth. He urged the Council to not approve this resolution.

John Lory, 602 Edgewood Avenue, commented that he felt there had been a rapid rise of this topic and the public had not had the time or information to fully understand what the Council was voting on tonight. Even after listening to the presentation, he was unsure of the implications and whether this was the best approach to solve the problem. He understood there was a problem and felt the City should take ownership of the fact it had not anticipated this situation, but he did not believe this meant they needed to rush into something without the public fully understanding the issues. The staff had spent a lot of time putting this together and he believed the citizens needed the same amount of time to understand the issues and formulate their own perspectives. He thought it would be a travesty to move forward with the level of understanding they had tonight. He noted his neighborhood had talked about getting together with Mr. Thomas to discuss this issue, but had not had the time to get together. He understood this was a pressing issue, but pointed out there were other pressing issues and priorities in the community. He thought more discussion was needed in a way that did not divide them like the current process had.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, stated she was excited there was interest in building in the downtown as she felt many people that were not students wanted to live in the downtown, but noted she saw this as an opportunity to build the City properly, and did not believe 26-story apartments next to Peace Park was appropriate. She also did not understand how the creation of the TIF would solve the problem of C-2 open zoning. The TIF funding would just allow for more unplanned development. She pointed out she had just spent the past year or so on a public education process as part of the Public Transit Advisory Commission, and felt something similar was needed for planning the downtown and funding these utilities.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and commented that they were concerned with the use of TIF to move development projects that had been approved in spite of infrastructure inadequacy. She noted the community was experiencing inadequate zoning protection. She understood the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council had asked for a development moratorium in 2013 to get ahead of development, but that had been rejected in favor of revisions to the zoning code, which she thought was needed but would take time to complete. As a result, they could only use guidance from the various planning documents. She believed there had been misinterpretation in terms of density versus sprawl, and felt more affordable housing was needed. She noted the community did not want to rush into TIF and pointed out the People's Visioning supported a user-base or impact fee that would change development patterns in Columbia. She did not believe the citizens should be taxed, and the property taxes of other entities should not be diverted. She asked the Council to vote against this resolution.

Diane Meeker, 2401 W. Broadway, Apt. 1120, stated she was speaking on behalf of the Columbia Area National Organization for Women and asked the Council to vote against any TIF and this resolution. She felt people were clamoring to build in Columbia, and as a result, no further handouts were needed. She believed the developers needed to pay for the cost of what they built, and it should not be imposed on the citizens of Columbia. She felt this TIF discussion was similar to the Enhanced Enterprise Zone (EEZ) discussion in that they were told businesses would not come without the EEZ, but they had come, and she thought the same thing would occur in this situation because Columbia was a great town.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that Toys R Us was an example of a corporation that did not pay Missouri taxes. Columbia provided developers the opportunity to make money, but the money they made did not stay in Columbia. He thought the City needed impose fines as a result of violations, and did not believe that was done effectively. He felt the money the City had needed to be used in a proper way as well.

Robert Hollis, an attorney with offices at 1103 E. Broadway, commented that he represented the developers of three of the projects impacted by this. He explained his clients did not have an opinion in terms of being in favor of or in opposition of a TIF. In addition, his clients had not instigated this TIF process and did not stand to benefit from the TIF in any manner greater than anyone else. He pointed out the lack of infrastructure was a problem his clients could not solve. He did not believe the projects funded with the proposed TIF would be improvements his clients would be required to make, so it was not a handout or subsidy. The TIF was not even an incentive for his clients to develop in Columbia. It was solely a potential financing mechanism for the City to pay for infrastructure improvements that were general in nature. He pointed out it was not a forgone conclusion that these developments would take place, and noted these three developers had been working on the projects for Columbia for over a year and had attempted to move forward with specific projects for months. He asked the Council to solve the problem in the near future whether it was through TIF or another financing mechanism. At this time, there was not enough certainty to permit his clients to move forward, and he did not believe whether they felt the proposed projects were good or bad was relevant in the discussion since the projects were not an option at this point.

Mr. Thomas understood the three developers he was referring to were Park7, American Campus Communities and Opus. Mr. Hollis stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if Opus was still at the table. Mr. Hollis replied they might be depending on whether the situation was resolved.

Paul Allaire suggested the City meet one-on-one with the developers as he believed they would be more than happy to fund some infrastructure improvements.

David Owens, 110 Hubbell Drive, commented that he had lived in the downtown area for most of his adult life and believed there were people who wanted to invest in Columbia for the long-term as it was a wonderful place to live. He stated he was a believer in higher densities in urban areas as he felt it was essential for human beings to share resources and to not be sprawled out because it would result in less internal combustion and engines and more pedestrians and mass transit. An issue that needed to be discussed was the amount of density they wanted as density drove capacity costs, which in turn was driving the TIF debate. He thought they needed to determine the optimum livable population density for the downtown and consider Hong Kong, New York and other places that were not as beautiful as Columbia. He did not believe this decision needed to be rushed. He felt the TIF was a specific tool for some problems, and should not be used in a sweeping way to finance developments. He believed those that wanted would develop in Columbia and that the City should just take care of the capacity it currently had while taking the time to get ahead of resource needs by planning better. He asked the Council to vote against the TIF.

Chuck Headley, 5009 Cullen Court, stated he agreed with Mr. Stanton in that the City needed to improve developer involvement in this process. He noted he and his wife were opposed to this TIF process. He thought it was best to have bond-funded projects approved by voters before the projects took place, so the voters understood what public funds would go towards. He thought there was too little citizen input in the TIF process, and suggested the Council table the proposal if they did not defeat it, so they could have a better understanding of what this meant as he felt there was a fair amount of uncertainty based on their earlier discussion.

Rick Shanker, 1829 Cliff Drive, noted he was neither for nor against the TIF, but felt there was an air of uncertainty regarding this proposal, and suggested the issue be tabled to allow time for the Council to visit with its constituents. There seemed to be a lot of disconnect in terms of what was really needed and the associated costs. He reiterated he hoped the Council would table this issue.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, provided a handout and encouraged the Council to reject this resolution and adopt a substitute resolution directing staff to stop any and all efforts to establish a Central Columbia TIF District until the Council explicitly directed staff to proceed by a resolution approved by two-thirds majority vote. He understood Mayor McDavid had characterized the establishment of the Central Columbia TIF district as a generational opportunity to fund needed public infrastructure in central Columbia, and he disagreed. He did not believe this would pay for itself due to the financing structure and level of property taxes. He pointed out the Council had never directed staff to take all necessary steps to increase population density in the central area of the City, and did not believe the studies or plans had directed staff to take such an aggressive action. He commented that staff had

brought forward this resolution, which would direct them to proceed, but felt it violated the normal process for establishing a TIF if approved. He also felt it was political blackmail, which was another reason it should be rejected. He believed the TIF Commission should be the first to opine the “but for” issue and thought this was a backdoor maneuver to get majority approval of the Council in case the TIF Commission rejected it.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, commented that he was not opposed to a TIF in concept as he had represented and assisted developers with the approval of TIFs through a normal process, but he did not believe this was a normal process. He understood the TIF Commission had a meeting on February 11, and the two items on the agenda were an overview of a potential proposed Central Columbia Redevelopment Area Plan and the setting of a public hearing on that proposal. He explained that prior to a TIF project getting to a point where the Council was taking a vote, the TIF Commission had to hold a public hearing, which involved some strict statutory notice requirements that had to precede the TIF Commission’s public hearing. After the TIF Commission’s public hearing, the TIF Commission had 30 days to make a recommendation to the Council about the proposal, and the nature of their recommendation affected the vote of the Council in terms of the number of votes required for approval. In addition, the Council was hearing the entire TIF proposal from staff when notice had only been given on Friday that this would be on the agenda. He felt there was an issue with process, and noted he believed the process was very important when it involved identity-shaping development projects. He commented that he had been deeply puzzled when he read the resolution as it stated the Council did not intend to fund immediately necessary infrastructure projects except from the revenues of a TIF district because he did not know the boundaries of the TIF district, the rationale, the available City resources compared to the needed resources, the projected amount of revenue that would be generated from the TIF district, etc. If those items had been addressed, he thought they needed to be shared with the public. He did not believe this resolution was needed and asked the Council to respect the process.

Dan Rader, 1716 Ridgemont, stated he was a downtown property owner and noted he considered himself a smart growth advocate. In listening to the comments made tonight, he did not believe many understood how the development process worked, particularly in terms of student housing developments. He had met with many student housing developers, and some of them had rejected coming to Columbia so he did not believe it was accurate to say these developments would occur regardless. He commented that he believed there was a misunderstanding in terms of how the TIF would work and how it would relate to the developers as he believed it was inaccurate to say the TIF would allow for a handout to developers because the developers had been interested prior to the TIF being proposed. He also felt it was unreasonable to expect developers to foot the bill for infrastructure that everyone would benefit from in the downtown, and noted he did not believe they would agree to it, which would kill some fantastic projects. He commented that he had been impressed with the renderings for the building that would be located on his property at Sixth and Elm as there was nothing like it in Columbia, and thought more people would be in favor of it if they knew what was proposed. He thought these properties would eventually be developed, but

might be developed in a less desirable manner if the current proposed developments could not move forward due to capacity issues.

Tracy Greever-Rice, 602 Redbud Lane, stated she did not believe the problem was with the tool as TIF districts could be helpful and constructive, and provided the Tiger Hotel and The Broadway as examples of good investments. In addition, she felt there were a number of items on the proposed list that were good investments as well, but she asked the Council to consider whether they had all of their questions answered regarding the “but for” and the TIF, as projects, fully and formally by staff in a format that could be reviewed by the public, and whether they could identify examples of citizens voting down bond issues for infrastructure. She believed Columbia was a generous and supportive community that rarely voted down bond issues, and when it did, it was due to concern with the process. She also asked the Council to consider the ratio and tenor of feedback received from constituents because she felt a survey could also be done for a financing scheme that would fundamentally redevelop the scale and use of the downtown since a phone survey had been done with regard to bus ridership. She wondered how the TIF could be put before the review and revision of the zoning code as she believed the City was thwarting its own investment in improving the quality of development by facilitating a community altering development prior to that review and revision. She also questioned whether the truth was being told in terms of the proposed projects being the rationale for spurring an immediate need for redevelopment, and how a public hearing could be held without the required notification.

Don Stamper, 2604 N. Stadium Boulevard, stated he represented the Central Missouri Development Council, the Columbia Home Builders Association, the Columbia Apartment Association, and Columbia Board of Realtors, and of those organizations, none had taken an official position on the TIF proposal. This was not because they were not interested in this mechanism of financing. It was because they did not have enough information. He commented that he was astonished by the number of people who would oppose something before they knew what it was or what it would do. The organizations he represented were generally supportive of communities moving forward and using the tools available to them. He thought City staff had done a good job of narrowing this down to five options, and pointed out this was a City problem since the City did not have adequate infrastructure to accommodate projected or needed growth. He noted the downtown would not be able to accommodate arts facilities or museums until the capacity issues downtown were resolved, and wondered what would happen if a legislative allocation for a 55,000 square foot structure was granted to the University or another organization. The TIF proposal would not create a windfall for developers. It would only provide them the opportunity to build their project. He believed the TIF was solely a tool the City had to move and grow the community forward. He thought the Council had to decide whether it would hold the downtown to where it was currently or choose a mechanism that would creatively solve the problem. He agreed there were many questions at this time and noted some of his members did not understand why the district was so large and the need for some of the projects on the list. He thought they needed to be careful as there had been many projects and events in the past where people questioned the need for public funds that had defined the community positively, and listed some of those.

Holly Henry, 410 Hirth Avenue, stated she felt Mr. Stamper's comment of only having the two options of stopping growth and development or moving forward was not true.

Mayor McDavid pointed out this resolution would not approve the TIF. Staff had brought this forward to determine if the Council felt it could make the "but for" argument because if they could not, there was no need to move forward in this TIF process. He understood the question before the Council tonight was whether these projects were reasonably likely to be funded if they did not proceed with a TIF. He felt there were four critical issues, and those were water, electric, sewer and stormwater.

Mayor McDavid stated he planned to make a motion to amend Exhibit A of R29-14 so the only projects included were those identified as A-D totaling \$19.75 million, and that for TIF to immediately sunset once the \$19.75 million had been achieved. Ms. Thompson pointed out the inclusion of a sunset would create a legal problem in terms of developing the plan. Staff only needed a project list tonight because the plan would be developed based on the project list that was approved by Council, and that plan would include a cost-benefit analysis, etc.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend Exhibit A of R29-14 so the only projects included were those identified as A-D totaling \$19.75 million. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. Trapp asked for clarification regarding the sewer project identified as F totaling \$500,000. Mr. Glascock replied it would add sewer work at Fifth and Turner.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend the motion made by Mayor McDavid to include the projects identified as E and F totaling \$6.996 million so the projects identified as A-F totaling \$26.746 million were listed on Exhibit A of R29-14. The motion was seconded by Mayor McDavid.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mayor McDavid to amend the motion made by Mayor McDavid to include the projects identified as E and F totaling \$6.996 million so the projects identified as A-F totaling \$26.746 million were listed on Exhibit A of R29-14 was defeated by voice vote with only Mayor McDavid, Mr. Trapp and Mr. Schmidt voting in favor of it.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend Exhibit A of R29-14 so the only projects included were those identified as A-D totaling \$19.75 million was defeated by voice vote with only Mayor McDavid, Mr. Trapp and Ms. Nauser voting in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid commented that it was interesting to see the polarizing effect of this TIF issue as he had been threatened with a lawsuit if this issue failed and if this issue passed. He understood Ms. Greever-Rice had indicated that not many bond issues failed, but he recalled three general obligation bonds that failed for Boone Hospital in the late 1960's. In addition, in 2005, a one-fourth cent capital improvement tax passed by less than one percent, and it was a continuation of an existing tax. There was also a new one-eighth cent capital improvement tax that had failed in 2005 by a 2-1 ratio. He noted the projects that had been included in this TIF discussion could be funded with a tax increase if the public felt they were important enough, but he thought it would be a challenge to ask the citizen to raise taxes or user fees because the City would likely ask for a renewal to the one-eighth cent

parks sales tax and one-fourth cent capital improvement sales tax in 2015. In addition, the City was struggling to find a way to fund stormwater. As a result, he did not believe it was reasonably foreseeable the public would approve these taxes. He noted it was complicated to put something before the voters. A committee had to be formed and those on the committee were then also asked to fund the public relations aspect of the ballot issue. Given the schedule of tax continuations important to the City, he was not confident in asking citizens outside of the downtown area to increase user fees, utility fees, property taxes or sales taxes to fund the downtown. He commented that he took Mr. Matthes at his word regarding downtown development, and that meant development would be pushed out in areas like Grindstone and Discovery Ridge, which he felt was anti-smart growth. He noted he was not a developer so he did not have any personal interest in this, but he looked at an empty asphalt parking lot differently than others as he saw the potential for a retail outlet, adults living downtown, hundreds of employees and millions of dollars in property taxes. He pointed out the City received less than \$5 million per year in property taxes from the proposed TIF district area, and the pending projects would generate about \$2 million per year. He agreed Columbia would be fine in the big picture, but believed this was an opportunity missed.

Mr. Schmidt stated he felt the TIF Commission had been mistreated and that the Council could ask them for more than an up or down vote. He suggested sending this issue back to the Commission and allowing them to recommend projects and boundaries, and obtain more financial information. He commented that when they voted on simpler projects, they received multipage information, but in this instance they were being asked to make a multi-million dollar decision and there was not much of a description of those multi-million dollar items. Allowing the TIF Commission to vet this would provide an opportunity to get the information out. He also suggested a committee to focus on determining where all of the capacity issues throughout town were located, so they could have emergency funds ready to address these issues in the future.

Mr. Thomas stated he was not interested in sending this issue to the TIF Commission. He noted he believed these were important projects that needed to be completed, but he did not believe a TIF district was the only way it could happen, and as a result he did not support this resolution. He agreed they wanted downtown development and a greater density in the downtown, so they needed to solve this shortage of infrastructure capacity as quickly as possible. He understood many felt excluded from this process, and he did not believe that was the right way to run government. He thought they needed to take the Comprehensive Plan into consideration, and the neighborhood planning component, which was very important, had not occurred for the downtown neighborhoods. Although they needed to address the capacity issues in the downtown in a timely manner, he felt they also needed to do it in a way the community wanted, and another priority in the Comprehensive Plan was for new development to pay its fair share. He did not believe this was about punishing new development or making developers pay more than they should. It was about good public policy. The City had to build infrastructure and allocate those costs one way or another. As infrastructure expanded, the community as a whole was taking on a much larger percentage in terms of costs than was being allocated to the new development. He commented that if additional costs were allocated to new development, it did not mean the developers would

have to pay those costs out of their pockets as they could price their projects higher, and he did not believe that was necessarily a bad thing. He thought it was good public policy for the costs of infrastructure to be shared. He believed the City could come up with accurate numbers in terms of how much was spent to build electric, sewer, water and transportation infrastructure, and the capacity of that infrastructure system, and once they had those numbers, he thought they needed to be compared to the existing fee structure. He explained the City charged new development only 75 percent of the administrative component of the permitting process. In addition, the City charged \$800 per dwelling unit to connect to the sewer system. He wondered what percentage that amounted to in terms of building a sewer system for 1,000 or 10,000 people. The charge to connect to water was \$638 and there was no charge to connect to electricity. He thought they needed to decide whether the community as a whole should pay for the expansion of the electrical system for increased capacity or whether the new development should be assessed a part of the cost. He noted the fee for roads was \$0.50 per square foot, and he did not believe that was enough and thought it should include roads and public transit costs. He was not sure developers were getting a sweet deal, but also did not feel the City had the right policy at this time. He suggested the City know the cost allocation for infrastructure, and to set amounts based upon that allocation. He also felt they needed to review and potentially revise the downtown zoning ordinances to ensure they had the development they wanted as a community in the downtown.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not believe this district-wide TIF proposal satisfied the “but for” test. The 2005 election included a quarter-cent capital improvement sales tax extension that had passed and a new one-eighth cent capital improvement sales tax that had failed. In addition, a development fee increase from \$0.05 to \$0.50, which he still felt was inadequate, had passed overwhelmingly. He noted he had been opposed to the capital improvement sales tax ballot initiatives, not because the road improvement projects were not needed, but because of process in terms of public input in the priorities. He explained he had been on the Council in 2008 when the Council established the TIF Commission and took up the Tiger Hotel project, which was the first TIF approved. He felt they had maintained, when they passed the policy regarding TIFs, that they would evaluate future TIFs on a case-by-case basis and on particular projects. He agreed with Mr. Root with regard to process, as he felt the TIF Commission, which was advisory to Council, had been told what to do by City staff. He did not agree with the idea of trying to make policy decisions in an information vacuum for either the TIF Commission or City Council. He reiterated that he did not believe there were no other alternatives to a TIF in this situation as he felt one alternate was impact fees or a trip generation fee with regard to roads. It was based on trip ends, the size of the development, and its use. He thought it would make sense to charge a fee based upon the impact of the development to the road, and suggested staff come back with information on those types of fees so they had the information needed to create policy. With regard the recently passed sewer bond issue, he agreed they had the responsibility to complete the Midway and Hinkson Creek sewer extensions, but did not feel it meant they could not defer those projects due to the infrastructure exigencies in the downtown. He pointed out density was not the only smart growth principle as there were ten principles, and the principle that

dealt with density actually discussed compact building designs. The other principles discussed livability, walkability, equity, fairness and balance. He stated he planned to vote against this resolution as he would not prioritize infrastructure exigencies in the absence of a detailed cost-benefit analysis and information regarding other options, such as impact fees, trip generation fees, etc. During this lull in development, he thought they needed to consider a C-2 zoning overlay prior to the comprehensive review of the zoning classifications in order to make a difference in how the downtown developed. He thought that would only take 1-3 months versus the six months to a year it would take to get information back from the consultants.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with Mr. Skala and Mr. Thomas. She read Section 1 of the resolution, which indicated the Council would find, determine and declare it does not intend to undertake the projects listed in Exhibit A unless those projects could be paid or reimbursed from tax increment financing, and she did not believe the Council could responsibly or truthfully agree with that statement. They had received only a dearth of information, and the powerpoint presentation had been more helpful than the documentation provided in the packet. She noted the Council had not discussed or analyzed the variety of ways these projects could be funded. They had planned to address ways development could pay for itself when they discussed the budget. They needed to determine whether new development was being charged appropriately for all of the infrastructure costs. She agreed they wanted the downtown to grow while implementing the ideas in the Vision Report, Comprehensive Plan and H3 Charrette Report, but felt they needed the appropriate items in place to accomplish those goals, and this meant the C-2 zoning district needed to be reviewed. She pointed out they had received recommendations from various boards, commission, neighborhoods, etc. with regard to suggested changes. She understood the zoning consultants had indicated they could provide recommendations within a couple of months specifically with regard to C-2 zoning, and felt the Council should charge them to do this. She commented that she felt the process associated with this TIF proposal had been inadequate and referred to the CoMO Connect process as it engaged the Council, citizens, etc., gathered data, etc., which had resulted in a great plan. She pointed out she had voted in favor of specific TIF projects in the past, so she agreed there were appropriate uses for TIF. She preferred the neighborhood planning component of the Comprehensive Plan to begin first so the City understood what the neighborhood wanted because the community needed to be involved in the planning process so they had ownership in it and would advocate for it. She thought the staff had good intentions, but also felt it was important to go through the appropriate processes to ensure the end result was good because it would be something they would have to live with for many years to come. She stated she planned to vote against this resolution.

Mr. Trapp commented that all of the City's recent plans had emphasized increasing density in the central city, and the sewer, water and electric infrastructure in the central city was dated and inadequate for further intensive development, and rebuilding the necessary infrastructure was expensive. The surge in resource intensive downtown development took place after the sewer bond issue had been recently passed by the voters. He did not believe anyone had expected the explosion in downtown housing construction, and that was the

reason these infrastructure projects were not included in past plans. Planning horizons and the necessary public processes were long and unwieldy, so responding to quickly changing conditions was difficult for any city. He did not believe the City's historic process for repairing and upgrading infrastructure was adequate any longer given Columbia's growth, so they had to determine what choices they had. They could take funds from the recently passed sewer bond, cancel promised projects, and redirect the effort downtown, but he felt this would lead voters to question the City's intent on all future bonds. They could try to go to the voters for another bond issue and raise utility rates for everyone to pay for the bond or they could proceed with the TIF in some form. He felt they were at an impasse because downtown infrastructure had to be improved if they wanted to increase downtown development as called for in the planning documents. He believed such development was good for downtown businesses and resulted in additional tax revenue, and without development, there was no increased revenue for any taxing entity. As a result, he felt it was reasonable to direct some of the additional revenue created by these projects to pay for the infrastructure needed to make those projects possible. He noted stormwater funding had been discussed for the two years he had been on the Council, and they had not yet come up with a workable solution. He commented that voting this resolution down would not move them any closer to repairing the watershed and allowing development to continue in a smart fashion. He stated he planned to vote in favor of this resolution.

Ms. Nauser commented that she did not believe anyone paid their fair share as every subdivision they resided in added to the stress on infrastructure, and she did not agree with the concept of making the new people responsible for fixing problems existing people had created. She agreed the City had infrastructure problems and needs, but thought they needed to research the options further instead of saying it was the responsibility of new development to fix existing problems. She stated she believed the TIF was a valid tool, but would not agree to support a TIF that had \$70 million worth of projects. She thought the TIF should only address critical problems, which were the four items identified as A, B, C and D on Exhibit A. She noted that she had received a lot of feedback from people that were against this proposal as well, and she believed it was a result of process. This appeared to be moving too fast, was unclear, and lacked community involvement. She hoped this vote would not derail this process, and that the TIF Commission would continue to work on developing a plan for Council to consider. She did not believe trip generation fees and development fees would provide the \$19 million needed for infrastructure now. The City would have to come up with some alternative funding sources. She stated she would vote against this resolution due to the list of projects included at this time.

Mr. Schmidt stated he felt this was a public health issue, and although he planned to vote against this resolution, he did not feel they could not do anything. He suggested they ask the TIF Commission to discuss this further. Mayor McDavid thought that if the Council voted this resolution down, it was over. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct because by voting against it they were saying there were alternative funding sources, and there was no point in the TIF Commission meeting any further because the proposal would not meet the "but for" test.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification because he did not understand why the TIF Commission would be required to endorse a district-wide TIF. Mr. St. Romaine replied the City would have to provide the TIF Commission a redevelopment plan to review. He pointed out the role of the TIF Commission was to vote yes or no on the redevelopment plan. They could provide recommendations, but they had to be provided the redevelopment plan to review for a basis of those recommendations.

Mr. Skala encouraged Mr. Matthes to share with staff the recording of a session at the Smart Growth Conference entitled “Emerging Fiscal Impact Tools: Highlight the Economic Consequences of Development Decisions” that he had attended. He thought they could then discuss alternatives to satisfy planned growth and citizen engagement.

Mr. Thomas commented that staff had proposed a solution to a problem, which it appeared the Council would reject, so he thought the Council needed to be proactive in developing a proposal to move forward. In developing a proposal, he thought they needed to merge at least three priority proposals in the Comprehensive Plan into a process as soon as possible, and those were neighborhood planning, new development absorbing the correct cost allocation for new infrastructure, and the design and livability of downtown through zoning. He pointed out he did not believe new development should pay for the repair and maintenance of existing infrastructure, and felt it was appropriate to spread those costs across the community. He believed it was good policy for new development to pay a reasonable percentage of new infrastructure. He reiterated he thought this needed to be done as quickly as possible while educating the Council and engaging the public, and noted this process might result in the need for a TIF for some project.

Ms. Hoppe stated that even if the City proceeded with a TIF for these particular projects, it was a short-term fix for short-term development. Columbia would continue to grow and develop, and this did not address the overall issues. The City’s infrastructure funding model was broken and they needed to ensure a sustainable funding model for the future.

The vote on R29-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, SCHMIDT. Resolution declared defeated.

**R25-14      Authorizing various Adopt A Spot agreements.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe explained she had a concern regarding the adopt-a-spot at Stadium, west of Highway 63, where The Domain was located. She understood this area was supposed to be a beautiful parkway, and according to the statement of intent, the developer was to have water in the median area and care for the median. This had been overlooked and the developer was now not responsible for it. She was not sure one person could maintain the median in the manner it needed to be maintained, and did not know if staff had approached the developer to point out that responsibility. Since she had questions, she wanted the opportunity to explore the situation further, and suggested they remove approval of that agreement from this resolution at this time. If they ended up proceeding with the adopt-a-spot, she wanted to ensure this person could maintain it and how the City would assist.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend R25-14 by removing Section 1 and renumbering the other sections. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Skala asked if there was a mechanism by which adopt-a-spots were evaluated. Mr. Teddy replied staff provided technical assistance, and the agreements were renewed annually so they would determine whether the adopter had done a decent job of maintaining the spot prior to the renewal.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend R25-14 by removing Section 1 and renumbering the other sections was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R25-14, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. 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.

- B42-14**     Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to establish a 2-hour parking zone on the east side of Orr Street, between Ash Street and Park Avenue.
- B43-14**     Authorizing a grant agreement with the State of Missouri – Missouri Arts Council for the Parks and Recreation Department 2014 Stephens Lake Amphitheater Concert Series; appropriating funds.
- B44-14**     Amending the FY 2014 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Parks and Recreation Department and Water and Light Department; amending the FY 2014 Classification and Pay Plan by adding, reassigning and closing positions in the Parks and Recreation Department and Water and Light Department.

## **REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

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

Mayor McDavid stated he planned to appoint Deb Sheals, John Ott, Allan Moore, Christina Kelly and Skip Walther to the Downtown CID as suggested in the absence of any objections.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to accept the appointments of Deb Sheals, John Ott, Allan Moore, Christina Kelly and Skip Walther, as suggested by Mayor McDavid, for terms ending February, 2016. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

- REP16-14**   Aldeah – Sewer and Stormwater Issues.

Ms. Hoppe understood the City had an I&I program and it appeared there was a big need for this area. She asked where these projects were on the list. Mr. Glascock replied they were being worked on right now.

**REP17-14 Evaluation of I&I Programs.**

Ms. Hoppe stated she thought the consideration of participating in the NLC Warranty Program, which would allow individual homeowners to have insurance to pay for sewer repairs for the portion of the line that was the property owner responsibility, was supposed to come before Council for a vote and asked for its status. Mr. Matthes replied they would escalate that request on the priority list. Ms. Hoppe commented that if the City developed a long-term program to resolve this issue, she thought it would likely take a couple of years to organize so this could be utilized until then. Mr. Matthes stated he thought another company was offering that product locally now, but noted staff would bring the NLC Warranty Program item to Council for consideration.

Mr. Thomas understood there was a study phase, a construction phase, and a confirmation phase for the I&I mitigation project, which he was interpreting as a baseline measurement, an intervention, and a post-intervention measurement to determine if the intervention was successful. He also understood the study phase or baseline measurement had been completed for all six basins. Mr. Glascock stated he thought that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood the construction phase had occurred in just one of the basins. Mr. Glascock stated he believed it had been done for two of the basins. Mr. Thomas understood no post-intervention measurements had been completed. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and noted it took 8-10 substantial rain events to evaluate it. Mr. Thomas asked when staff anticipated having the results of the confirmation phase for those two basins. Mr. Glascock replied flow monitoring in sewers was hard to do because they tended to get plugged up, so they had to check them often and they did not always read accurately. He was not sure when they would have that information, but he guessed they would have it by the end of the year. Mr. Thomas understood they would have some definitive numbers by the end of 2014.

Mr. Thomas understood only the publicly-owned collectors were being treated and not the privately-owned laterals. Mr. Glascock explained they only lined the privately-owned laterals, with the permission of the homeowner, when they were in the public right-of-way and they saw there was a problem. Mr. Thomas understood the City only inspected the part of the lateral that was in the public right-of-way, and asked how confident staff was that there were not leaks in other areas of the laterals that were not inspected. Mr. Glascock replied the other parts of the lateral could leak, but those leaks normally occurred at the tap where there was excavation. Mr. Thomas understood, if there were problems, it was more likely to be at the joint. Mr. Glascock stated it would be at the joint and in the right-of-way where the pounding of the street occurred.

Mr. Thomas commented that he was hopeful they would see data soon so they knew they were not spending a lot of money on something that was not effective. Mr. Glascock noted other cities had done this, and he understood it was successful in those communities. He thought Springfield had a 38 percent reduction as a result of this type of program. Mr. Thomas asked if Columbia was following their protocols closely. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mr. Schmidt stated that once the work was done, and if spikes still existed, they would know it was due to the laterals. Mr. Glascock thought the spikes should come down some, but this would not get rid of all of the spikes because this was an ongoing maintenance

process with 600 miles of lines, so they would have to start back over when they were finished.

**REP18-14 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

Ms. Hoppe stated the report showed a transfer of funds for natural gas buses because the cost was higher than had been anticipated, and asked for the original cost estimate. Mr. Glascock replied he was not certain, but thought it had been around \$400,000. She understood each bus would cost \$10,000 more than had been estimated.

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, thanked the Council for the good discussion and vote on the TIF issue. He suggested the Council restructure the TIF Commission, so the taxing authorities had the voting power and controlled the decision, and noted that was one thing that would make him feel more sanguine about the process. He also suggested the Council use requests for proposals to complete cost of service studies for at least the four infrastructure facilities causing concern, and to require a 20 year capacity needs cost projection over a range of specific development scenarios. He believed those that conducted cost of service studies were good at this, but if they did not have this information, he thought they could still provide an independent look at the range of infrastructure needs in the downtown and other different sections of the City. The City could then base its analysis of capacity, use, fair share, etc. on it. He commented that he personally believed the connection fees would be double the current fees if capacity was included. He also felt the Council needed to support the completion of the long-term conceptual downtown plan, and for the City Council to develop, campaign and win support for an increase of the City property tax rate to \$2.50 per \$100 of assessed valuation.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been discussion regarding the enforcement of snow removal on sidewalks in front of private property and noted he was unclear as to what was being done or discussed. Mr. Matthes explained they had started to prioritize routes and had reached out to those affected by reminding them of their responsibility to clear the sidewalks and that the City would be enforcing this in the future. As a result, they were on the enforcement phase for priority routes. He pointed out they did not have the staff to walk door to door, but they would work their way through the priority routes. He stated this approach was a best practice approach used by other cities. The difference was that unlike more northern cities where there was neighborhood peer pressure to shovel sidewalks, Columbia did not have as much experience so people did not do it. Mr. Thomas stated he believed there was growing neighborhood peer pressure in Columbia, and felt the City's approach was a good first step as they had to build a culture of responsibility.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a policy for the Transit staff to ensure the main bus stops were safe and accessible during inclement weather. He wondered if they should send staff out in a van with shovels to literally clean out areas, such as the transfer points with CoMO Connect. Mr. Matthes thought that was a great idea as the new stops were built. Mr. Trapp pointed out stops were shoveled and salted now. Mr. Thomas stated he had received

complaints around Fairview and the west side of the mall. Mr. Glascock noted the problem was that the street trucks tended to push the snow back onto the areas shoveled out. He explained they had just failed to double-check the stops after the streets had been plowed a second time.

Ms. Hoppe read an e-mail from a person who had received notification from the City to keep her sidewalk clear and who was amused by the fact the City expected her to do a better job than it did. She stated she felt this meant the City had to ensure it cleared its property, pedways, medians, etc., and lead by example.

Mr. Thomas asked if fines would be issued for the next snow storm if sidewalks were not cleared. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and noted the ordinance included that as a penalty. Mayor McDavid pointed out some people were not physically capable of removing the snow off of their sidewalk, so he did not feel this was largely enforceable throughout the community. Mr. Matthes explained there were certain events where it would be unreasonable to enforce it so some judgment would be used. Ms. Hoppe suggested the City purchase a sidewalk machine for those situations. Mr. Matthes asked the Council to let staff know of specific situations so they could address it.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted the neighborhood planning process as discussed in the Comprehensive Plan to begin. Mr. Matthes noted staff would come back to Council with a proposed process. He pointed out there were approximately 80 neighborhoods so they would need to develop a way to prioritize them. Mr. Thomas suggested they start with neighborhoods adjacent to the downtown as it might also help address the infrastructure capacity problem.

Mr. Schmidt understood a kid crossing the street at the intersection of Aldeah, Edgewood and Broadway was nearly hit, and wondered if a flashing walk light could be installed at this intersection. He noted he would forward the e-mail regarding this issue to staff.

Mr. Trapp stated he was glad the City was moving ahead with the enforcement of removing snow from sidewalks. He noted he had walked through the Vanderveen Subdivision, and almost everyone shoveled their walks in that neighborhood, which was nice to see.

Mr. Trapp commented that Mr. Johnsen had raised some equity issues about net metering customers not paying for infrastructure used, and he had struggled with that because he thought the City needed to promote solar, but was sensitive to the equity issues. He understood Austin Energy in Texas had moved away from net metering and had a value of solar rate, which was an attempt to set a more equitable rate for solar photovoltaic customers. The rate was based on an algorithm that incorporated the six value components of loss savings, energy savings, generation capacity savings, fuel price hedge value, transmission and distribution capacity savings, and environmental benefits. It was meant to reflect the actual value of solar energy by creating a break-even value for a specific kind of

distributed generation resource at an economically neutral value to the utility in regards to infrastructure. They had been able to have a fairer and more accurate rate, a reduction in payback period for solar, and greater conservation because they were able to separate use from generation. He thought it was a model staff could look at to address some of the equity issues.

Mr. Johnsen agreed the City would have to revisit this issue with Council because they wanted to ensure an equitable arrangement existed before net metering blossomed on the system and they had to change the playing field after agreements had already been made. He noted the Austin Energy model sounded like a feed-in tariff, which involved an arrangement where the utility had a rate they would pay the customer for any energy the customer delivered to the system. He understood the feed-in tariff changed depending on the time of year, and that it was more common in western states. He pointed out there was a bit of a fixed cost the City currently netted that they needed to revisit in order to ensure they knew how these units were being subsidized.

Mr. Thomas asked if this meant customers that could not generate enough energy on-site would pay for that energy from the system. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. He explained there were fixed costs on the system, and at this time, the City credited it at the full retail rate, which meant fixed costs were rolled into it. This was initially done because they wanted to encourage participation, but there would be a point where they would need to address the issue of fixed costs. The City's ordinance tried to ensure there were no producers of energy to the system, but if the City transitioned to a feed-in tariff, the utility was neutral, theoretically, in terms of where the energy came from because they would not be subsidizing any customer class.

Mr. Skala stated he was anxious to highlight some of the potential solutions to the City's infrastructure exigency downtown, and thought the four potential solutions of impact fees, a generalized trip generation model, bonds or taxes, and the deferral of sewer bond projects had been mentioned. He asked staff to provide an analysis of the potential for some of these problems. He understood the powerpoints from the Smart Growth Conference sessions he recommended would be available soon, and thought that might assist staff. He also thought the December, 2012 Tribune article that discussed a report comparing development costs might be helpful.

Ms. Nauser commented that she hoped staff would re-evaluate the infrastructure capacity issue to come up with another creative plan for Council consideration.

Ms. Nauser understood there would be more shelters when CoMO connect was implemented and suggested partnering with the private sector in terms of advertising at the shelters to help pay for transit.

The meeting adjourned at 12:21 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk