

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
SEPTEMBER 2, 2014**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 2, 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 TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID and CHADWICK 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 July 21, 2014 was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Trapp and a second by Mr. Skala.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Hoppe asked that R164-14 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with R164-14 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

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Jama Rahn – Utility customer service.

Ms. Rahn, 105 N. Garth Avenue, Apt. 45, commented that she felt compassion and understanding, as a society, needed to be shown to the most vulnerable, which included the disabled, the elderly, the poor, and the working poor. She explained she had moved to Columbia about 1 ½ years ago and loved the community, but thought the City utility customer service representatives were rude and made customers feel they were not worthy of their time. She pointed out it was difficult to have to contact utility customer service on a regular basis to request an extension, and noted no one wanted to call and admit they did not have the money to pay their bill. She explained her neighbor, who was 70 years old, had been ridiculed because she did not realize she needed to wait for a confirmation number with the automated system. Ms. Rahn commented that she had received a disconnect notice on August 8, 2014 indicating she needed to provide payment by the following Monday, so she got the money together and put a money order in the drop box. When she had spoken to a customer service representative she was told she should not have done that, but the payment was there. A week later, however, her power was disconnected because her

payment had been lost, and she had one of two options. She could either pay the bill again along with a reconnect fee or wait until the payment was found. She noted the payment had yet to be found, and the video the customer utility service division had reviewed showed that it appeared as though she put something in the drop box. She explained she was now fighting to get the money back or credited to her account. She commented that her concerns were that this could happen to anyone and wondered if they wanted people speaking to their parents the way the representatives had spoken to her and her elderly neighbor. She wondered if they wanted people speaking like to their parents. She did not believe the vulnerable needed to be spoken to in that manner.

Mayor McDavid asked Ms. Rahn to send a synopsis of this situation to him and Ms. Chadwick. Ms. Rahn replied she would.

Doug Dickherber – 2012 Ordinance 14-180 only allowing access to closed part of campus to the city buses.

Mr. Dickherber, 903 Ellis Park Drive, Wentzville, Missouri, stated he owned two businesses in Columbia and had lived in Columbia for six years prior to moving to Wentzville. He commented that an ordinance passed in 2012 had amended Section 14-180 of the City Code, and only allowed the City access to the closed part of the University of Missouri campus for the delivery of students to and from school. He noted Greenway Shuttles, his shuttle service, had been in business for seven years and provided shuttle services to 18 apartment complexes. He stated they transported approximately 5,000 students to and from campus, and approximately 12,000 students were able to ride his shuttles, which was about one-third of the student population at the University. He explained he had been using Brady Commons for the last six years, but his vehicles were now being forced to use alternative locations. He believed the ordinance was unfair as it only allowed City transit buses to use the area in front of Brady Commons. He noted he had tried to work with the City in terms of times he could be in the area and for other alternative locations, and felt this was a safety issue because the locations he was limited to did not have shelters. He noted he had started a petition on Thursday, and had almost 1,000 signatures in only two days. He understood City staff had indicated they were not permitted in the area due to safety concerns, but he did not agree as there were more issues for them to use Hitt Street since it involved more turns and crosswalks. He commented that he preferred to have his clients in Brady Commons waiting for the bus, and asked why this change was necessary. He thought he should at least be able to pull through on Rollins Street, and reiterated he believed the ordinance was unfair to his private business.

Ms. Chadwick asked where the shuttles were dropping students off now. Mr. Dickherber replied the designated location was Missouri Avenue, which was on the west side of Brady Commons. They were also on the closed section of Hitt Street at the back side of the library and near Memorial Union. He commented that this portion of Hitt Street was very busy. It took his shuttles an extra five minutes to get on and off campus now, which put several of his vehicles behind schedule. He pointed out he received 279 complaints from students and parents on the first day. Ms. Chadwick understood they were driving into the

closed portion of Hitt Street. Mr. Dickherber stated that was correct, and noted it was a nightmare due to all of the congestion there.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- B233-14 Adopting the FY 2015 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.**
B234-14 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code as it relates to sign permit fees; amending Chapter 24 of the City Code as it relates to right-of-way permit fees.
B235-14 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to hauled liquid waste rates; amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility rates and sanitary sewer utility connection fees.
B236-14 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to fines for unmetered off-street facilities and parking meter violations.
B237-14 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to parking rates.
B238-14 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and Recreation fees.
B239-14 Amending Chapter 20 of the City Code as it relates to Community Development Department processing fees.
B240-14 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to rental unit inspection fees and charges.
B241-14 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.
B242-14 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to rates for water service lines.
B243-14 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.
B244-14 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water backflow prevention charges.

The bills were given third reading by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid suggested the amendment sheet associated with B233-14 be addressed at the next meeting, and for them to specify any additional amendments they wanted considered. He noted he planned to suggest an amendment to continue the solid waste black bag voucher system. Mr. Matthes stated staff would appreciate knowing the thoughts of Council tonight.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Chadwick asked if Lawrence, Kansas did not charge a rental application fee per building. She understood they had the highest rental fee per unit. Mr. Matthes replied they did not charge an application fee per building.

Mr. Matthes continued with the staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood the blue bags would still be supplied, and asked for the cost of those bags and why those bags would still be provided. She wondered why they would not charge for the recycling bags if they charged for the black trash bags. She also asked how the cost of bags was incurred. She wondered if they were purchased in bulk. Mr. Matthes replied he thought the cost of the blue bags was about the same as the cost of the black bags, and the approach they had taken to promote more recycling and less garbage. Ms. Hoppe pointed out the City saved money by not using the landfill so recycling saved money in the long-term. Mr. Blattel explained the City purchased the bags in bulk from a vendor. The bags were stored in a warehouse and delivered to the stores as needed. Ms. Nauser understood the City paid in advance for the bags and was then reimbursed. Mr. Blattel stated that was correct, and pointed out the price of the bag was different every time they were purchased due to the price of oil. Mr. Matthes understood the purpose of the voucher was to track usage. Ms. Chadwick understood the City was not really being reimbursed as they

were charging the ratepayers for the cost of the bags. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Ms. Chadwick noted everyone was being charged the same regardless of the number of vouchers redeemed. Mr. Glascock pointed out only three vouchers per year were provided, which equaled about 75 bags per year.

Ms. Chadwick understood there would be ten more full-time transit employees, and asked how many part-time transit bus drivers the City would employ. Mr. Glascock replied he did not have that number at this time, but noted eleven would be transferred to full-time. Ms. Chadwick explained she had asked so they could consider converting them to full-time employees during the next budget cycle. Mr. Glascock pointed out some transit employees were not needed for the entire year. Mr. Matthes noted two-thirds of the transit staff were not full-time employees, and the addition of these ten full-time employees would make the ratio closer to 50-50. He explained some part-time drivers were needed as well. Mayor McDavid stated he did not realize two-thirds of those employees were part-time. Mr. Glascock pointed out they were temporary employees, not part-time employees. Ms. Chadwick thought the down side to part-time employees was a higher turnover due to lower wages and fewer benefits, and felt more full-time employees would provide more consistency and better customer service.

Mr. Skala understood one of the reasons provided in the past to move away from the black bag system was due to workers compensation costs, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Matthes replied this and sewer work were the most dangerous jobs, and even more dangerous than police work. He noted needles in bags tended to stick people, the bags were sometimes very heavy, and it was a very laborious job in that the bags were lifted and thrown in the trucks. A roll cart system would avoid these types of problems because the trucks would have a hydraulic arm that lifted the cart and dumped the trash into the truck, but there would still be the potential for other problems associated with workers compensation since the employees worked with large equipment and because employees picked up trash at the doors of some customers that could not place their trash at the curb. He pointed out the elimination of City provided black bags would likely not affect the workers compensation claims since residents would buy their own bags and solid waste employees would still lift bags and throw those bags in the trucks. Mr. Glascock stated the workers compensation cost for the entire Public Works Department was about \$6 million, and for \$3.5 million the Solid Waste Division.

Mr. Skala asked if biodegradable bags had been considered for environmental purposes. Mr. Glascock replied he understood biodegradable bags tended to degrade before they were used. Mr. Skala understood bags would still be used with a roll cart system because people would likely not throw their trash directly into the roll cart. Mr. Glascock agreed, but noted that currently, many people used the City provided bags as a second bag like a roll cart. As a result, some people were using more bags than needed.

Ms. Chadwick commented that if the City charged \$1.58 per month, the annual cost was \$18.96 for 75 bags, which equaled about \$0.25 per bag, and ratepayers were forced to pay that amount regardless of the number of bags they used. She understood compostable bags at Target were about \$0.26 per bag and the heavy duty bags were a little over \$0.25 per

bag, which was about the same as was being charged to ratepayers, but allowed the consumer to purchase as few or as many bags as needed.

Ms. Nauser asked for a departmental breakdown of the workers compensation costs for the next budget year as she believed it would be helpful in their analysis and when explaining it to the citizens. Mr. Glascock replied that information could be provided, and pointed the numbers he previously quoted were the numbers from the last ten years.

Ms. Hoppe noted there had been a suggestion to charge a base rate per unit to address the master meter situation in multi-unit buildings, and asked how much would be collected if that was done. She explained she was asking in order to potentially reduce the proposed base rate charge. Mr. Glascock replied staff had not made that calculation.

Ms. Hoppe understood Ben Londeree had spent a lot of time trying to determine what the City's existing sewer system consisted of, its value, depreciation, etc. in an attempt to calculate an equity buy-in fee for new development, but had been unable to finish that work, and asked if City staff had continued with that work. Mr. Glascock replied City staff had not, and explained Mr. Londeree had done the work on his own and he had never received the work product.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she did not believe the connection fee should only cover the cost to connect the building to the sewer system, and noted it should also include the cost to buy into the existing sewer infrastructure. Mr. Glascock suggested Andrew Burnham of Burton & Associates, the firm that conducted the cost of service study, describe the reasoning behind the connection fee.

Andrew Burnham stated he was Senior Vice President of Burton & Associates and explained they had conducted the sewer cost of service study for the City. He noted the connection fee included the backbone infrastructure cost for treatment and conveyance of wastewater, and was often referred to as a system development charge as it recognized the unit cost of capacity of the system to serve new connections as they connected. It reflected the cost of the existing system, the reconstruction cost, which was the new less depreciation, and the portion tied to expansion, so it was a weighted cost. Ms. Hoppe understood it reflected the existing system value with depreciation as well as the needed infrastructure to handle the additional load in the future. Mr. Burnham stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe asked for the amount of money that would be generated if the City charged a base rate per unit regardless of whether the building had a master meter, and how much they could reduce the proposed increase in the base rate by if they made that policy change. She assumed that had not been reviewed as part of the cost of service study. Mr. Burnham explained that had not been reviewed because the unit information was not available in the billing system for sewer. He suggested an audit of all of the multi-unit accounts in the system as a future consideration to ensure the base charge paid per unit was consistent because it would be inappropriate for a 20-unit complex with a master meter to have a different base charge per unit than a 20-unit complex with individual meters, and pointed out this would take a fair amount of work to accomplish.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought the base charge was only supposed to include the customer-related costs, such as meter maintenance, meter reading, billing, and customer service, and asked if there were any other components to the base charge. Mr. Burnham

replied the base charges for water service and sewer service typically included the customer-related costs and a portion of the fixed cost of the system associated with the readiness to serve component, which involved having the infrastructure size to meet the peak demands of customers throughout the year. He noted common rates structures had two components, a base charge and variable rates, and the base charge included some level of recovery of the fixed costs of the system. The level of recovery was reflective of many factors, to include local policy objectives relative to affordability, fiscal stability concerns, industry recommendations from rating agencies, etc. He commented that the base charge recommended for next year included the costs mentioned by Mr. Thomas and the debt service expenses for capacity-related costs that would be incurred year round. He reiterated capital costs and the customer-related costs were what they were currently sizing the base charges to recover. Mr. Thomas asked how the debt had been incurred. Mr. Burnham replied they had identified all of the outstanding debt of the City for sewer infrastructure and the annual repayment schedules, and then had identified the payment costs for FY 2015 along with the customer-related expenses while providing a credit for one of the Build America bonds and the interest subsidy received, to determine the amount of revenue that should be recovered in the base charge. Mr. Thomas asked if the debt incurred had been used to expand the system for new customers. Mr. Burnham replied he thought it was likely a combination of system expansion costs and system renewal and replacement costs. He explained he did not have the specific knowledge of each individual bond issue.

Mr. Thomas asked if the sewer utility would have enough money coming in from new development to expand the system appropriately to accommodate new development if the City implemented the recommended connection fee increases, and, would not need to incur additional future debt in order to add customers to the system. Mr. Burnham replied that was difficult to answer because the timing of capital improvements for expansion was often based upon a multi-year analysis. He pointed out all of the connections fees would likely not be collected upfront for a capital investment, and that it might take 5-20 years to recover the cost of the investment. He noted he could not say that by increasing fees the City would not incur debt to pay for upfront costs to expand facilities, but the connection fee revenues received could be applied to future capital expansion-related projects or the debt incurred for the capital expansion-related projects. Mr. Thomas understood the connection fee increase was the estimate of what it would cost per new customer to the system. Mr. Burnham explained the fee represented the current value of the existing system and the five year portion of the CIP Plan associated with system expansion.

Mayor McDavid understood recommended the connection fee was 2.5 times the next highest connection fee in Missouri. Mr. Burnham explained the study had identified the current cost of capital for which the City could charge a connection fee. Ultimately, it would be the policy decision of the Council as to the level of fee the City wanted to impose to recover the cost of capital, and the balance between connection fees and rates. Mayor McDavid understood it was discretionary. Mr. Burnham stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed a problem with connection fees was that they did not know the number of connections over the next ten years. As a result, if they imposed connection fees that were substantially above the market, they could influence the market.

Mr. Burnham commented that they had been a part of a number of studies relative to upfront capital connection charges in terms of whether system development charges, such as connection or impact fees, were an economic barrier to development, notably in Florida, and the results were largely inconclusive because there were a number of other market factors that drove decisions relative to construction, to include timing, location, property acquisition costs, interest rates, etc. Mayor McDavid asked if they had considered the impact of a \$2,400 sewer charge on affordable single-family homes in comparison with other markets in the immediate area. Mr. Burnham replied no. He explained they had provided some benchmarking, but had not conducted an economic analysis of potential impacts to development.

Mayor McDavid understood 90 percent of the cost of the wastewater treatment plant was fixed, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Burnham replied that was a good rule of thumb for the industry although every system was different. Mayor McDavid understood a new home at Old Hawthorne would not increase the cost at the treatment plant much. Mr. Burnham explained the cost recovery in terms of fixed versus variable addressed the cost of a utility system as it stood to recover debt service, operating and maintenance, and other items. The marginal impact of a particular development was different. Mayor McDavid understood the City was capable of discretion, and that they could raise the connection fees as high as they wanted if they wanted to discourage single-family homes, or they could lower connection fees to encourage single-family homes. Mr. Burnham pointed out the purpose of the study was to establish a ceiling. He noted the Council would have the basis to adopt a fee up to the amount identified based upon the cost of the capacity of the system, and he cautioned them not to go above that number. Mayor McDavid commented that it appeared as though that was the number being recommended, and it was six times that of the fee in Jefferson City and fifteen times that of the fee in Boone County. He believed tripling the connection fee could have ramifications in terms of single-family homes, particularly the lower-tiered single family homes. Mr. Burnham stated he hesitated to speculate as he was not in a position to make a definitive statement one way or the other, and explained their fundamental objective was to help the City understand the choices and their consequences. The choice they had was to determine how much to recover from new development versus existing ratepayers. While an upfront fee for connection costs might provide some people an economic disadvantage, the on-going cost in terms of low utility rates might be attractive to others, so it was difficult to speculate what would be viewed positively from an economic impact perspective. He stated he understood and appreciated the points made, and explained it was really a policy decision, and that was why it was difficult for them to make a recommendation.

Ms. Hoppe understood that if the City did not charge a sufficient connection fee, the cost would still need to be covered and ratepayers would be impacted even if they did not purchase a new house. Mr. Burnham commented that in order to accomplish the objectives, the costs would need to be recovered by one of the two funding mechanisms.

Ms. Hoppe noted benchmarks were provided to comparable university communities, and the City's current fees were low in comparison to Ann Arbor, Michigan, Lawrence,

Kansas, and others. Mr. Burnham pointed out Ann Arbor was conducting a comprehensive review of their fees.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought they could also consider quantity or the amount of use in their decision, and wondered if they could subsidize low users through higher rates for the high users. Mr. Burnham explained this was typically seen with water in terms of price incentives and greater cost allocations to higher discretionary usages, which were largely associated with outdoor irrigation, but that conservation-type pricing component was not really seen in terms of wastewater due to federal grant and user charge provisions in the Clean Water Act that dictated wastewater charges based on proportionality of use. The City could, however, consider affordability programs whereby people could qualify for credits on their bill based upon income, and that type of expense then became a line item expense within the utility's overall cost of service.

Mr. Trapp understood Mr. Burnham had previously indicated the operating rates would not have to go up as much because the City had a growing pool of ratepayers, and asked for clarification. Mr. Burnham replied they had tried to bifurcate the annual revenue increase requirements for the sewer system between what was associated with capital versus operating, and they were showing an overall increase in operating expenses of about three percent per year, but because many of those costs were fixed in nature, the rate increase requirement was only one percent per year based on a two percent growth assumption.

Ms. Hoppe understood the general fund subsidy for the Parks and Recreation Department had been reduced by \$200,000 in FY 2012 and by another \$200,000 in FY 2014, and that the money had not been added back to their budget even though funds had been added back to other departments. She also understood that when the permanent parks sales tax had passed, a promise had been made indicating the Parks and Recreation Department general fund budget amount would not be reduced. Mr. Matthes stated it had only been cut back to what had been promised, so they were not using less general fund money than they did when the ballot passed. They only took back some of the increases made, and moved those expenses to the sales tax. Ms. Hoppe understood those were increases based on inflation and other things, and asked if there was any plan to get them back up to where they were prior to FY 2012. Mr. Matthes pointed out every City department was about 30 percent understaffed, and between on-line shopping and the recession, the sales tax revenue had not kept up with growth. He noted he would love to replace that funding, but did not yet have a way to do it at this time. Ms. Hoppe asked for information to be provided regarding what the Parks and Recreation Department had received in the general fund in FY 2000 and in every year thereafter. Mr. Matthes replied that could be provided.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Steve Sheltmire, 1908 Tremont Court, commented that he and other concerned citizens had circulated two petitions with regard to the proposed changes to solid waste. One petition dealt with future policy decisions regarding residential waste pick up in terms of ensuring the cost of service study was completed prior to making any decision, and for that information to be made available to the public for an adequate amount of time prior to making any decision. The other petition referenced their preference for residential trash service. He provided copies of the petitions for the record.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, stated her appreciation for the comments made by Mr. Burnham of Burton & Associates regarding sewer, and felt it would be more helpful if they were talking about a sewer system in good repair. She understood Mr. Matthes had stated during his opening comments regarding the budget at the Saturday work session that it was time to ask for an additional investment from the citizens since the economy had recovered, but noted the economy had not improved for all City stakeholders. She commented that although she was a proponent of charging more so they had infrastructure in good repair, she was concerned the increases in the rates proposed as part of this budget were inversely applied in that most of the fees were being applied to those that had least recovered. She noted Josh Wexler had asked for clarification as to how contributions by developers were calculated on June 16, and Ms. Nauser had asked for report on the issue that same night, but did not believe a report had been provided, and was concerned these budget discussions were occurring without a clear understanding of how the contribution had been calculated. She asked the Council to seek clarity on the issue in terms of all types of infrastructure prior to voting on the budget items. She noted she was also concerned about these decisions being made without any business justification as many cost of service studies had not yet been completed or identified. She also asked that the City identify which cost of service study they were relying upon for budget decisions, and the most recent cost of service studies since that was difficult to follow.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, asked the Council to increase the rental inspection fees as it appeared the taxpayers had subsidized that activity for a long time. She believed it was time to hire another inspector because six years was too long of a time to inspect rental properties, especially those that had been in existence for 20 years or longer.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he did not like the idea of the sewer system connection fee being based on the next five years of capital improvement projects because the CIP Plan was only a budgeting tool and was not backed up with any long-term planning. He thought the CIP Plan should include 20-30 year and beyond projections, and felt the calculation for the sewer connection fee recommended by Burton & Associates was too low. He understood Mayor McDavid was concerned about affordable housing, and wondered if that meant the difference between \$200,000 and \$175,000, or those with truly modest means. He noted the economic development model for Columbia over the past 25 years was based on population growth and big-box retail expansion, and this had significantly reduced the level of service in terms of infrastructure. He pointed out housing growth and retail growth was derivate and not a good model for population growth, and believed it was a Ponzi scheme. It was not the kind of growth that should be subsidized.

Bruce Watts, 1403 Berwick Court, stated he believed it was the responsibility of government to take care of its poorest citizens. Bringing rich developments and people to Columbia had not benefited those in service industries. He commented that the City had not analyzed how much new development would cost in the long run as had been requested by the citizens, and referred to the People's Visioning Plan B report. He asked the City to do the proper analyses so the burden of costs could be placed on those that made money from the developments.

There being no further comment, Mayor McDavid continued the public hearing for B233-14, B234-14, B235-14, B236-14, B237-14, B238-14, B239-14, B240-14, B241-14, B242-14, B243-14, and B244-14 to the September 15, 2014 Council Meeting.

Mayor McDavid understood the community criticism in fee increases, but noted the City had services it needed to deliver and bills to pay. He thought a flaw was that the City had allowed some fees to remain dormant for many years, so the increase in those fees were substantial due to inflation. He appreciated the benchmarking provided for many of the fees as that had not been provided in the past, and understood many of those fee increases placed Columbia in the middle or kept Columbia within the lower range when reviewed against comparable cities.

Mayor McDavid noted the City was involved in litigation with regard to billboards, and thought there was an opportunity to set higher fees on billboards to prevent this situation in the future.

Mr. Matthes commented that the decision the Council had to make with regard to B235-14 involved setting the FY 2015 sewer rates and fees. The budget had been drafted with a \$1,200 recommended sewer connection fee, but the Council could decide to leave it at \$800, increase to \$960, increase it to \$1,200, increase to \$1,333, or develop another strategy.

Ms. Hoppe understood any accessory dwelling unit would be required to pay a \$1,200 connection fee for a 5/8-inch meter, and asked if a lower rate could be assessed for those types of units or other affordable housing units. She explained she was also interested in the three-year plan, which would make the connection fee \$1,333. She reiterated she did not believe a \$300,000 home should be charged the same as an accessory dwelling unit.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was concerned about adopting a policy and then allowing exceptions as they then would likely not meet their original goals. She thought they should look for ways to incentivize low income housing other than setting a policy for fees and reducing the number of people that had to pay that fee.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with Ms. Nauser, and noted he thought they needed to charge new development the cost they imposed on the system. He believed there would be the same number of toilet flushes in an accessory dwelling unit as there would be in a 4,000 square foot home. He explained he was not willing to support any special exemption since they had not even agreed upon an increase at this time. He thought they could look at other necessary adjustments in the future.

Ms. Chadwick asked if there would be a difference in the cost of the connection based on the location or size of the structure. Mr. Thomas replied he did not believe there would be a difference with regard to the physical connection, but other fees might be impacted. Mr. Matthes explained there were fees based on the size of the meter. Mr. Thomas stated he believed the connection fee was to account for the burden of an additional use on the system as a whole, and understood the consultant had recommend \$2,460 as the appropriate level when looking at future sewer plans.

Mayor McDavid asked if a 100-unit apartment paid a connection fee for each unit. Mr. Glascock replied they would pay \$800 per unit. Mr. Matthes noted they also then charged a base charge for the meter and a volume charge based on the size of the meter.

Mr. Skala commented that generally speaking, there were likely the same number of people regardless of the size of a house, and sewer usage could be accommodated by volume and the variable rate. As a result, he agreed the connection fee should be established without too much consideration to size. He pointed out this did not apply to other utilities, such as electric or roads, as use and size tended to interact more. He thought they could try to accommodate discounts for low-income homes or subsidize low-end users. He noted he wanted the connection fee to be set at the maximum agreed to within three years.

Mr. Thomas stated he also favored the three-year period. He noted he had received pictures of the sewers erupting at Ridgefield Park today, and the project to correct that situation was on a waiting list. The existing sewer system was in poor condition and had deteriorated significantly over the years as they had allowed new customers to connect to the system without charging what it would cost to expand the system.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with the three-year implementation as well, and pointed out an increase to \$1,200 would still keep Columbia lower than Champaign, Illinois and others with lower rates were in the process of reviewing their rate structures. Mr. Matthes pointed out the three-year process would require the connection fee to be \$1,333 instead of \$1,200 in FY 2015.

Mr. Thomas understood there was a recommendation for a volume charge per ccf reduction from \$2.414 to \$2.27, and asked for the reason for that recommendation. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it was because the previous cost of service study was based upon seven ccfs, and it had now dropped to five ccfs, so the average usage had decreased. In addition, the rate had been changed from 67 percent volume and 33 percent fixed to 75 percent volume and 25 percent fixed when a previous cost of service analysis was conducted. As a result, there was an increase in fixed costs and a decrease in volume costs. Mr. Thomas understood the recommendation was to move back to a 33 percent base charge and a 67 percent volume charge ratio. Mr. Burnham explained they were recommending a 40 percent fixed cost and a 60 percent volume cost ratio. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification on the reason for that recommendation. Mr. Burnham replied it had to do with the recovery of some of the fixed costs in the base charge along with the customer-related costs and debt service expenses. Mr. Thomas asked for a description of the fixed costs. Mr. Burnham replied the fixed costs included personnel based on mandated regulatory requirements, such as the number of certified operators, etc. because they had to have certain staff levels regardless of the amount of volume pumped. It also included repair and maintenance and capital investments. While volume dictated some of the useful life of the assets, infrastructure had to be repaired and maintained on a regular basis to achieve its useful life regardless of whether or not they were trying to extend the useful life. The variable costs were largely associated with electricity, some chemicals for treatments, and maybe a small amount of fuel for running the pumps and lift stations, so a very small percentage of the costs varied and were dependent upon the volume treated.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed there were two issues. One was whether the costs were fixed or variable, and the other involved the equitable way to pay for those costs. He agreed a certain level of staffing was needed, but wondered if it was equitable to put those costs in the base charge, which everyone paid regardless of the burden they put on the

system. Mr. Burnham pointed out they did not include all of the fixed costs of the system into the fixed fee. He reiterated the rule of thumb was that 90 percent of the costs were fixed, but the fixed cost recovery from the base rates was recommended to only be 40 percent, and it really only accounted for the debt-related expenses and the small amount for customer service and billing expenses. The City would only recover a small percentage of fixed costs in the base rate, but it was more than it recovered currently. He pointed out this was an increasing industry practice and the rating agencies recommended the base rates or fixed fees generate over 30 percent of the revenue in order for them to be viewed as a financially healthy and stable utility. Mr. Thomas stated he felt only customer-related expenses should be included, and thought they should reduce the base charge and increase the volume charge, but understood the debt rating agencies would not like that because there would be uncertainty with the number of toilet flushes throughout the community and the amount of revenue the City would collect to cover those costs. Mr. Burnham noted the rating agencies had a significant degree of concern with the level of revenue stability of utility systems, whether water, wastewater, etc. He explained businesses could find ways to be more efficient with water use, customers could install water-only irrigation meters, avoid wastewater charges entirely, etc., so they were more nervous when more revenue recovery was from variable sources. Mr. Matthes stated the entire country was becoming more conscious regarding water conservation in terms of rain barrels, water saving devices on faucets, etc., and this was partly due to the fact they were all becoming more educated about the costs associated with clean water. He noted this utility would be significantly impacted if conservation goals were met. Mr. Glascock understood the treatment plant handled 12-13 million gallons per day in the 1990s, and about 15 million gallons today, so the volume did not grow significantly, but the costs to treat it did. Mr. Skala felt some of that was due to low-flush toilets and other conservation efforts. Mr. Blattel pointed out that if the City had a rate structure that the lenders were confident with, they would provide a higher rating to the City when bonds were issued, which in turn would result in a lower interest rate and a reduction in future capital costs. Mr. Burnham noted the base monthly charge for comparable utilities between Kansas City and St. Louis was about \$10-\$11, and explained they had tried to recommend a balanced approach in terms of affordability, financial stability, etc.

Mr. Thomas stated he was concerned about the more than 50 percent increase in the base charge, especially since many could not afford to pay their utilities now, and felt the philosophy of a higher base charge put the burden of the cost of the system on the smaller user. Ms. Chadwick commented that she felt the same was being done with trash as those that produced less trash paid the same as those that produced a lot of trash. Mr. Thomas understood the report provided was a draft report, and asked when they would receive the final version. Mr. Burnham replied they were waiting to incorporate the final decisions of the Council so they could include projections in the final report.

Mr. Thomas asked if the City had any provisions for low-income households in terms of sewer and the other utilities. He understood the City had a "cash and help" program, and asked for clarification on how it worked and whether there were other programs. Mr. Matthes replied the City worked with those that could not pay their utility bills, but noted there was not a program specific to sewer. Ms. Hoppe suggested a pre-council meeting or a report on

“cash and help” and other programs so they all understood how they worked and the amount of funding available to those in need. Mr. Matthes stated he thought they could provide a report at the next meeting regarding the issue, and pointed out the money in the programs tended to be used up fairly quickly.

Mr. Skala asked when the final report would be delivered. Mr. Burnham replied he thought they could provide it within about two weeks of knowing the final budget decisions of Council on the sewer utility.

Mayor McDavid understood parking meter fines collected went into the general fund instead of the parking utility, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Blattel replied the fines collected went into the general fund because the salaries of the meter enforcement personnel were paid from the general fund.

Mayor McDavid asked if a formal report would be provided to the Council with regard to the collection of parking fines. Mr. Matthes replied yes. Ms. Chadwick asked if the report would be provided before the next meeting. Mayor McDavid replied he did not know. He thought there had been 192,000 tickets issued in the last 2.5 years, and 52,000 tickets were still outstanding. He understood the problems associated with chasing down the payment, but felt that also amounted to \$500,000-\$800,000. He commented that the amount charged did not matter if the City did not collect the money.

Mr. Thomas understood staff had proposed parking fine increases and parking fee increases, and that the parking fine increases would pay for the additional public safety officers and the parking fee increases would go into the utility. Mr. Blattel stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser commented that fines were utilized to deter bad behavior, which in this case was the delay in paying parking tickets. She understood they had hoped people would pay their parking tickets on time with a higher fine, and was concerned this might not be a long-term, stable funding source to pay for additional officers. Mr. Blattel agreed there was a concern, and as a result, they had benchmarked the fines with those of other communities, and Columbia was low. Ms. Nauser asked if those benchmarks included the total number of tickets to the number of outstanding tickets, and what they tended to spend to recoup those unpaid tickets. Mr. Blattel replied they only looked at the amount of the fines. Ms. Chadwick stated she would also be interested in knowing where the money for these fines was going in the benchmarked communities. Mayor McDavid understood it was undesignated if put in the general fund, similar to property tax revenues. Mr. Matthes noted they felt there was a connection in terms of traffic enforcement and the parking fine, and pointed out sales tax was equally unrelated to police work. He stated it was a legal way to accomplish the goal. Mr. Thomas thought most of them felt the parking fines were too low, and that the City had too few police officers and firefighters.

Mr. Blattel noted this item also included a change in the enforcement hours, and asked if the Council was in agreement that the enforcement hours would be extended and effective January 1 as had been shown on the amendment sheet. Mayor McDavid stated he was supportive of it. Mr. Trapp explained the idea was for the parking enforcement time change to not go into effect at the same time the parking fines were increased. Ms. Nauser suggested enforcement continue to begin at 8:00 a.m. Mr. Blattel noted it was listed on the

amendment sheet to begin at 8:00 a.m. and end at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Chadwick stated her only concern was the confusion it would create between the University meters and the City meters. Ms. Hoppe commented that she liked the 8:00 a.m. start time for enforcement.

Mr. Trapp understood the Police Department paid the parking utility to be able to park cars on the street. Mr. Glascock stated they paid for parking meter usage and paid to park in the garages in which its vehicles were stored similar to the other City departments. Mr. Matthes pointed out the Police Department was provided the funding to pay for parking. Mayor McDavid understood this did not take away money in terms of public safety. Mr. Matthes replied no. It was a cost they would recover from whoever parked at the meters or in the parking garage, and the City provided money in the Police Department's budget to pay for parking.

Ms. Chadwick understood the garages were sold at about 125 percent of capacity, but there were still empty parking spaces, and asked if this ordinance could be amended if they wanted to increase it to 150 percent. Mr. Blattel replied that was done by policy so it could be changed at any time. Mr. Glascock explained they had tried to go to 130 percent at the Tenth and Cherry garage and it had been unsuccessful because people could not find parking spaces. Ms. Chadwick asked if that had been done in specific garages or in all of the garages. Mr. Glascock replied the policy could be specific to garages because the Fifth and Walnut garage could be oversold by a lot more than the Tenth and Cherry garage. Ms. Chadwick asked if the City had an across the board equal percentage of oversold spots. Mr. Glascock replied no.

Mr. Thomas suggested the fees of all departments be reviewed on an annual basis in terms of inflation and other factors instead of waiting several years.

Ms. Nauser asked if most of the parks and recreation fees were based on the cost of service and if they paid for themselves at a 75-100 percent recovery rate. She understood some services were subsidized, but not many. Mr. Matthes replied some recreation programs had to be subsidized. Ms. Nauser understood the ARC had a 100 percent recovery rate. Mr. Blattel stated the ARC fully recovered its fees. Mr. Skala understood the cost of the swimming pools was only partially recovered. Mr. Blattel stated that was corrected. Mr. Matthes explained they charged what the market would bear, which was far less than the cost. Mr. Griggs noted the recovery rates for their programs and facilities varied from eight percent to 100 percent.

Ms. Nauser asked if the inspection period would be reviewed because six years seemed like a long time between inspections. Mr. Matthes replied staff could provide a report with an analysis for shortening the time frame. Mr. Skala noted Ms. Hammen had indicated six years might not be long for a new building, but it was for older buildings, and suggested that factor be considered. Mr. Matthes asked if the Council wanted this information prior to voting on the proposed rental inspection fees at the next meeting. Ms. Nauser replied no, and explained she only wanted to have that information prior to the next budget cycle.

Mayor McDavid commented that he did not believe the City had done a good job of explaining the costs for all of the solid waste options, and understood the general public did not want a change at this time. As a result, he would suggest they continue with the existing

system at this time. He believed an automated system would be cheaper, but felt they would have to present the varying levels of service and costs to the public. Mr. Matthes noted staff had hoped to have that information for this budget cycle, but it was not ready, so they planned to have the information for the next budget cycle.

Mr. Thomas stated the responses he had received had been evenly split in terms of people that wanted to continue the service and were willing to pay \$1.60 per month and people that wanted to do away with the service and did not want a cost increase, but noted both groups had indicated more trash bags than needed were provided. He suggested the City provide fewer bags and not increase the fee. Mr. Matthes thought the utility could handle that without going broke if the other changes suggested were made. Mr. Glascock asked how many bags should be provided. Mr. Thomas suggested two rolls instead of three rolls. Mr. Glascock noted that would equal about 50 bags. Ms. Hoppe understood if someone wanted more, they could purchase them like they do now. Mr. Glascock noted they would have to purchase regular bags. Mr. Thomas suggested they purchase their own since the City picked up trash in all types of bags. Mr. Matthes pointed out the utility would spend more than it would receive, but there was enough cash to cover this change for one year.

Ms. Nauser commented that she felt the Council would need to grow a backbone to make any changes to the solid waste utility as she had received a lot of feedback on the issue. She did not believe the black bags were an operational necessity for the utility and pointed out they could be purchased at any grocery store.

Ms. Chadwick stated she felt it was an issue that they were charging everyone the same rate even when some people were not using the City provided black bags. She suggested they not increase the monthly fee, but require the vouchers to be purchased at about \$6.32 per voucher. This would allow those that wanted the bags to purchase them, and would not require everyone to pay for them. Mr. Thomas commented that he did not feel it was a good idea to introduce a complicated new program when they would likely review everything associated with this utility within the next few months. He stated he would prefer to keep the system as close to what it was now, and to look at that as an option as part of the review if they decided to continue providing bags in some manner.

Mr. Skala commented that less than half of the people in his neighborhood were actually using City provided bags, and noted he did not have an issue with providing two vouchers, but was concerned they were not addressing a “pay as you throw” system or any of the environmental aspects.

Mr. Glascock stated a policy with regard to recycling and trash consumption was needed. In October 2007, the citizens wanted to reach a goal of zero waste through increased recycling and to reduce consumption throughout Columbia. He noted staff would need some guidance from Council on the issue in the future. Mr. Thomas commented that he thought that could be addressed once they had the cost of service study. Mr. Glascock stated he thought the draft cost of service study would be ready in October.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that some of his constituents had asked about the status of roll carts as they had liked the idea. He noted it allowed for the “pay as you throw” approach and incentivized less waste. It was also safer for the solid waste employees. He understood

some people were concerned with the ability to get the carts to the curb, but explained the City already had a program that addressed that issue now.

Mr. Skala commented that most of the people that had contacted him were in support of the black bag system, and only about 25 percent of the feedback he received indicated a desire for roll carts. He suggested they provide fewer bags without increasing costs this year if that could be accomplished, and to try to get something new in place for next year to address the issues.

Mr. Thomas reiterated his suggestion for an amendment was to reduce the number of bags provided from 75 to 50 bags per year without increasing the cost of the service to residents while they reviewed the utility and decided how to move forward. Mr. Matthes stated he thought they could go a year without the utility going completely broke. Ms. Chadwick noted she was not sure they wanted to go an entire year under the existing system. Mr. Matthes explained the intent was to have the policy discussion and be ready to move forward with a decision well in advance of the next budget cycle.

Mr. Thomas asked if the recycling of #3 through #7 plastics could be considered in the overhaul of the entire utility. Mr. Glascock replied that was not part of the cost of service study, but noted they would review whether all of the recycling should be taken to St. Louis if they could not accommodate it in the City's facility in terms of cost.

Mr. Thomas pointed out 3-4 people he had spoken with regarding the solid waste system had stated their appreciation for the work of the solid waste staff as they worked hard to clean up areas when the bags tore open. He was pleased that they had proactively complimented the staff.

Mr. Trapp asked if there was a possibility of more municipal garbage cans throughout the City. He explained he thought a lot of the concern with the elimination of the black bags was litter and trash in the streets, and felt communities with less litter had more trash cans. He wondered if now would be a good time to look into this issue as well. Mr. Glascock replied staff was considering upgrades to their drop-off sites, and noted this issue could be looked into for the future as well.

Mr. Thomas understood the electric utility was based on a "return on investment" model, and not an electric connection fee model. Mr. Johnsen explained the current model in terms of recovery was based on a "return on investment" model. He noted there was a certain amount of investment, as a utility, they expected to make for new customers, but if the customer required more than the utility expected to invest, an in-kind contribution for their expansion needs would be negotiated. He pointed out it was a typical electric utility model, and in addition to the initial investment, there was quite a bit of cost in maintaining and continuing to provide the electric service. If asked to consider a connection fee similar to the water model, they would have to revisit the cost of service studies and the entire rate structure.

Ms. Hoppe understood that might be how the industry operated, but she believed they needed to separate private companies from city-owned utilities. Mr. Thomas agreed a profit-making electric utility needed to make a return on investment for their shareholders, etc., and their rates included a built-in profit, but Columbia Water and Light was a non-profit organization so there was no reason for a return on investment.

Mr. Thomas understood the City had spent \$20 million over the last ten years expanding the electric infrastructure system to accommodate new development, and was not sure how they would get a return on that as they would charge new customers only the cost to produce electricity. He felt they had subsidized the growth of the City because they had not had a connection fee for electricity.

Mayor McDavid commented that he believed the City profited from new customers in terms of the gross receipts tax or PILOT as it was a major source of the general fund account. He believed it was the funding source that had kept the City going considering its low property tax rate. He noted the City was also surrounded by Boone Electric, and many of the new developments were served by Boone Electric, so the City could not charge those homes a connection fee, and only collected money from them through the gross receipts tax.

Mr. Thomas agreed the City should not charge a connection fee to someone they would not serve as they were not a part of the City utility system, and assumed the \$20 million spent was to serve City customers. He believed the new homes connecting to the City system should be charged a connection fee as they would then be paying their portion of the cost to expand infrastructure.

Mr. Matthes explained the large power line project proposed in south Columbia had to be done and would serve everyone in the community because it created redundancy and would reduce the exposure of cascading failures from the connection to the outside grid. It would also create capacity in the grid around it. Mr. Thomas did not believe the fact it would benefit everyone was the point. He felt the investment would not need to be made if the community and the number of customers served had not grown. He commented that in order to maintain the level of service for the entire system, the City had to invest in infrastructure each time a customer was added. He asked if it was fair to say the \$20 million and the lines in southeast Columbia were related to adding new customers to the City utility. Mr. Johnsen replied some of the transmission line project was due to regulatory requirements, but noted they were adding a substation in the area as a load serving device. They expected to make the investment for new customers, and the rate structure recovered that cost for them. If the Council wanted a different cost recovery mechanism, the entire rate structure would need to be revisited. Mr. Matthes pointed out the philosophy of the electric utility was different than the other utilities, so the cost of service study completed for electric was based on a philosophy that emphasized rates over connection fees. The recommendation to Council was roughly a two percent increase as it was based on the amount used and the type of customer, and it moved a little more of the fixed costs into the rate, but it also reduced the cost for everyone in the first 300 kilowatt hours. It was about a \$1.27 increase for the average customer. He understood no household used less than 300 kilowatt hours, and only vacant homes would fall into that category.

Mr. Skala commented that many of the people that had contacted him were having difficulty understanding the details based on how this had been presented. He understood the increase was a function of charging someone that had previously not been charged due to a vacant home, etc., and that low-income people would not fall in that category. In addition, generally speaking, the rate increases for low-income people would be less than two percent. He did not believe the City had explained this well to the public.

Mr. Thomas understood everyone would pay an extra \$6.00 per month for the base charge, and almost everyone would get a \$6.00 rebate for the first 300 kilowatt hours, and asked what was achieved with the change in the rate structure. Mr. Johnsen replied it was a fixed cost recovery mechanism, and they were trying to recover the customer service charge through a fixed cost mechanism instead of a variable rate mechanism. The cost of service study indicated certain costs should be recovered through certain mechanisms. Mr. Thomas felt the City would not reduce its variable rate exposure since only the part of the rate structure everyone paid would be changed. Mr. Matthes commented that the City's rate structure was one in that the more someone used, the more they were charged but the utility was a cost-based system, so they had to recover something to accommodate really low usage times. He pointed out the current structure was subject to significant revenue volatility because the utility was dependent on high users. Mr. Skala understood there were some high users that were not weather dependent as there were some commercial aspects. Mr. Matthes agreed, but noted there were very few.

Mr. Skala understood the utility in Austin, Texas charged more to the high-end users that were less weather dependent and were then able to offset the costs of the low-end users, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Johnsen replied the rate structures were similar in that they were shaped the same even though the dollar values were different, and anytime that much revenue was tied to higher usage bands, there could be fluctuations in the revenue stream. Mr. Skala understood Mr. Johnsen had indicated Austin subsidized their low-end users more than Columbia. Mr. Johnsen stated he thought he had pointed out the rate structures were similar, and noted they treated solar completely different than Columbia at this time.

Mr. Matthes explained the current system had volatility, which hurt financially last year and would likely hurt them again this year. The cost of service study noticed this exposure, so they were trying to slightly change the structure in order to receive more of a guaranteed revenue versus being so dependent on weather. Mr. Skala understood it was a way to bypass the fluctuations in weather. Mr. Matthes stated it would reduce the risk for big deficits based on the weather.

Mr. Thomas understood the recommendations of the cost of service study were different from the staff recommendations in the proposed bill for the different classes of customers, and asked why staff had chosen only some of the recommendations of the consultant. Mr. Johnsen replied the rate structures for the larger classes were different as they had a customer charge, demand charge, and energy charge, and much of the fixed costs were still associated with the demand charge. Mr. Thomas asked how the demand charge was calculated. Mr. Johnsen replied by kilowatts. He explained the demand and energy charges took into account peak load, which dealt with the size of wires and transformers, and the load factor, which took into account the proportion of the energy used to its demand. It adequately represented the cost to the customer of the utility. He pointed out the entire rate structure needed to be considered when comparing the classes of customers.

Mr. Thomas understood the industrial customers paid a lot less per kilowatt hour than residential customers. Mr. Johnson stated that was because they had a demand charge.

Mr. Thomas asked how the revenue for the utility would be affected if they eliminated the demand charge and charged all of the customers the 10-12 cents per kilowatt hour. Mr. Johnsen replied that would not be representative of how they incurred the cost to the utility. He explained the staff would rather move all customers to a demand and energy charge because that really represented the costs. Mr. Thomas asked if they could eliminate the customer charge. Mr. Johnsen replied no, and explained that was a fixed cost recovery component which needed to be kept. Mr. Thomas understood the preference was for a customer charge, demand charge, and energy charge. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct, and explained the only information they had for residential customers was the energy charge.

Mr. Skala thought some of the costs could be shifted as a percentage of the rates, and that the City could decide to increase the rate on high-end users regardless of the demand charge, and the change would presumably partially subsidize the low-end user. He asked if that was the decision they had to make. Mr. Matthes replied the City utility was cost-based, so if there was an increase in the rate, the base charge would be less, and if the base charge was increased, the rate would be reduced. Mr. Skala thought the rate could be reduced differentially between low and high users. Mr. Matthes agreed, and noted they did that to some degree already. Mr. Skala understood the rate for high-end users could be increased by one percent to subsidize low-end users under the current rate structure. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and noted the trajectory of the trend line would be rotated. He pointed out it would also increase the volatility of the utility at the high end. Mr. Skala understood increasing the slope on the high end would increase volatility, but thought that could be accommodated through the base charge. He also understood high-end users paid more for electricity than low-end users, and his thought was that slope might not be high enough. He felt they could accommodate low-end users even more.

Mayor McDavid commented that Columbia had companies that employed a lot of people, such as Kraft Foods, that were high energy users, and the ability to serve them was dependent on cost. He thought they were already at a point where they would have difficulty helping them increase their service lines because Columbia was already a more expensive place to do business than the competition, so he was concerned about the movement to increase the cost to companies that employed a lot of people.

Mr. Thomas understood the electric utility had about 41,000 residential customers that paid 10-12 cents per kilowatt hour, 5,500 small business customers, 1,000 large business customers, and 30-40 industrial customers. He did not know what the small and large general service customers were paying per kilowatt, but understood the industrial customers were paying 4-5 cents per kilowatt hour plus a demand charge. He asked if they were recovering from each class of customer the amount they were spending to serve that respective class. Mr. Johnsen replied yes, and explained at this time, the utility did not have any inter-rate class subsidies. There was only a little usage subsidy. He pointed out the proposed increases would affect the higher users a little more than the lower users, and would shift some costs to the customer charge that should be appropriately priced because it was a fixed charge. He thought that would reflect well during the bond rating time.

Mr. Skala thought it would be useful to have these charges in a table format by customer class, so they could see the slope of the increasing charge, and asked if that could

be provided by the next Council Meeting to assist them with their decisions. Mr. Johnsen understood Mr. Skala wanted information as to how the current rate changes would impact customers based on usage. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. Mr. Johnsen thought a chart had been provided. Mr. Skala explained he wanted the information for the customer classes by a number of divisions because he understood high-end users had additional charges, such as the demand energy charge, the low-end users did not. Mr. Johnsen understood Mr. Skala wanted to know how the different rate classes would pay their portion of the total cost. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. Mr. Johnsen thought the cost of service study the Council had received had discussed how the costs were apportioned amongst the classes, but staff could try to summarize it differently. Mr. Skala stated he would appreciate a simplified format if possible.

Mr. Thomas stated he would not make any suggested amendments regarding electricity, but noted he did not feel it was equitable. He also did not feel it adequately incentivized conservation or renewable energy usage. He asked for a report on redesigning the bill the customers received so it showed the base charge and usage charge in the different blocks of energy used. He thought it should be split out for the water and sewer portions of the bill as well. Ms. Chadwick asked if that information could be provided in the newsletter if it could not be included on the bill. Mr. Blattel asked if this change could be put off until the new utility billing system was implemented. Mr. Thomas asked when that would likely be implemented. Mr. Blattel replied he thought it would be within 18 months. Mr. Thomas stated that was acceptable to him.

Mr. Matthes pointed out there was no item in the budget to fund CAT, and understood the Council wanted to provide some funding to the organization.

Mr. Skala asked what had been provided last year. Mr. Matthes replied the agreement for last year involved a \$100,000 contribution and a two for one match up to \$100,000 for money CAT raised. Mr. Skala understood the City had provided a reduced level with incentives. Mr. Thomas understood they would raise the full \$50,000 to qualify for the \$100,000, so they would end up with \$250,000 total, which was actually more than they had previously received.

Ms. Hoppe commented that during the five year agreement initially entered into with CAT, the City had not indicated CAT would not receive any additional funding. Last year, they had discussed weaning the public contribution while CAT increased its level of fundraising. She stated she was interested in continuing that model.

Mr. Thomas stated there was a lot of support in the community for the CAT program and for some public funding for it. He commented that the \$200,000 per year for five years had been connected with the franchise fees the City had received and part of a philosophy that good communication was good for government, so he suggested they agree upon an ultimate funding level for CAT that would be in the budget every year in the future and to step down to that amount. He noted his recommendation was \$50,000.

Ms. Hoppe stated she would suggest \$100,000 for this year with \$50,000 being guaranteed and the other \$50,000 being dependent upon CAT raising another \$50,000.

Mr. Thomas stated he preferred to discuss the end number and obtain a majority Council opinion on it prior to deciding how much to provide this year. Mr. Skala stated he

agreed and noted he was comfortable with the \$50,000 and an intermediate step so CAT knew what to expect.

Ms. Nauser commented that she did not believe CAT could argue they had not known what to expect when they had been told by Council last year that this was one time funding. Mr. Skala agreed the Council had indicated that last year, but noted he had changed his mind. There had already been a substantial investment in CAT, and it was a popular program. As a result, he felt it had been unreasonable to make the decision to cut them completely off at that time.

Mayor McDavid explained economics was the allocation of scarce resources, and asked if they would be willing to cut a firefighter or police officer position or social services to fund CAT. Mr. Skala replied it would depend on the situation. Ms. Hoppe pointed out they had a council reserve fund of \$73,000 and a council contingency fund \$100,000. Mr. Thomas thought Mayor McDavid was commenting on the long-term solution. Mayor McDavid understood the council contingency fund was \$98,000. Mr. Matthes stated there was a City-wide contingency fund of \$100,000 that was generally reserved to accommodate an extra snow storm or an emergency of some kind. The council reserve fund was different fund that could accommodate things that were not in the budget, such as the funding for Job Point and the assistance provided for homeless shelters in previous years. Mayor McDavid asked how much the council reserve fund had in it. Mr. Matthes replied \$98,000 for FY15. Ms. Peveler explained there was about \$73,000 left in the FY14 council reserve fund.

Ms. Nauser asked why CAT could not apply for funding through the Office of Cultural Affairs like other entities. Mr. Matthes replied the Office of Cultural Affairs provided about \$100,000 in grants annually, and the maximum grant they would provide to an entity was \$10,000. Ms. Hoppe stated she did not believe CAT was a good fit for that grant funding. Mr. Matthes agreed they would not end up competing well because they did not produce the culture. They only provided exposure to the culture. They also did not compete well for Convention and Visitors Bureau grant funding because they did not really attract people to visit the community.

Mr. Matthes pointed out the franchise fees from the three cable providers had decreased over time, and was about \$120,000 less than it had been. He thought it was dropping due to fewer people buying video service since there were many other options. Mr. Skala asked if most of that money was going to the City's government channel. Mr. Matthes replied it was general revenue funding, and some of that money was applied to the City's channel. He noted that money pre-dated CAT so CAT was funded with general revenue funds. He pointed out the City channel had two full-time employees while CAT had four full-time employees, but noted he did not know the comparative salaries, etc., and explained their missions were different. The mission of CAT was largely educational and related to the first amendment.

Mr. Skala noted KOPN, the community radio station, had not taken any money from the City, and CAT was a similar entity.

Mr. Thomas suggested they make a decision regarding this year, and provide Mr. Matthes another year to determine how to adjust for funding CAT in future years. Mr. Thomas recommended they ask Mr. Matthes to fund CAT at a level of \$50,000 for the FY16

budget. Mr. Skala understood they would need to come up with an interim amount and source for this year's budget.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she believed the franchise fee should be the source of funding for CAT as long as the City collected that fee.

Mr. Thomas thought CAT should provide a report to the City on their operations annually toward the end of the year with regard to how many people had been trained, how many hours of programming they had completed, etc., and the Council could then decide whether to renew that funding on the basis of the report for the next few years.

Mr. Trapp suggested providing CAT \$100,000 in FY15 with about \$73,000 from the FY14 council reserve fund and \$27,000 from the FY15 council reserve fund. Mr. Thomas suggested some part of the money be provided as a guarantee while the rest be provided contingent upon fundraising. Mr. Skala agreed the incentive program was essential. Ms. Hoppe suggested \$50,000 guaranteed and \$50,000 as a match. Mr. Matthes understood the match would be a \$1 to \$1 match. Ms. Nauser stated she preferred the \$1 to \$1 match over a \$2 to \$1 match. Mr. Skala and Mr. Thomas were agreeable to that recommendation. Mr. Matthes understood the FY16 budget proposal would include funding of a \$50,000 level for CAT. Ms. Nauser thought that would provide CAT ample time to increase its membership and develop alternative plans. Mayor McDavid understood the Council would vote on this recommendation at its next meeting.

(A) Construction of a shared use path, pedestrian bridge and roadway improvements along Forum Boulevard, between Katy Lane and Woodrail Avenue.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor McDavid pointed out this project would be paid for with non-motorized transportation grant funds, and those funds could not be used for public safety as it was designated money.

Ms. Hoppe stated she appreciated the invite from staff to walk the potential trail as it provided an on-the-ground view of where it would go and how it would affect the area.

Ms. Nauser thanked staff for the tour and its work on this project as she had not received any negative feedback on this project. She thought it helped that staff had notified those affected in advance of survey flags, and that this was a much needed project in terms of pedestrian safety and traffic flow. She asked staff to inform the public of road closures well in advance as well.

Mr. Glascock pointed out the restriping would not preclude bicyclists from being on the roadway. It would only provide a safe passage if they chose to use the shared use path. Mr. Thomas noted bicyclists would be in the lane as there would not be enough room for them to be next to a vehicle in that lane. Ms. Nauser asked if there would be markings to ensure that was understood. Mr. Glascock replied they might be able to put a sharrow in the middle of the lane, but would first need to ensure it was an appropriate use for that marking.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had received some communication with regard to this project and it had all been positive. People felt it was an important connection, and that the current bridge was unsafe for bicyclists and pedestrians. He understood the CIP included a \$13.5 million road project to expand Forum Boulevard from Chapel Hill to Green Meadows, and hoped that would not be necessary after the completion of this project as it would save the City a lot of money. Mr. Glascock stated traffic improvements at Woodrail and Green Meadows would be necessary regardless. Ms. Nauser commented that she had heard some discussion with regard to strategically placed round-a-bouts to help traffic flow through the corridor.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for the shared use path, pedestrian bridge, and roadway improvements along Forum Boulevard, between Katy Lane and Woodrail Avenue. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(B) Voluntary annexation of property located approximately 800 feet west of Thompson Road (4097 Thompson Road).

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked if the reason for the annexation was to hook up to City sewer. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained it would be the expense of the applicant to make the connection.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

(C) Consider the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and FY 2015 Annual Action Plan.

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that the CDBG plan appeared to be consistent with the City's affordable housing goals, and asked if the consultant involved in the review of the zoning codes had intended to address inclusionary zoning. Mr. Teddy replied it was a theme of their work on the regulatory side. One of the strategies was to try to create opportunities for affordable housing, and they had discussed the elimination of minimum house sizes. Mr. Skala asked if the consultant had brought up the issue of inclusionary zoning. Mr. Teddy replied they had received comment on it, but he was not sure of any product that would be a result of it. Mr. Thomas stated he had spoken to the consultant about this and he had indicated it would be appropriate to build in an inclusionary zoning component. Ms. Chadwick understood the consultant had indicated the Council would create it. Mr. Thomas noted the consultant had suggested a memo to Mr. Teddy, but Mr. Matthes had suggested a motion, which he planned to make later tonight as he believed it was a better way to generate affordable housing than trying to keep the cost of growth at an artificially low level.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

OLD BUSINESS

B259-14 Rezoning property located east of the intersection of Bluff Creek Drive and Pebble Creek Court from O-1 to PUD-5.1; approving the PUD Plan of Cotswold Villas at Bluff Creek Estates; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mark Farnen, 103 E. Brandon Road, stated he represented Lyon Crest Properties, LLC, the developer of the project, and explained and they were requesting the rezoning because attached single-family dwelling units with zero lot lines were not permitted on O-1 zoned properties. He commented that the neighborhood and the developer felt this type of development would promote homeownership, which they felt was more compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. He displayed the layout of the subdivision and noted there would be 44 lots exhibited by 22 structures. Each unit would be 2,000-2,500 square feet, so a single building would be about 4,000-4,500 square feet, which was similar to the size and scale of the buildings and houses in the rest of the neighborhood. He provided a depiction of the style of construction that might be used, and noted the neighbors had indicated this proposal was preferable to any other they had previously seen for this property. He stated they were not asking for any more density than would be allowed under the O-1 zoning, and felt the variance allowed them greater flexibility. In addition, the developer lived across the street from this development.

Mr. Skala understood there was a trail associated with this development. Mr. Farnen stated the trail was not associated with this property, but was close to it. He displayed a map that showed an approximation of the trail, and described a potential point of public access.

Ms. Hoppe understood the trail would help move people riding a bike or walking to Hollywood Theaters, but noted Bluff Creek Drive was not the only way out. They could also get out through Lacewood or Chinaberry. Mr. Farnen stated they were pretty far into the neighborhood, but the other options were travelable and reasonable.

Charlie Blackmore stated he was the past president of the Bluff Creek Neighborhood Association and resided in the subdivision across the street from the developer of this property. He commented that there were presently 52 homes and nine vacant lots in the area, and the developer would add approximately 44 structures. He explained there would be less than 100 structures if the vacant lots were not considered, and did not believe five of those lots would ever be developed. He pointed out this was the fourth project proposed for this property, and it was the first time there had not been any opposition from any member of the subdivision. He thought it was likely many people similar to him would want to move into these condominiums after they were built. He stated he did not feel the trail had anything to do with this development, but noted the City had planned to purchase an easement to place an access to the trail at the end of Bluff Creek Drive, which was right beside and slightly north of this new subdivision.

Chris Reid, 2309 Bluff Creek Drive, stated he was the President of the Bluff Creek Neighborhood Association and noted no one in the neighborhood was in opposition to this rezoning request. He thought everyone in the neighborhood understood this property could be more densely developed, and that this was the lowest density proposed to date. He

pointed out he lived right across the street from it so he would see whatever was developed there, and he believed this would be a good development.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there had been a lot of neighborhood concern with previous plans for the property under the existing zoning, so she was pleased with this neighborhood-friendly project as it fit well within the neighborhood. She thanked the developer and owner of the property for this proposal.

Mr. Thomas stated he was in support of this rezoning request as well, and noted he appreciated the outreach efforts of the developer. He understood they could not have zero lot lines under the O-1 zoning district, but they could with the downzoning, and asked if this quirk to the existing zoning rules would be improved with the update to the zoning code. Mr. Teddy replied he understood mixed-use districts would allow all building types that made sense, and noted they had not gotten to that point in the zoning code review so he was not sure how it would be handled.

Mr. Thomas understood there was a minimum parking requirement of two parking spaces per unit, and asked if that was provided for with driveway space. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained garages and driveways counted. Mr. Thomas thought it was interesting that they felt the necessity to have a rule that demanded it, and asked what they feared. He could not imagine a bad outcome if they did not have the requirement. Mr. Teddy stated he thought it was a product of the way a lot of zoning ordinances were traditionally done so one did not fail to build a driveway or off-street facility. Mr. Skala thought there was likely some fearfulness out there.

B259-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B266-14 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to repeal Section 14-411.1 relating to disabled parking in parking meter zones.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood there was no incentive to move a car since there was not a parking meter at those spots. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala asked if other communities had adopted this approach. Mr. Kruse replied yes, and explained it was becoming a trend for cities to require paid parking at disabled only spots. He commented that one of the reasons the payment had initially been eliminated was that people were having difficulty with the old meters, and they did not feel the modern meters were as hard to operate.

Ms. Nauser stated she had received a phone call from a gentleman that had been upset about charging disabled people to park at meters, but noted she was more confident in moving forward since the issue had been discussed and was supported by the Disabilities Commission because she agreed turnover was needed for those spaces as well.

Ms. Chadwick noted she had been contacted by the Disabilities Commission and the functionality of the meters in the past had been mentioned as the reason for not paying for parking. They had also indicated they felt they should be treated like everyone else.

B266-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B276-14 Appropriating funds for the solar photovoltaic (PV) pilot project behind the West Ash Pump Station located at 1917 West Ash Street.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe understood the project would be built for \$600,000, but the City could get that money back as people bought into it. Mr. Johnsen stated the hope was that the increased cost of the project as a renewable energy source for the system would be offset by the participation of members of the community. He noted a lot of the details would need to be worked out to include securities and exchange issues to ensure there were no financial difficulties to the utility. Ms. Hoppe asked if it would be built in-house. Mr. Johnsen replied they planned to purchase the materials and design the project through the request for proposals process, but intended to build it in-house at this time.

Mayor McDavid asked for the estimated project cost. Mr. Johnsen replied \$600,000. He explained it would be designed as a 250 kW site, and they expected 317 kilowatt hours per year from it. He agreed it would have a very small renewable energy impact at .03 percent. He noted the costs would be offset if it was rolled into a community solar program by participation.

Mayor McDavid understood the estimated cost had been \$500,000 on May 19, and asked for clarification. Mr. Johnsen replied the \$600,000 was the updated estimated cost based upon the bids received.

Mayor McDavid asked for the amortization of the cost of energy. Mr. Johnsen replied 7.5 cents per kilowatt hour. Mayor McDavid stated the number he had calculated was different. Mr. Johnsen explained they took 317 kilowatt hours over 25 years with a \$600,000 investment. Mayor McDavid noted the number he calculated was 12 cents and asked for the interest rate used. Mr. Johnsen replied they had not used an interest rate. Mayor McDavid understood the net present value of the cost of money had not been considered. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. He pointed out there would also be some operating and maintenance costs, which they estimated at .05 cents, and those costs had not been included either. He noted one of the purposes of the pilot was to gain knowledge on what it took to own and operate this type of system.

Mayor McDavid commented that his calculation was \$126 per megawatt hour, and it displaced \$36 per megawatt hour. He understood the City had a renewable energy commitment, but felt this was a poor way to get to the 15 percent by 2017 as it was very expensive energy. He noted Clean Line Energy would sell the City all it wanted for about \$45 per kilowatt hour. He stated he did not believe this was a wise use of limited resources and preferred to get to the 15 percent with a cheaper form of renewable energy, so he would not support this project.

Ms. Nauser stated she would not support this project either as she felt it was too expensive for a pilot project. She thought they should let others in the market pursue this and buy into it.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she believed a lot of good would come from this project. She explained there had been two presentations with regard to community solar programs at the Advancing Renewables in the Midwest conference this year. There were not only cost benefits, but environmental benefits as well. The cost of this project would be low once the community solar program began. In addition, this was local energy whereby they were keeping money in the community. She pointed out it was pilot program so it could be replicated, and as the costs went down, it would be more beneficial to the City.

Mr. Skala asked for a status on community solar projects. Mr. Johnsen replied he was only aware of a couple within Missouri. He understood the one in Springfield had sold all of its subscriptions.

Mr. Skala noted the City had other programs where they were paying more because of the aggressive renewable portfolio they wanted, and stated he believed the benefit to this being a pilot program was that they would obtain information from it.

Mr. Johnsen stated he agreed with Mayor McDavid in that this was expensive at this time, and hoped they could find ways to offset the costs. In addition, they were trying to be diverse in terms of resources, and did not have much in this area.

B276-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, HOPPE, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NAUSER, MCDAVID. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B260-14** Approving a revision to the Lot 2, Discovery Park CP Development Plan and approving the CP Plan for Discovery Office Park South; approving a revised statement of intent; setting forth a condition for approval.
- B261-14** Rezoning property located west of Ponderosa Street, south of Philips Farm Road and north of the Discovery Parkway/Gans Road interchange from C-P, O-P, PUD-4 to C-P and PUD-4; approving a revised statement of intent; approving the C-P Plan for Lots 4 & 5 Discovery Park Sub. Plat 2B; approving less stringent parking requirements.
- B262-14** Approving the Final Plat of Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2-B, a Replat of Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2-A, located between U.S. Highway 63 and A. Perry Philips Park, north of the Discovery Ridge and Gans Road interchange; authorizing a performance contract.
- B263-14** Changing the uses allowed on O-P zoned property located on the southwest corner of Pratt Street and Ripley Street (103 Ripley Street); approving a revised statement of intent.
- B264-14** Changing the name of a portion of Bodie Drive located between Highway 763 North and Edenton Drive to International Drive.
- B265-14** Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on a portion of Executive Drive, from Southampton Drive to Corporate Plaza Drive.

- B267-14 Authorizing construction of the Westwood-Glenwood Avenue Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B268-14 Authorizing construction of sanitary sewer improvements along West Broadway between Aldeah Avenue and Glenwood Avenue; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B269-14 Authorizing an agreement with the Transportation Security Administration for the lease of office space in the North Terminal Building at Columbia Regional Airport.
- B270-14 Authorizing an agreement with John W. and Carol Ann Alspaugh for the grant of easement for sewer purposes relating to the construction of the Upper Hinkson Creek Outfall Sewer Extension Phase 1 project.
- B271-14 Authorizing a cost apportionment agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for roadway pavement improvements to Clark Lane between Woodland Springs Court to McKee Street.
- B272-14 Appropriating Federal Aviation Administration grant funds for costs relating to the design and relocation of Rangeline Road as part of the reconstruction and realignment of Runway 13/31 and Taxiway B project at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B273-14 Accepting conveyances for sewer and sidewalk purposes.
- B274-14 Authorizing construction of Alluvial Wells No. 16, No. 17 and No. 18 in the McBaine Bottoms; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B275-14 Authorizing a second amendment to supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for highway/rail crossing signal improvements at the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with College Avenue (MO 763).
- B277-14 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for the Comprehensive Tobacco Control Coalition Building and Support program; appropriating funds.
- B278-14 Accepting donations from Common Voices, Wal-Mart and FM Global to be used by the Fire Department for public education and fire safety programs.
- B279-14 Accepting a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency - Department of Homeland Security for the purchase of self-contained breathing apparatus equipment for the Fire Department.
- R151-14 Authorizing various Adopt a Spot agreements.
- R152-14 Authorizing an artist's commission agreement with Peggy Guest relating to the Traffic Box Art Program.
- R153-14 Repealing Resolution No. 144-14 that expressed support for the second phase of the Gentry Estates housing development for senior citizens and adopting a new resolution on the same subject.
- R154-14 Authorizing an agreement with New Dawn Technologies, Inc. for the purchase of application programming interface software and annual support for the JustWare case management software in the Law Department – Prosecution Division.
- R155-14 Authorizing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Columbia Housing Authority's Low Income Services (CHALIS) relating to Teen Outreach Program (TOP) activities.

- R156-14 Authorizing an educational affiliation agreement with Alverno College JoAnn McGrath School of Nursing to provide health clinical experience and instruction for nursing students.
- R157-14 Authorizing an educational affiliation agreement with Herzing Inc. d/b/a Herzing University to provide health clinical experience and instruction for nursing students.
- R158-14 Transferring funds for the cost of a reservation fee at The ARC for a Youth Summit.
- R159-14 Transferring funds for the property room upgrade project at the Columbia Police Department.
- R160-14 Authorizing an extension of the temporary closure of a portion of Ponderosa Street to facilitate the construction of a roundabout at the Nocona Parkway and Ponderosa Street intersection and a roundabout at the entrance of the future A. Perry Philips Park.
- R161-14 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement for professional engineering services with Trabue, Hansen & Hinshaw, Inc. relating to the Avenue of the Columns streetscape project and the reconstruction of portions of the sidewalk and intersection improvements along Eighth Street between Walnut Street and Cherry Street.
- R162-14 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the contract with Engineering Surveys and Services, LLC for professional engineering services with relating to the College Avenue safety enhancement project.
- R163-14 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with SEGA, Inc. for design and survey services relating to the Mill Creek 161 kV transmission line project.
- R165-14 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with TranSystems Corporation for design of the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard project.
- R166-14 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with CDG Engineers, Inc. for design services for construction of pedway, trail and shoulder improvements along Clark Lane between Paris Road and the east side of the Highway 63 Connector, and south along Hinkson Creek between Clark Lane and the south side of I-70.

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

NEW BUSINESS

- R164-14 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with TranSystems Corporation for an alignment/conceptual study of the Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street East-West Trail Connection project.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe noted the scope of services indicated an analysis of bridge options based on cost, constructability, long-term maintenance, and aesthetics, but she did not see where it included an analysis of the cost of the respective trail options, which she felt was important,

and asked for clarification. Mr. Glascock replied each trail option would be analyzed through the four alignments. Ms. Hoppe asked if the cost would be analyzed. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Hoppe stated she did not see that in the scope of services. Mr. Glascock explained each trail option would have a cost to it when it was brought forward to the Council. He noted this showed one bridge location, but other bridge locations would be analyzed as well. Ms. Hoppe pointed out she was interested in the total cost of each respective trail in addition to the cost of the bridges. Mr. Glascock stated that would be done. Ms. Hoppe asked if it was implied and not specifically in the agreement. Mr. Glascock replied it was implied if it was not in the agreement. Ms. Hoppe asked if the study would also include an estimate of the number of trees that would need to be removed for each trail option. Mr. Glascock replied he thought they would likely stake the route so it could be visually seen. He also pointed out Page 3 of the scope of services indicated the consultant would prepare a memorandum documenting alternatives considered, advantages/disadvantages, model shift, construction costs, and the recommended concept.

Mr. Thomas understood this was Phase 1, and asked for clarification regarding Phase 2. Mr. Glascock replied Phase 2 would hopefully be the construction of the trail. Mr. Thomas understood staff had hoped the analysis would be completed by February. Mr. Glascock stated he thought it would be done by the spring season.

The vote on R164-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. 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.

- B280-14 **Approving the Final Plat of Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 12 located on the northwest corner of State Route WW and Old Hawthorne Drive East; authorizing a performance contract.**
- B281-14 **Vacating an unused portion of street right-of-way within Deerfield Ridge Plat 2 located west of Scott Boulevard and north of Banyan Drive.**
- B282-14 **Authorizing the installation of audible pedestrian signals and countdown timers at the intersection of College Avenue and Broadway; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**
- B283-14 **Authorizing the construction of roadway safety improvements on College Avenue between University Avenue and Rollins Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**
- B284-14 **Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of roadway safety improvements on College Avenue between University Avenue and Rollins Street.**
- B285-14 **Authorizing a transportation enhancement funds supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to the College Avenue safety enhancement project.**
- B286-14 **Authorizing the construction of sidewalk improvements along Manor Drive, from Rollins Road to West Broadway; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

- B287-14 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of sidewalk improvements along Manor Drive, from Rollins Road to West Broadway.
- B288-14 Authorizing a Right of Use permit with Josie and Eric Chapman for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a retaining wall built within a portion of the drainage easement on Lot 17 within West Lawn Subdivision, Plat 1 located west of Rothwell Drive.
- B289-14 Authorizing a third power exchange agreement with Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission relating to Iatan Unit 2.
- B290-14 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B291-14 Authorizing the acceptance of a donation of land located near the intersection of Leland Ridge Road and Tiernan Drive, contiguous to the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary; providing that the land shall be used for a park or nature preserve open to the public.
- B292-14 Appropriating funds for personnel expenditures in the Department of Economic Development.
- B293-14 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families America program.
- B294-14 Adopting the FY 2015 Classification and Pay Plan; providing FY 2015 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plan; providing for a 2% salary increase for eligible employees; establishing an implementation date of September 28, 2014.
- B295-14 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
- B296-14 Amending Chapter 18 of the City Code as it relates to Police and Fire Pension Plans.
- B297-14 Authorizing amendments to the City of Columbia, Missouri, Money Purchase Plan.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

- REP81-14 Traffic Restriction on Rollins Street within UMC Closed Campus.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood Rollins Street was closed to traffic during the day. Mr. Glascock replied it was closed between Missouri Avenue and Hitt Street. Ms. Chadwick understood it was closed to car traffic, but buses had traveled down it for years, so students expected the buses to be there.

Ms. Chadwick asked if Missouri Avenue was closed to traffic. Mr. Brooks replied no. Ms. Chadwick asked if Hitt Street was closed to traffic. Mr. Brooks replied yes. Ms. Chadwick commented that she did not believe students expected vehicular traffic, to include the buses, to be traveling on Hitt Street. Mr. Brooks pointed out the City buses had used Hitt Street for year.

Ms. Hoppe asked for the number of shuttle bus companies that wanted to use Rollins Street similar to Greenway Shuttles. Mr. Brooks replied he was only aware of 2-3 providers, and Greenway Shuttles provided service to virtually all of the different apartment complexes that COMO Connect did not serve. Brookside also had service to their Old Plank property.

Mayor McDavid commented that Greenway Shuttles was delivering a lot of students to and from campus, and that it should be encouraged even though they competed with COMO Connect, and as a result, he thought they should be allowed to park on Rollins Streets. He noted it was odd that they wanted to encourage transit, but were now worried about the traffic caused by the transit buses. Mr. Glascock pointed out staff was concerned about safety. He explained that the City had absolute control when the buses were parked at the Wabash Station, but the Wabash Station had been essentially moved to Rollins Street. Higher safety was needed because they were not used to people passing them. Mayor McDavid asked how many buses were parked on Rollins Street at any one time. Mr. Glascock replied the City was coming through every 15 minutes, and noted the portion that was closed was not long. Mayor McDavid understood staff felt private buses could not be accommodated safely. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid reiterated that he thought Greenway Shuttles should be allowed to provide service. He understood they were charging more, but provided a better level of service because they did not have the same limitations as the City. Mr. Matthes understood one of the issues was that the timing of the City routes would be significantly affected if they had to wait behind a line of private shuttles. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. He explained the City had eleven fixed route buses that traveled through there every 15-30 minutes, and ten Tiger Line routes went through there as well for a total of about 22 buses during peak service. The frequency was considerably more than it was with the old system.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with Mayor McDavid in that Greenway Shuttles provided a good service and that they wanted more students riding buses. He did not view the City as being in competition with Greenway Shuttles as they provided a different kind of service. COMO Connect customers had access to the entire community while Greenway Shuttles provided a taxi service. He also thought it was reasonable for the public bus stops to be on the public streets if there was not enough bus stop space, but asked if the Greenway Shuttle buses could drive through Rollins Streets even if they could not pick up and pull over at the curb. Mr. Glascock replied it was a safety issue. The City buses did not expect someone to pull beside them, and as a result, an accident could occur. Mr. Thomas commented that the City buses traveled all over town, and they had to look in their rear view mirror in those situations before getting back into traffic. Mr. Glascock pointed out the buses were in the lane in those situations. Mr. Brooks noted the University had actually picked the spots for the private shuttles, and Hitt Street could be used from the east while Missouri Avenue could be used from the west, so there was not any reason to cross in front of the student center.

Ms. Chadwick asked why there was increased traffic at Rollins Street. She explained she was a student and understood the students were upset about the restriction on Greenway Shuttles. She thought it was giving COMO Connect a bad reputation because the students felt the City was pushing the buses they wanted to use out. Mr. Glascock explained Greenway Shuttles was not on a time schedule. The City buses were on a schedule requiring them to be on Rollins Street for a period of time prior to leaving. If Greenway Shuttles waited for all of their customers, they would take up space, which would prevent the City buses from getting in and out on time.

Mr. Skala asked if there was any way to address the safety issue while accommodating Greenway Shuttles. He wondered if improvements could be made in terms of extending the length of the cutout area. Mr. Brooks replied that would be the decision of the University since they owned the sidewalk.

Mayor McDavid suggested they each spend some time on Rollins Street to see how traffic flowed.

Mr. Thomas commented that it was nice to see the City and University communicate and agree on this issue, and he appreciated the City being proactive in terms of sending letters in June and in August regarding this issue.

Mr. Skala agreed with Mayor McDavid in that the City transit system and Greenway Shuttles had two different missions, and that they should try to accommodate all forms of transit assuming there were not any public safety issues.

Ms. Nauser stated she would personally visit Rollins Street to view the traffic situation as she wondered why it was not unsafe for City buses when it was unsafe for the private buses. Mr. Brooks explained it had to do with the volume of traffic through there.

Mayor McDavid understood the recommendation of staff had been validated by the University of Missouri. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct.

Mr. Glascock pointed out City transit staff had never boarded the Greenway Shuttle buses and had not been antagonistic to him.

Mr. Thomas commented that there were dozens of buses in front of the student union in Champaign, Illinois, and asked if they were all public buses or if any were private shuttles. Mr. Brooks replied he was not aware of any private shuttles, and pointed out it was a very different system as that campus was completely closed to all vehicle traffic other than buses. Mr. Glascock pointed out Rollins Street had actually been open until the student center was redesigned.

REP82-14 Reports related to the Hinkson Creek Collaborative Adaptive Management Process.

Mayor McDavid explained he had compared spring season numbers from 2001 through 2006 and this last set of numbers, and did not quite reach standard deviation. There was a 92 percent probability of improvement with the average going from 13.9 to 15.2 and the median going from 14 to 16. He believed a lot of people had done a lot of good work on the stream for many years, and thought they could speculate the Hinkson Creek was healthier than it had been in 100 years.

Mr. Glascock pointed out the formula had changed, and it was still fully a supported stream.

Ms. Hoppe noted Jason Hubbart was continuing to do good research on this issue so that was helpful. She agreed there had been many improvements, and explained erosion and silt in the stream might be the biggest the problem now.

REP83-14 2940 S. Maple Bluff Drive – Connection and Tap Fees.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that this was an example of the City using a lot of money from the sewer utility to repair an inferior product. If this had been a new neighborhood, the developer would have paid for it, and the homeowners would have bought into it when they purchased the homes. He, personally, could not see any reason for a refund.

Ms. Nauser explained she had told the property owner this would be a decision of the Council as it was a set fee that would have to be waived. She understood their complaint was that this problem had not been discovered when the original break was found, and they were now having sewer back-up problems.

Mr. Skala stated he was inclined to agree with Mayor McDavid.

Ms. Nauser understood the cost to fix the problem would likely be more than \$848 because they would have to tear up the property again, and thought that could be a justification for waiving the fee.

Mr. Thomas asked how this particular subdivision became a part of the City's sewer system, and how much they were charged and what services were provided. Mr. Glascock replied he did not have the costs with him, but explained it was within a sewer district, which meant the property owners had to pay a certain amount of the cost, and that cost was capped at \$5,000. He noted the City had removed the septic tank and installed the new lateral. Mr. Thomas asked if there was one septic tank for all of these properties. Mr. Glascock replied each had its own septic tank. Mr. Thomas asked why they had not been a part of the sewer system initially. Mayor McDavid thought the subdivision was built outside of the City limits. Mr. Thomas understood at a certain point it was decided they would come into the City system. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct and noted they were having sewer problems. Mr. Thomas understood the City charged \$800 per dwelling unit to join the sewer system, and asked if the City built the pipe down the middle of the street. Mr. Matthes replied the developer would normally pay for everything, but in this case, the City paid for the fix. Mr. Thomas understood the developer would have built all of the trunk lines and the City would have charged \$800 per dwelling unit if this had been a greenfield development. Mr. Glascock stated that would be correct up to the 100-acre point.

Mr. Thomas asked what would have happened if a developer created 100 lots and sold each lot individually for each individual to build a house. He wondered if the City built the sewer to the home in that situation. Mr. Glascock replied the City did not build the pipe to the home. The City only built up to the 100-acre point, which was the drainage area. Anything beyond that was required by the developer. He noted Mr. Thomas was talking about the connection fee, and the developer had to put in all of the infrastructure. If the lot did not sell, there would not be a connection fee, but once the lot was sold and a house was built, the connection fee was required for the house to connect to the sewer. He noted they had to build the lateral to the public main.

Mr. Thomas understood this subdivision had lots that had already been sold, and there was not a main in the street. Ms. Amin pointed out these homes were in the County, and annexed into the City in order to connect to City sewer. Mayor McDavid pointed out the City had agreed to pay for it because they felt there was a public need due to health. Mr. Thomas understood those homes were built without the internalized costs of building the sewer, and

agreed there was not an inequity there or a reason to subsidize the sewer improvement costs.

Mr. Glascock pointed out an on-site septic system was allowed in the County if the lot was large enough. Mr. Thomas asked what happened if the City annexed a subdivision that had on-site septic. Mr. Glascock replied it remained on the septic system until there was a problem, and the City then determined the equitable cost to bill them based on the ordinance. Mayor McDavid noted the City ended up subsidizing the cost for the public interest in terms of health and safety. Ms. Amin explained the deferred costs were waived in this situation, which was not normal.

Mayor McDavid did not believe these costs should be abated, and understood the Council agreed.

REP84-14 Evaluation of Inflow and Infiltration Reduction in Flat Branch Basin D.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if there was a completed basin. Mr. Glascock replied he did not believe it was complete yet. Mayor McDavid understood the numbers would continue to improve. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mayor McDavid understood staff had hoped for 40 percent. Mr. Glascock replied 40-50 percent was the hope.

Mr. Thomas understood this was one of six basins. Mr. Glascock replied this was the first one, and it was within the Flat Branch watershed. Mr. Thomas understood there were two others in the Flat Branch watershed, and three in the County House Branch watershed. Mr. Glascock stated there were more in the Flat Branch watershed, but these were the three that had been prioritized. They would then move to the County House Branch watershed.

Mr. Thomas asked why the baseline data went as far back as 2000. Mr. Glascock replied he had not been with the City then, but thought the City had conducted flow monitoring prior to a master plan study. Mr. Thomas understood the inflow and infiltration work started more recently than 2000. Mr. Glascock replied that was correct. It did not start in 2001 as they were doing more structural repairs then. He thought it had been 3-4 years since they had concentrated on inflow and infiltration, and noted it was worse in 2008 than it had been in 2001. He explained that was when they created a line item in the budget for inflow and infiltration.

Mr. Thomas asked how the peak and volume data was collected. Mr. Glascock replied through flow monitors.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the City was done with inflow and infiltration in this sewer basin. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know that they were completely done as there were a few small pipes that need to be addressed. Ms. Chadwick understood there was not a way to construct a sewer system that handled five inches of rain in a short period of time, and noted she had heard from constituents in the area that had hoped their sewer issues would be addressed, but they had not as some had sewer back-up issues yesterday. Mr. Glascock noted 34 manholes had overflowed yesterday, and the power had gone off at the plant in addition to the amount of rain that had fallen in a short period of time

Mr. Thomas understood the amount of overflow in this basin was less than it would have been in 2008. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Ms. Chadwick noted she had

checked in with some constituents that had overflow problems in the past that did not have those problems yesterday in this basin.

Mr. Thomas asked how much had been spent on the inflow and infiltration. Mr. Glascock thought they had that information for this basin, but noted he did not have the information with him. Mr. Thomas felt that information would be useful to determine how much money would need to be spent in the other basins for the same level of improvement. He wondered if they could reduce the number of overflows in Ridgefield Park to one every five years. Mr. Glascock stated the hope was that through inflow and infiltration the relief sewer would not have to be built.

Mr. Glascock pointed out that in order to get to the 52 percent, the City needed the private sector to do its part in terms of disconnecting sub-pumps, drains, etc. Mr. Matthes noted staff owed the Council a report on that issue. Ms. Nauser did not feel people realized the extent of this problem. Mr. Thomas asked if the City had an estimate of the number of homes that were not compliant. Mr. Glascock replied they were found with smoke tests for the most part, but the ones that had foundation drains hooked to the sewer were hard to find because they did not produce as much smoke. Mr. Thomas asked if the basement drains were as much of a problem as the gutters. Mr. Glascock replied yes, and listed other examples of problems. Ms. Nauser felt a licensed plumber would be able to find those issues, and believed any plumber that incorrectly hooked the drains to the sewer should lose their certification.

REP85-14 Sanitary Sewer Utility Rate Study Draft Report.

Mayor McDavid noted this had been discussed in length earlier this evening.

REP86-14 Parks and Recreation Commission Recommendation regarding the FY 2015 Budget and the Maplewood Home.

Mayor McDavid stated he had toured the Maplewood Home, and felt this was reminiscent of the Blind Boone Home in that they did not consider the cost of upkeep on the old homes. He understood the agreement had indicated the Historical Society would help maintain it, but they had been unable to raise those funds, and the City owned the property so they needed to decide how to deal with the deferred maintenance issue. He understood the recommendation was to include this on the next ballot proposal. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked how many homes the City owned that would require maintenance. Mr. Griggs replied the agreement indicated the Historical Society would take care of the Maplewood Home while the City took care of the rest of the structures, which included the Carriage House, and had been maintained. He pointed out the City had put a new roof on the home, but it needed to be replaced again. Ms. Nauser asked when the roof had been previously replaced. Mr. Griggs replied he thought it had been replaced in the early 1990s.

Mayor McDavid thought they needed to make a commitment to maintain the buildings they owned, and noted it would take more money than was currently allocated. Mr. Skala commented that it was an equity issue to a certain extent. He explained he had been in favor of helping with the Blind Boone Home and thought they needed to treat the Maplewood Home in the same manner.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the Blind Boone Home was a Columbia Parks and Recreation Building. Mr. Matthes replied they were managing it for the City, but the intent was to not own the home once the project was complete.

Ms. Nauser stated she thought it made sense to put this on the parks ballot once a detailed analysis of the improvements needed was completed, and to then put aside a certain amount of money annually in order to maintain the property in the long term if the City continued to own it.

REP87-14 Water and Light Advisory Board Review of Columbia Water and Light's Existing Electric Energy Portfolio.

Mayor McDavid understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

REP88-14 Vision Commission Implementation Status and Media Mention Reports.

Mayor McDavid understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

REP89-14 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor McDavid understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Thomas stated he wanted to look into the idea of an inclusionary housing policy, which involved a certain percentage of units in a large development to be built and maintained as affordable housing for rent or for owner-occupation. Typically if more than 20 units were built in a subdivision or apartment building, about ten percent had to be affordable units. He pointed out the affordable units did not have to be built the same size or have the same value as the other units as there was not an expectation that the developer had to lose money. He understood this had been successful in other communities.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to prepare a report showing the different ways an inclusionary housing policy could be implemented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting against it.

Mr. Thomas asked how long it might be before the report was received. Mr. Matthes replied at least a couple of months.

Ms. Nauser asked if the transportation system would be reviewed as well because she did not feel it was appropriate to build a subdivision with affordable housing on the perimeter of Columbia if other necessary services were not provided. Mr. Matthes replied he agreed, and noted there were sometimes options for a developer to buy out of the requirement if there was a hardship or if services were limited. Mr. Thomas pointed out a density bonus was also provided if the development included affordable housing, and noted, at this time, he only wanted potential policy options. He did not feel a review of the transportation system was necessary.

Ms. Chadwick thought the report needed to be completed in time to review it and make decisions that coincided with the zoning review process. Mr. Thomas agreed. Mr. Matthes stated it would be helpful to the consultant for Council to provide a preference for how the City would implement the policy.

Mr. Thomas asked when the City last conducted a study of the parking occupancy rates on the different streets and in the different garages. Mr. Glascock replied a review of parking occupancy rates for the garages was completed on a monthly basis. Mr. Thomas asked if a review could be done for the metered spots on the streets, and for a report to be provided for all of the streets and garages.

Mr. Thomas noted he would miss the October 6, 2014 Council Meeting.

Mr. Skala understood the City had to have enabling legislation ready so they were prepared to move forward if the federal and state legislatures decided to allow sales tax to be collected on internet sales, and asked if they could work on that legislation. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and explained they had made a certain amount of progress a year ago.

Mayor McDavid thought every municipality in Boone County would be supportive and felt the effort needed to be coordinated. He believed it sounded like a tax so it would take a lot of education for people to understand they should be paying that fee. They also had to find a ballot window that would not compromise other ballot proposals.

Mr. Skala understood there was some controversy with regard to how surplus funds were handled, particularly with respect to Article 12 of the Charter and the Water and Light Department. He asked for clarification from the Law Department on the last paragraph of Section 102 of Article 12. Ms. Thompson replied that as a utility, the money generated by the utility had to be used and funneled back into the utility. It could not go into the general fund to supplant it.

Ms. Chadwick asked Mr. Skala if he felt money had not gone back into the utility. Mr. Skala replied some people had raised that question, which was why he was requesting clarification. He wanted to be able to present that information to the public.

Mr. Skala noted sewer projects had been reprioritized to accommodate the downtown infrastructure exigency, and he believed they still needed to consider a reprioritization of the Henderson Branch project and the Upper Hinkson Creek project since one was outside of the urban service area and there was not pressure to proceed with the other one at this time. He pointed out he was only talking about deferring those projects for now.

Mr. Skala asked if rumble strips or indentations would be placed on Clark Lane where the improvements had recently been made. Mr. Glascock replied they would likely receive complaints from the noise of the rumble strips. Mr. Skala understood, but pointed out he thought it was important for the safety of pedestrians.

Mr. Thomas understood staff did not like the idea of rumble strips there. Mr. Glascock stated he did not recommend it when the road was in town as there were too many homes nearby. He believed people would not be able to sleep when people were driving on them at 2:00 a.m. Mr. Skala thought the rumble strips would be on the edge of the road. Mr. Glascock explained MoDOT had a rumble stripe so the strip was painted over the rumble, and referred to the Highway WW improvement recently completed. Mr. Thomas suggested they move it a few inches outside of the stripe. Mr. Glascock stated that was a MoDOT road. Mr. Skala asked if staff could check with MoDOT. Mr. Glascock thought they would also

need to check with the Disabilities Commission for those in wheelchairs. Mr. Matthes stated staff would check.

Ms. Hoppe commented that B283-14 and B284-14 involved the College Avenue Roadway Safety improvement project, and noted she felt a left turn was needed at Wilson Avenue at the very least. She explained she might propose an amendment to those bills at the next Council Meeting to accommodate the left turn.

Ms. Hoppe explained the marijuana ordinance had been tabled to the October 6, 2014 Council Meeting, and because Mr. Thomas would not be in attendance at that meeting, she planned to request it be tabled to the October 20, 2014 Council Meeting.

Ms. Hoppe understood Hunt Ridge Drive, which connected to Carter Lane, was not a residential priority snow removal street, and asked what needed to be done to include it. Mr. Glascock replied staff would soon provide the priority list to Council for review and potential changes.

Ms. Hoppe stated a rezoning on the corner of Carter Lane and Green Meadows Road would soon come to Council and asked staff to review the possibility of a speed limit sign and whether yellow striping or some other measure might be appropriate to help slow traffic. She had been told traffic traveled at 45-50 mph there.

Mr. Trapp explained the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence would hold public forums on Monday, September 8, 2014 from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. for the community, Thursday, September 11, 2014 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. for parents, and Friday, September 12, 2014 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. for the youth. He thought they had passed a budget of \$2,500 for these forums, and were now asking for an additional \$1,000.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to provide \$1,000 from the council reserve fund for the public forums held by the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 12:49 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk