

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2014**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, September 15, 2014, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK and TRAPP were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 4, 2014 was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nauser.

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

Upon his request, Mayor McDavid made a motion to allow Mr. Trapp to abstain from voting on the appointments to the Personnel Advisory Board. Mr. Trapp noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that one of the candidates was on the Board of Directors for the Phoenix Programs, which was his employer. The motion was seconded by Ms. Chadwick and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, including the consent agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Chadwick.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

Mayor McDavid asked staff to readvertise the Tax Increment Financing Commission vacancies.

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, with Mr. Trapp abstaining from the appointments to the Personnel Advisory Board, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions.

**CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD**

Woods, Jayne, 4604 Bolten Court, Ward 2, Term to expire November 1, 2016

**CITY OF COLUMBIA NEW CENTURY FUND INC. BOARD**

Lennon, Brianna, 2269 Concordia Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2017

Williams, Matthew, 2609 Limerick Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2017

**CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD**

Bell, Susan, 575 E. Sexton, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2016

Jashnani, Leela, 900 Vandiver Drive (business address), Ward 6, Term to expire September 30, 2016

Kelly, Michael, 1231 E. Bluebird Lane, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2016

Schultz, Thomas, 7100 Madison Creek Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2016

Trabue, Kimberly, 3530 S. Old Ridge Road, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2016

Turner, Spencer, 5701 E. Mexico Gravel Road, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2016

Weise, Teri, 3007 S. Rodeo Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2016

**PERSONNEL ADVISORY BOARD**

Jenks, Ron, 2509 Woodberry Court, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2017

Rushing, Joy, PO Box 61, Ward 1, Term to expire September 30, 2017

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Sean Goggins – Planned growth.**

Ms. Amin explained Mr. Goggins had contacted the City Manager's Office earlier today and had indicated he would be unable to attend and would communicate with the Council by letter instead.

**William Turpin – Bus system problems.**

Mr. Turpin was not in attendance.

**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.**

**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.**

**R178-14 Transferring funds to provide funding to Columbia Access Television in FY 2015.**

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 were given fourth reading, B294-14 and B295-14 were given second reading, and R178-14 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe asked when the change in the deposit law had occurred. Mr. Blattel replied he believed the law had change in 2001 or 2002.

Ms. Nauser asked for the reason for the deficit in solid waste. Mr. Matthes replied it was because the City used the most expensive method possible to collect trash and had not raised the rates to keep up with the associated costs. He explained they had twice as many employees per vehicle and had many workers compensation injuries because the employees physically handled the garbage. They also had to open another cell in the landfill, which would cost millions, and equipment had to be upgraded on the capital cost side.

Mr. Skala asked for the breakdown for the actual cost per bag per customer. Mr. Matthes replied it was difficult to determine since the bags were made from crude oil and that price fluctuated. Mr. Skala explained he was looking for a number for comparison purposes in terms of people purchasing the bags themselves. Mr. Matthes understood the City had spent over \$500,000 last year on bags. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and noted it broke down to about 22 cents per bag depending on the price of oil.

Ms. Nauser understood the closest competitor was the company that collected trash for Boone County residents, and asked what they charged for trash collection and whether they used roll carts. Mr. Matthes replied he knew Jefferson City used a roll cart system, but did not know what they charged. Mr. Glascock noted the chart indicated the company that served Boone County residents charged \$16 per month for trash only, and he thought it was a manual pick up. Mr. Matthes pointed out Columbia was fourth out of a list of eleven in terms of residential rate comparison, and was charging \$15.42 per month and still losing \$2 million per year.

Ms. Hoppe asked when this fund had last been balanced, and whether the imbalance was due to inflation, growth, or something different. Mr. Matthes replied the imbalance began during the recession, in either 2008 or 2009. Ms. Peveler explained the large amount of capital projects needed and the fact the City did not recover the full cost of commercial service were other reasons for the shift.

Ms. Nauser asked if there was a fee to commercial customers for recycling. She felt that since the rates were increasing, it might incentivize commercial customers to recycle to reduce costs. Mr. Glascock replied there was a fee for recycling for commercial customers. Mr. Thomas asked if that fee would increase in the proposed budget. Mr. Glascock replied there was a 10 percent across the board increase for trash and a \$3.00 per ton increase for the landfill. The recycling cost charge was based on policy, and was 80 percent of the cost of trash service for the customer. Mr. Matthes explained the 10 percent increase in the trash fee automatically created an increase in the recycling fee. Ms. Chadwick asked if it was based on weight. Mr. Glascock replied it was based on pull, which was when the bin was picked up. Ms. Chadwick asked if there were different bin sizes. Mr. Glascock replied customers indicated the bin sizes desired, and the cost was 80 percent of that cubic yard.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Kim Kraus, 2304 Ridgefield Road, urged the Council to support the sewer connection fee of \$1,200 with a 3-4 year phase-in to \$2,400, and asked them to keep in mind that a phased-in set dollar amount was degraded over time due to the rise of material and labor costs. She understood there was concern that the increase would adversely affect development, and specifically affordable housing development, and asked for a substantiation of those statements as she had not seen any evidence indicating either concern was valid. She also did not believe the increase over 3-4 years constituted a financial hardship. She understood some had expressed horror that the fee was being tripled, but noted the fee was currently too low. She asked the Council to look at the fees charged to developers compared to the costs the taxpayers had to pay as she felt the burden was currently being placed on the taxpayer. She commented that there had been much discussion and concern with regard to the unaddressed and on-going sewer flow issues around town, and collecting more money through connection fees would allow for more maintenance and repair. She understood it would not address all of the sewer needs, but felt it would help and was a logical step. She stated she did not believe supporting the belief that development should be done with purpose and careful planning and making the residents a top concern was anti-business. She noted she appreciated Mr. Matthes' comment regarding the need for new funding solutions in this and other areas.

Jennifer Erickson stated she represented Columbia Access Television (CAT) and thanked the Council for listening to its constituents and realizing CAT was a valuable asset to the community. She was pleased a resolution had been reached to continue funding CAT even though it was on a step-down basis. While \$100,000 for the FY 2015 budget year represented a substantial reduction in City support for public access, she felt they could manage the cut by continuing their sustainability efforts. She asked that they meet more often with the education and government providers over the next year as there was likely potential to share some expenses and cut costs across the board. She commented that CAT was more than just a public access station as they provided the public with resume building skills, allowed the public to use expensive equipment, software, and computers to create videos and other media, and provided the outlet for sharing. She listed some of the people and organizations that were utilizing their services and contributing to public access programming.

Ms. Chadwick asked Ms. Erickson if she had specific ideas for partnering with the city channel to help reduce costs. Ms. Erickson replied she wanted a more open dialogue with the other representatives of the PEG channels, but did not have any specific ideas at this time. She noted CAT had a full studio at Stephens College, which could potentially be used by the City.

Mr. Skala understood CAT had a successful matching program during FY 2014, and asked if they had met their \$50,000 goal. Ms. Erickson replied they would meet that goal.

Ms. Hoppe asked Ms. Erickson to elaborate on the involvement of CAT in the Youth Summit. Ms. Erickson replied they had met with leaders of Battle High School, Rock Bridge High School, and Hickman High School last week regarding the Summit, and explained CAT

staff and students would help collect and edit video pieces from the Summit. The content would then be shown on CAT-TV and would stream on their website.

Mary Hussmann, 210 Ridgeway Avenue, stated she did not want to see any big changes in the Columbia trash system, and would support a reduction in strong black bags from 75 to 50 bags annually. She felt changes to the trash system were controversial because people dealt with it on a daily basis. She thought the current system worked well, and suggested the Council ask citizens how the City could improve the existing system instead of proposing divisive, expensive, confusing, and unsafe alternatives that would result in fewer jobs. She reminded the Council that at its previous meeting, they had received petitions asking for no change or at least no change until the cost of service study was presented and citizens had been given several months to study the possibilities. She provided a handout of 50 questions she wanted they City to respond to prior to making any changes, and read a few of those questions.

Chuck Headley explained he represented a group known as the Solid Waste Action Group, and noted they were in agreement with the amendment proposed by Mr. Thomas to include the black bag system in the upcoming fiscal year and to reduce the voucher allocation to two vouchers per year. He asked the Council to require the solid waste consultant to hold a public forum prior to producing a final report so public input was incorporated into the findings for a more complete report.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, stated his support for the suggestion of Mr. Thomas to reduce the number of bags distributed, and recommended the City partner with neighborhood associations in terms of solid waste and other budget issues. He explained his household was probably atypical in that they did not even have half of a bag of trash per week, and for the last couple of years, he had placed his bag next to other bags on the street so the trash collectors had to make one less stop. He commented that the neighborhood groups had a wealth of ideas that were not being tapped, and suggested the City consider localized collection sites instead of picking up trash in front of every home. He noted this was done in apartment buildings, and did not know why that could not be done on a neighborhood basis.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, commented that a presentation had been made by the Water and Light Department staff at the August 23, 2014 Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) meeting, but the EEC had not had time to explore the issue or come to a consensus due to the number of other items on the agenda.

Dawn Zeterberg, 608 Hunt Avenue, asked the Council to remember those on fixed incomes when considering increases in fees and taxes as they could likely not afford those increases, and explained she was on a fixed income. She also noted that she did not have a lot of trash and wondered what she could do with her extra trash bags. Mr. Matthes commented that there might be a demand for those bags in the future. Ms. Zeterberg stated she was the only person in her house and she recycled more than she threw away. Mr. Matthes explained that was not the norm, and he wished everyone recycled more. He stated he thought the bags could end up being used with any future trash system. Ms. Hoppe suggested giving or selling the black bags to neighbors. Ms. Zeterberg stated she had been giving them away to friends.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, explained he was a disabled and low-income individual. He understood the cost of black bags purchased at the store was \$6.40 and the cost of blue bags was \$4.64, and suggested providing more blue bags and less black bags as it would save everyone money and incentivize recycling. He commented that he helped to bring Habitat for Humanity to Columbia, and it now had a ReStore, which was another form of recycling as some items would likely not make it in the landfill. He suggested furniture and other items on the curbside be recycled or refinished, and recommended educating the youth on the benefits of recycling by showing them some of the uses of recycled materials in City Hall. He commented that people he had spoken with were not happy with the new bus system either.

Mary Lehmann, 2601 S. Providence Road, stated the document explaining the two percent increase in the base rate was very complicated even though it was based upon simple facts. She noted the customer charge was the same as the base rate, and believed a base rate was unfair. The base rate for a large consumer of energy was small in terms of percentage, but as the energy usage decreased, the base rate would be large in terms of percentage and would not provide any incentive to save energy in terms of consumption. She also felt it was silly to charge a base rate and provided an example of going to the grocery store and being charged an extra \$5 due to the cost of transporting the for food. She did not believe it made sense. She suggested the City consider the recommendation of Tom O'Connor, who was on the Water and Light Advisory Board, for a small increase in the kilowatt hour charge instead of a two percent increase to the base rate. This would allow consumers to know the real cost of energy, which she felt they had a right to know, and would allow them to manage an increase by reducing energy consumption.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he supported the presentation of Ms. Kraus as she had asked for evidence of the negative impact of phasing-in the connection fees. He understood some felt it would drive development into Boone County, but he had not seen any data to indicate that would be the result. He noted the Water and Light Department was operating under a large scale production model that existed from 1920 to 1970, which was similar to a private investor-owned regulated utility, and he wondered who would be considered an investor, how they would receive dividends, and who functioned as the Public Service Commission. He felt the Water and Light Department needed to move to a different model. He suggested the Council ask the Public Works Department to provide a report regarding inflow and infiltration data to date, which would include the number of illegal connections and the percentage of problems that were created by those illegal connections compared to broken laterals, etc. He asked the Council to allow the public to digest the issues involved with the solid waste utility, and to review recommendations from staff after the end of the year.

Carl Taylor explained he had driven trash trucks in Kansas City and the Boonville area in the past, and had never recycled or even thought about recycling. He assumed Columbia provided free trash bags because people recycled and started recycling as well, but had since learned many people used the blue bags for trash as well. He believed the only incentive of recycling was the free bags.

Marybeth Champion-Garthe understood the Water and Light Department staff had recommended an increase in the electric rates, and if a rate hike was needed to recover costs, she would cooperatively support the increase. She felt the distribution of the increases raised some questions with regard to the design of the City's existing rate structure. If a two percent increase in revenue was needed, she felt a two percent across the board increase to all rate categories was more equitable than a regressive hike as it impacted the citizens that used the least amount of energy the most. She understood decoupling was an approach that separated the revenue of private utilities from the quantity of product supplied, and in order to protect profits from the impacts of renewable energy, conservation, and the variability of weather, the base rate was increased to divorce revenue from consumption. Since Columbia Water and Light was a public utility, she believed transparency and rates that reflected the true costs of service and consumption was best. She asked the Council to resist the decoupling and base rate approach. She understood a small number of large industrial and commercial customers used a large percentage of the total energy consumed, and asked the Council to ensure these companies and institutions did not receive significant discounts at the expense of individual citizens. She suggested incentives to the rate structure be provided for conservation instead of discounts, and for the City to educate the public with regard to opportunities to save energy and money. She also asked the Council to establish an electric utility connection fee instead of shifting the costs to existing citizens. She believed these changes would enhance the equity and resiliency of the community.

Louis Wilson, 404 W. Broadway, commented that he was supportive of Columbia Access Television (CAT) as it provided for the freedom of expression, which he felt was the bedrock of the United States. He noted he could not afford to start a television station, and CAT existed so he and others had the means to express themselves to a broader audience. He asked the Council to support CAT now and in the future as he believed government had a role, and pointed out he was a private contributor to CAT so he was doing his part as well.

Dick Parker, 215 W. Sexton Road, noted Columbia Water and Light was doing a lot to encourage people to reduce their energy use, and pointed out this proposed budget increased the pressure on people to reduce their use. The overall increase was two percent, but would likely not be two percent for the majority of Columbia Water and Light customers because very few bills fell under the 300 kilowatt hours per month. He reiterated this proposal increased the higher rates more than the lower rates. He commented that the utility needed to stabilize its income and be less dependent upon hot summers in order to break even, and this proposal helped to accomplish that goal even though the utility would still be dependent on the amount of electricity used in the summer. He noted this proposal also kept the rates low for those that lived in apartments and whose usage and income tended to be lower than those in single-family homes. He believed it was appropriate from a social point of view for the City to not put the burden on the long-term low-income community residents, and asked the Council to support the staff recommendation.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, understood there were different ways to achieve a conservation pricing rate structure that took into account those with low incomes. She explained People's Visioning supported a rate structure based on conservation, but also wanted those with the lowest incomes and those on fixed incomes to be considered. She

asked the Council to review the People's Visioning Plan B as it discussed the utility and infrastructure issues and provided for maintenance fees, which she thought was important and had been lacking. She suggested a review of all department finances and a monthly reporting of the City's financial situation. She commented that she believed the review of the zoning codes should be completed prior to any new development as many of the current problems were associated with new development. In addition, she felt smart growth and green building codes were vital and suggested a 100 percent renewable energy goal.

Bruce Watts, 1403 Berwick Court, pointed out they were all in this together as a community, and as a result he did not want to place further costs on people through taxation. He preferred those costs be based upon usage. He commented that he knew people that were affected by the smell of asphalt, which was used for resurfacing, and suggested the use of FilterPave products as it provided for permeable surfacing.

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

Ms. Chadwick understood the solid waste utility had been operating at a deficit and asked if there was anything else that was not balanced or not addressed by this budget. Mr. Blattel replied the stormwater utility was lacking, but they planned to try to address that as a future ballot issue. Ms. Chadwick asked if all costs could be reviewed on an annual basis as she felt that would help alleviate large increases to rates and fees. Mr. Matthes replied he thought there were methods that could be utilized to allow for that. Ms. Hoppe commented that the City needed to use cost of service studies as guidance in that regard as well. She felt they needed to ensure they met the cost of service amounts even if phased-in over a period of years. Ms. Chadwick stated she believed this was needed for all budget items, and that they needed to consistently conduct cost of service studies. Mr. Skala stated he thought it would be useful to have a regular cycle for each operation even if the cycle times were different for each operation.

Ms. Nauser asked if the solid waste utility paid for the cost of the bioreactor and if the cost of the bioreactor was the same as a typical landfill. She understood some felt the electric utility should pay for the bioreactor since the methane generated from that cell assisted the electric utility. Mr. Glascock replied Columbia Water and Light paid the solid waste utility a per kilowatt price for the methane generated.

Ms. Nauser asked if trash was separated based on whether it was biodegradable or not when it went into the landfill. Mr. Glascock replied it all went into the landfill if it came in as trash. The recycling bags went to the MRF and were separated manually at that location. Ms. Nauser asked if they were increasing the number of employees in that division. Mr. Glascock replied they were increasing the number of full time employees.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the black bags could be purchased at stores now. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Chadwick asked for the price. Mr. Glascock replied he thought the cost was \$6.40.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by delaying the parking enforcement hour change to January 1, 2015 and by increasing the parking enforcement hours by one hour so they would be from 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by funding CAT-TV \$28,000 from the FY 2015 council reserve account. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mayor McDavid stated he planned to oppose this motion. He explained the City had major revenue stream issues, which he felt would continue and accelerate in the future due to e-commerce, and CAT-TV was not listed as a priority by the citizens. The first priority was public safety and the second was streets. He noted this funding was a scarce resource and there were too many other issues the City needed to address, such as maintaining the Maplewood Home, staffing for the Police and Fire Departments, etc. The support of CAT-TV was not a mission of the City, and one reason he would oppose the motion. Another reason he planned to vote against the motion had to do with process. He noted there were many other quality organizations, and the City would provide CAT significantly more than it had provided those other organizations. In addition, those other organizations had to go through a grant application process, which he felt should be required of CAT as well. He did not believe they should be able to lobby the Council. He commented that he also felt there was insufficient accountability for the amount of public money provided. He noted he had not seen any performance metrics and did not know how many people watched CAT-TV. He also had been unable to find their annual report or budget on-line. He reiterated he would not vote in favor of this motion to fund CAT.

Ms. Hoppe stated she thought it was important to look at context and history, and explained CAT had received PEG funding through a different source six years ago. In addition, CAT served many of the organizations that received grant funding so the City would further support those organizations by supporting CAT. She noted they were gradually reducing the funding for CAT in order to provide them the opportunity to find other sources of funding. She commented that CAT had a history of building up people and facilities, and the City would undermine that investment if they did not provide funding. She pointed out there might be opportunity for CAT to work with the city channel and the public school channel, and provided the Youth Violence Summit as an example. It had been a well-attended event, and would have benefited more people if it had been televised. She thought the approach suggested was a good one, and would support funding CAT.

Mr. Thomas commented that he agreed with Ms. Hoppe. He noted it was a popular program, and the reduction in funding was relatively harsh as they would essentially lose \$50,000 per year over a three year period. He also believed the funding should level out at \$50,000 as a permanent budget item going forward. CAT provided people with an opportunity for free speech and built the capacity in the community to engage in political dialogue, which allowed the public to be involved in decision-making. He noted he agreed with Mayor McDavid in that there should be some accountability in terms of the funding provided, and asked staff to develop a reporting system that CAT could complete toward the end of each year to allow them to reflect on what had been accomplished that year and to justify funding in the future budget year. He stated he would vote in favor of the plan to allocate \$100,000 this year, and then moving to \$50,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Trapp noted they would be utilizing council reserve funds, which were reserved in the budget for projects that the majority of the Council felt was important. In addition, when

looking at the entire budget, it was a small amount of funding. He thought CAT had done a good job in working towards its independence as it had not been in their vision for the funding to end. He felt CAT added value and economic viability to the community as media was one of the larger industries in the area. It provided technical expertise and pathways into careers. He encouraged CAT to look at Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding in terms of economic development as he felt there were other avenues for CAT to pursue. He noted he was not sure how the budget would look next year, but they were able to fund CAT this year with the council reserve fund. He stated he would support the proposal for this year and wished CAT the best in the future.

Mr. Skala stated he supported CAT and the step down approach. He commented that he did not agree with Mayor McDavid in that this was outside of the process as CAT would be funded with council reserve funding, which was a separate process. He did not feel this was unusual as they had made similar choices in the past, and provided the funding for the Blind Boone Home with excess funds and Job Point as examples. He agreed accountability was essential, and noted he was not certain how he felt about providing on-going funding of \$50,000 either. He thought they needed to look at it in the context of each budget year. He was agreeable to the use of council reserve funds on a one-time basis, and noted he would support the motion.

Ms. Nauser commented that when this was discussed last year, she distinctly recalled them agreeing last year would be it for CAT in terms of funding from the City. She noted \$50,000 was the cost of a police officer, and because they had the money in council reserve from FY 2014 did not mean it should be spent. She explained she had been supportive last year because she did not feel it was fair to eliminate funding abruptly without a warning, but would not support it this year as she believed it was contrary to what they had agreed upon when they had provided funding last year.

Ms. Chadwick stated her daughter had been interested in movie making about three years ago, and CAT had provided the resources for to produce a piece to enter into the True/False Film Festival. She believed CAT was a wonderful community asset and would support funding it with council reserve funds.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Thomas to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by funding CAT-TV \$28,000 from the FY 2015 council reserve account was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser and Mayor McDavid voting against it.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by increasing the sewer connection fee to \$1,333 in FY 2015 so it would reach \$2,400 by the start of FY 2017. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Chadwick asked for clarification. Mr. Thomas noted he was supportive of the three-year approach, which meant the connection fee would be \$1,333 in FY 2015, \$1,866 in FY 2016, and \$2,400 in FY 2017.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed that approach was excessive as Columbia would then have the highest sewer connection fee in Missouri. He noted the fee in St. Louis was \$1,072, \$500 in St. Joseph, and \$400 in Jefferson City, and Columbia would go from \$800 to \$1,333. He thought this increase would result in less housing in Columbia, and more in the

surrounding communities, and noted the three fastest growing communities in Boone County were Hallsville, Centralia, and Ashland. He commented that they needed to incentivize the things they wanted, and explained that was the reason they allowed those under the age of 18 to ride the bus for free and provided discounts for solar power. If they did not want something, they needed to raise the cost, as had been done with cigarettes. He believed the unintended consequence of this would be more growth in the outlying areas and more sprawl, which in turn would allow them to drive on Columbia roads without paying for them.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not believe it was the desire of everyone in Columbia for the population of Columbia to grow. He noted he did not have a problem with Columbia growing, but felt they needed to have a logical and reliable way to pay for the expansion of public infrastructure systems, and believed this increase accomplished that goal. He also challenged the assertion that raising impact fees discouraged growth as he had reviewed a study in Florida that found no correlation between changes in impact fees and the number of building permits issued. He explained he did not believe they needed to be concerned about growth declining, and even if it did, he did not feel they needed to be upset about it as it would allow them to keep more money in the utility to serve the serious problems they had with the sewer system.

Mr. Skala commented that he had reviewed the study mentioned by Mr. Thomas along with other studies, and understood impact fees tended to enhance economic development because everyone wanting to develop economically knew the infrastructure needed to be in place. He thought they wanted sustainable growth since unsustainable growth had caused this infrastructure exigency. He believed they needed to ensure they had enough funding through fee and rate adjustments and connection fees so they were not in the same predicament in the future. He did not believe the City could grow its way out of this, and felt it needed to grow its way into this by having the funds necessary to avoid these problems in the future.

Ms. Hoppe thought the basic questions were how much it would cost to provide new service to new development and who would pay for it if the new development did not pay that cost. She noted the citizens would pay if the development did not pay, which she was not sure was fair. She pointed out the development fees were currently too low, and there were a lot of sewer needs in terms of new growth, inflow and infiltration, and maintenance. If they did not raise the fees as needed, she believed the citizens who were not purchasing new homes would pay for those sewer issues. She noted existing homes were more affordable than new homes, and Mr. Thomas had asked for information to develop an affordable housing policy and program at the last meeting. With regard to people moving to the County, she understood Boone County did a good job of vetting developments in terms of the point system and its sufficiency of service review to ensure developments paid for themselves. In addition, those that chose to live far out in the County would have to travel further to get to Columbia, so what one would save in terms of the connection fee would be spent in gas and maintenance of a vehicle. There was a convenience and cost-saving factor to residing in the City.

Mr. Trapp commented that he agreed the connection fee should be raised, but was concerned with quickening the pace. He would prefer to slow the pace to allow surrounding

communities the opportunity to adjust. He agreed there were questions regarding overall affordability, but understood the affordability of Columbia was at 93 percent, which was below average, so they were more affordable than the average community in the United States. He believed sewer repair and remediation qualified in assisting with affordability, but felt they wanted to do it in a way that was not abrupt or disruptive. He thought a ten-year phase-in was too slow, and suggested a five or six-year phase-in period instead. He reiterated he believed there was room for an increase, but felt three years was too quick.

Ms. Nauser stated she agreed with Mr. Trapp in that three years was too quick and that they needed to phase-in the increase over a longer period of time, but believed the sewer issues needed to be addressed in some manner. She pointed out Columbia was cheaper in terms of its rates than the comparable communities. The monthly bill in St. Louis was \$28 while it was only \$20 in Columbia and \$42 in Boone County. She understood most people would likely also factor these costs into their mortgages, so the cost would be minimal over the course of homeownership. She reiterated that she agreed with Mr. Trapp in that this was a drastic change and placed Columbia at a considerably higher cost than surrounding communities even when taking the rates into consideration.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she had suggested a ten-year phase-in because she did not want to encourage sprawl. She wished they were not in a place where a drastic change was needed, and understood that was the result of not increasing fees in the past. She believed it was the responsibility of Council to ensure the cost of service was accommodated even during a recession. Due to the significant increase necessary, she stated she preferred Mr. Trapp's suggestion of a five or six-year phase-in period.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by increasing the sewer connection fee to \$1,333 in FY 2015 so it would reach \$2,400 by the start of FY 2017 was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas and Ms. Hoppe voting in favor of it.

Mr. Skala commented that he would propose the four-year phase-in period so they were at \$2,400 in four years, and pointed out they were really only dealing with the FY 2015 increase and reserved the right to alter the phase-in time frame in the future.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by increasing the sewer connection fee to \$1,200 in FY 2015 so it would reach \$2,400 by the start of FY 2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Ms. Chadwick understood the motion would really only address the connection fee for this year. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. Ms. Chadwick understood he was proposing the fee be \$1,200 in FY 2015. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if that meant the four-year phase-in period would not be binding. Mr. Matthes replied that future councils would have to confirm this council's choice in the future. He noted it would guide staff as they prepared the next budget, but it would still have to be approved by the next council.

Mr. Trapp noted the \$1,200 had been proposed by staff and asked if a motion was necessary. Ms. Thompson replied a motion was not necessary if the connection fee for FY 2105 was recommended to be \$1,200 as that amount was already a part of the budget.

Mr. Skala withdrew his motion, and Mr. Thomas was agreeable.

Ms. Chadwick understood their decision tonight would only set the sewer connection fee for FY 2015, and believed the \$1,200 fee had been recommended by a 2004 study. Mr. Thomas thought it had actually recommended \$1,300. Ms. Chadwick stated they had fallen behind, and although it was unfortunate that they had to make such a drastic increase, she felt it was necessary.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by decreasing the sewer connection fee to \$1,067 in FY 2015 so it would reach \$2,400 by the start of FY 2020. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Skala stated he would vote against this motion because he felt they were already way behind.

Mayor McDavid noted he would support this motion because he believed any other amount would likely be worse. In addition, if this motion passed, St. Louis would still have a higher connection fee than Columbia by \$5.00. Ms. Nauser pointed out the monthly rate for St. Louis would still be \$8.00 more.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by decreasing the sewer connection fee to \$1,067 in FY 2015 so it would reach \$2,400 by the start of FY 2020 was defeated by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser, Mayor McDavid, and Mr. Trapp voting in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid asked if anyone else wanted to propose an amendment with regard to the sewer connection fee. Mr. Thomas replied he thought they should just go with the recommendation of staff, which was \$1,200 for FY 2015 since there was not a consensus for increasing or decreasing that amount. Ms. Nauser stated she agreed.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by reducing the distribution of the black bag vouchers from three vouchers to two vouchers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mayor McDavid stated he would support this motion because citizens did not want a change in the current level of service, but pointed out it would result in a \$2 million deficit. He noted the solid waste utility was losing \$50 per household per year, and that could not be extended again next year. This meant something would need to change for next year. He felt the City needed to do a better job of articulating the options and associated costs of those options, and believed there were essentially two options. One was to increase the cost of the existing service by \$50 per month and the other was for some form of automated service at a lesser cost.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not believe those were the only choices. He noted they could charge customers for the bags used if they wanted to continue with the existing level of service and the black bag system. He was not sure it was inevitable that they would go to an automated system as the public was not agreeable at this time, although that could change.

Ms. Nauser understood many citizens had indicated they were willing to pay the extra \$1.58 per month, and wondered why they would not want to go that route so they were not further in the hole. She suggested leaving the system as it was and charging the extra \$1.58 per month because that would allow them to break even.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she was amazed by the fact they were arguing over \$300,000 when the deficit was \$2 million. Mr. Thomas noted the deficit would be addressed when the cost of service study was completed. He thought that would allow them to look at a range of different options. He pointed out he was personally in favor of an automated “pay as you throw” system, and felt the issues some had raised with roll carts could be addressed.

Ms. Hoppe agreed this was an interim solution until the cost of service study was completed, and noted staff had indicated they thought there were sufficient funds to provide fifty bags for one year. She commented that she intended to ask for a public input meeting to be held before the cost of service study was finalized because there were many facets, options, ideas, etc., and felt it was important to involve the public early in the process.

Ms. Nauser stated she was concerned about the loss of \$300,000 this fiscal year. Ms. Hoppe thought they could charge for 50 bags instead of 75 bags.

Mr. Trapp stated he would not support a rate increase as they had heard many comments with regard to affordability and people on fixed incomes. He noted there was an active and engaged interest group that felt changes to the bag system were a step toward another system, and thought it would be wise to avoid a change in the short-term. He agreed there was a cost to the health of the utility, but believed there would be a customer service cost if they changed the system now. In addition, there was an affordability cost if the rates were raised by \$1.58 per month for the trash bags. He stated he thought the proposal of Mr. Thomas was a good solution for now, and noted the cost of service study would come early in the fiscal year allowing time to review all options.

Mr. Matthes noted the cash reserve account would still be above the 20 percent guideline if Council supported the motion of Mr. Thomas, which was to go to two rolls of black bags without a rate increase. Mr. Thomas asked for a dollar figure associated with the 20 percent. Ms. Peveler replied \$4.39 million. Mr. Thomas understood there would be another \$1 million at the end of this year.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the recycling system would be penalized in any way by continuing to provide black bags. She wondered if there had been plans to spend any of that money for recycling as she understood the MRF needed to be upgraded in order to accommodate more recycling. Mr. Matthes replied the plan was to continue to provide the recycling blue bags even if they stopped providing black bags in order to emphasize recycling. Mr. Blattel noted there was not a proposal to change the budget in any other way, so the items that were planned for solid waste this year would remain in the budget.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by reducing the distribution of the black bag vouchers from three vouchers to two vouchers was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by approving the staff requests identified on the amendment sheet dated September 10, 2014. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding these amendments. Mr. Matthes replied they were adjustments for items they did not know about when the budget was drafted.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend the budget associated with B233-14 by approving the staff request identified on the amendment sheet dated September 10, 2014 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B234-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B235-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas stated he would vote in favor of this ordinance, but felt the increase in the base fee was very large. He commented that the shifting of costs to the base fee was logical only if the base fee genuinely recovered the customer-related charges, such as billing and customer service, which each customer should pay. The same theme came up with other utilities, notably electricity. He explained he had asked for the reason for base fee increases and had received a number of different answers, which were often not consistent. He noted he had some concerns, but would support the recommended increase at this time.

The vote on B235-14, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Ms. Chadwick stated they had received a report previously regarding the number of uncollected parking tickets, and that number had been large. Mayor McDavid understood there were 52,000 unpaid tickets out of 190,000 tickets that had been issued over the last three years. Ms. Chadwick felt they were only penalizing those that paid parking tickets with this change, and not addressing the collection of unpaid tickets, so she would vote against this ordinance. Mayor McDavid agreed the issue of unpaid parking tickets needed to be pursued. Mr. Skala thought a policy resolution could be established to pursue unpaid parking tickets. Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed they needed find a better method to track down those that had unpaid parking tickets. Mayor McDavid thought they had asked for a report. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

The vote on B236-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: CHADWICK. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B237-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B237-14, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B238-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B239-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Trapp asked how many units a code enforcement specialist could inspect per day. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it took about 30 minutes per unit, but the specialist would be in the office to write reports as well so he thought there would likely be a maximum of ten inspections per day.

Mr. Skala asked about the possibility of inspecting rental properties on a three year cycle instead of a six year cycle. Mr. Matthes replied staff was working on that analysis as it had been requested previously. He thought an increase in frequency would require an increase in staff.

Ms. Nauser asked if the application fee was a one-time fee or yearly fee. Mr. Teddy replied the fee was charged every three years. It was considered a renewal every third year. He explained that once an application was received and the initial inspection was completed, the unit was good for three years, and there would not be another inspection for another six years unless there were complaints or reasons to suspect violations. If an inspection was needed, an inspection charge would have to be paid as well. Ms. Nauser understood this was not an annual fee for every rental property. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Ms. Nauser understood this was being done under the philosophy of recovering 100 percent of the costs for this service. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Ms. Nauser understood the increase along with some other changes would pay for the new inspector. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

The vote on B240-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Ms. Thompson noted an amendment would be needed to B241-14 to correspond with the proposed amendment to the budget. She noted subparagraph (b) in Section 22-159 needed to be reinstated and changed to say "...twenty-five bags every six months...." instead of four months as it currently read.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B241-14 by reinstating subparagraph (b) and changing "four (4)" to "six (6)" so that section read "...twenty-five (25) bags every six (6) months...." The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B241-14, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B242-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Thomas thanked staff for meeting with him today and noted he had learned a big part of the cost of operating an electric system was dependent on the number of customers using it at the same time, so a billing philosophy that took into account the peak demand at any particular time was an important component. He stated he was not sure how he felt those items should be balanced, but the system attempted to find a balance. He understood there was a demand charge, which was the maximum amount of energy used in any one 30-minute period, and an energy charge, which was dependent on the consistency of usage. He noted he was concerned about the base charge increase, but did not feel he understood it well enough to object to it at this time. He stated he had been provided different reasons for the increase in the base charge. He had been told they had to target a particular percentage of revenues to come from the per customer charge as it maintained the stability of the revenue and kept the bond rating at a healthy level, which resulted in paying less interest when borrowing money. He also understood it was designed to recover actual customer costs, and felt what he considered actual customer costs would likely be less than \$14 per month per customer. He noted staff had also indicated an industry best practice was to allocate one-third of the distribution system maintenance cost equally to all customers. He understood it was their buy-in fee to be connected to the system and accounted for someone who was net zero or had local generation because they would still use the system when needed. He reiterated he would support the staff recommendation, but pointed out he would continue to advocate for a connection fee. He stated they had been spending about \$2 million per year as a utility on system expansion for new development, and thought the connection fee should be about \$2,000 per building. He understood an \$80 million bond issue would likely come before the public in April, and thought they should instigate a connection fee at that time as well even though no other electric utility in Missouri did it because he believed it was a more logical and fairer way to allocate costs.

Mayor McDavid commented that the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) had averaged 75 building permits per year over a 30-year period, and Columbia likely accounted for two-thirds of the MSA. He noted they all used a lot of electricity in August when it was hot, and that was the most expensive electricity to purchase. They had to have the capacity, and there was an associated capacity charge to having electricity, which everyone had to pay. Mr. Thomas stated he agreed everyone needed to pay for capacity, but he questioned the amount that needed to be paid and how that amount was calculated. Mayor McDavid understood the rates in Columbia were progressive, and pointed the cost to Boone Electric customers was \$148 for 1,500 kilowatt hours where the cost to Columbia Water and Light customers was \$175. He felt they helped subsidize students with this rate structure as they tended to live in smaller spaces. He noted he would support the staff recommendation as this was a complicated system.

Ms. Hoppe understood the electric system was one where a higher rate was paid for higher usage so it encouraged conservation, which she felt was good. She commented that Columbia Water and Light did not charge different rates for usage at different times in the day as was done by other utilities, and thought they could do more to lessen usage at peak times. She noted she understood the logic with regard to the base rate, but was concerned about continual increases to the base rate, and was therefore interested in an electric connection

fee. She wanted to ensure existing ratepayers were not paying for new development, and that new development was paying its share. She stated she was interested in receiving more information on that topic. She understood the City paid for the overhead lines to the edge of the subdivision and down every street, and if new development did not pay a connection fee, the ratepayers paid those costs. She noted she was not sure how it worked with underground lines. Mr. Thomas stated he thought the developer paid more for underground lines. She reiterated she thought this needed to be reviewed to ensure the base rate did not continually increase, and explained she would support this ordinance at this time.

Mr. Skala agreed this was a complicated topic. He understood the dichotomy between the base rate and the rates charged included volatility and the bonding mechanism. He reiterated that this was a progressive system in that the people that used more paid more per unit than those with low usage. He commented that he felt the City had not marketed this change well as he understood the customer charge had increased for everyone, but most customers would not see the entire \$6.51 increase because they tended to use at least 300 kilowatt hours. In addition, low-income people that lived in inefficient rental units would suffer less with this system. He commented that he would like to see a larger shift in the progressive rate structure in the future so high-end users paid even more. He noted he was comfortable with the current proposal at this time with the notion of providing extra scrutiny in the future.

Ms. Chadwick stated she would support the rate increase as proposed.

The vote on B243-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B244-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B294-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B294-14, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B295-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on R178-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, HOPPE, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NAUSER, MCDAVID. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

The vote on B233-14, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**OLD BUSINESS**

**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.**

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe explained improvements would be needed if left turns were not allowed on College Avenue between University Avenue and Rollins Street, at Rosemary Lane, Wilson Avenue, and Bouchelle Avenue, and she understood the cost of those improvements was estimated at \$750,000. She also noted the contribution from MoDOT for the median project was only \$650,000, and less than the cost to the City for the improvements that would be required as a result of the median project. She asked about the possibility of allowing left turns into Wilson Avenue as it could potentially obviate some of the improvements needed due to the left turn restrictions. She noted that ideally she would prefer both left turns and out at Wilson Avenue. She stated the Betas, the bed and breakfast, the Christian House, and the residents of East Campus had informed her that the restrictions to left turns would be devastating as they could not get out at Rollins Street and University Avenue when there was a lot of pedestrian traffic. She pointed out the study did not really analyze the traffic situation. She asked staff to send a letter to MoDOT to determine if allowing a left turn into Wilson Avenue would be supported and within the parameters of the grant as this could potentially save the City some money.

Mayor McDavid stated his recollection was that MoDOT was not interested in any left turn because it was a safety issue.

Ben Ross, an engineer with Engineering Surveys and Services, explained the issue of a left turn access had been discussed throughout the public involvement process. Eight different choices had been presented to the public, and one option involved no barrier down the middle of the road while another option included a traffic signal at Wilson Avenue for left turns in and out. All of the options were evaluated and they ended up with the alternative previously approved by the Council because it was the best in terms of cost-effectiveness and safety for the pedestrians. He explained a traffic count from 2013 had indicated 140 cars were trying to make a left either in or out of the East Campus neighborhood, and would be displaced by the proposed pedestrian safety improvement. He noted a proposed project that would improve traffic at College Avenue and Rollins Street was estimated to cost \$270,000, and would involve a left turn lane with a green arrow. He pointed out MoDOT has sent a letter to the City on March 5, which stated they felt allowing left turns onto or off of College Avenue would greatly reduce pedestrian safety.

Ms. Hoppe understood there was a question as to whether MoDOT would accept another option involving left turns and a MoDOT representative had not indicated another option was not acceptable. She noted staff had represented that MoDOT would not be agreeable, and believed that had influenced the decision of Council. She explained she wanted an official response from MoDOT. Mr. Ross stated MoDOT had been involved in the process all along and had helped them evaluate the different choices, and he understood they felt left turns as suggested in and out of Wilson Avenue would create a big pedestrian safety issue. He pointed out he did not know if they would approve the request if pressed, but understood MoDOT generally wanted to see a plan prior to approval and was usually concerned about conflicting traffic in terms of turning vehicles and pedestrians. Ms. Hoppe understood MoDOT had not suggested the elimination of left turns at University Avenue or Rollins Street, so she felt it was a matter of degree. Mr. Thomas pointed out there were traffic signals at University Avenue and Rollins Street, but not at Wilson Avenue. Mr. Ross stated that was correct, and noted one of the eight options was for a traffic signal at Wilson, but it would have required widening the road and they did not feel it would provide safety benefits. He explained there were a lot of conflicts and safety problems any time there was a mix of pedestrians and turning vehicles, so that option had not been rated very high or recommended. Mr. Thomas noted that would be the same situation they had at University Avenue and Rollins Street. Mr. Ross agreed and pointed out that most of the pedestrian crashes were happening at those intersections, and the proposal approved by the Council would include two HAWK signals as there would not be any conflicting traffic and it gave pedestrians a safer alternative than going to the signalized intersections.

Mr. Thomas understood 140 left turns on average at the peak traffic hour would be displaced and asked if that would warrant the reconstruction of the Rollins Street and College Avenue intersection. He wondered if the 140 left turns would persist or if they would disappear based upon the disappearing traffic theory whereby concerns never materialized. Mr. Ross replied he believed some traffic would find other routes, and understood there were lots of issues in the East Campus neighborhood in terms of commuter parking in the neighborhood, so he felt only time would tell.

Mr. Skala understood an improvement would be made at the intersection of Rollins Street and College Avenue for a dedicated left turn lane, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Ross replied they were recommending an improvement at that location, but it was not a part of the current grant funded project. It would be an additional project in the future with different funding. Ms. Hoppe asked if MoDOT had offered to pay for that improvement. Mr. Ross replied no. Mr. Glascock noted it was a MoDOT intersection so they would likely participate in some manner.

Mr. Thomas stated he felt the opening at Wilson Avenue would likely create an even more dangerous situation for pedestrians than was there currently.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, stated she was the Chair of the East Campus Neighborhood Association and explained over 200 hundred signatures had been gathered in a short time yesterday expressing the importance of keeping Wilson Avenue open for left turns in and out of College Avenue for the East Campus residents and businesses. They asked the Council to make that revision to the College Avenue Safety Enhancement project.

She commented that she had spoken to some students at the Lee Street Deli, and those students had not been aware of the fact left turns in and out of College Avenue would be restricted. Some were aware a barrier would be constructed, and most had indicated they would cross at the pedestrian crossings if installed. She stated the East Campus Neighborhood Association has asked for a traffic study to be conducted within the neighborhood to determine how the elimination of the left turns would affect the neighborhood and the pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the neighborhood. She read a note from Deb Strid, the manager of The Gathering Place Bed and Breakfast, which indicated a U-turn at Ashland Road was needed to re-route traffic back to the driveways that would be cutoff from left turns. The letter also indicated traffic from the downtown would have to route through the East Campus neighborhood and guests of The Gathering Place would need to cut-through the neighbor's parking lot to get to the bed and breakfast from Lee Street and their business did not have an entrance from Lee Street. They did not want people making dangerous U-turns at Rollins Street. Ms. Hammen understood this was one of the improvements that would be needed as a result of this project, and it was not funded either. The Gathering Place was worried their business would not survive if there were no U-turns and would like a left turn in off of College at the very least. She explained she had worked with the fraternities, and they had suggested a crosswalk with the HAWK signal at the left turn at Wilson Avenue. She pointed out there was only a few times during the day where there were a tremendous number of students crossing College Avenue. She thought it could be similar to the area going into Stephens Lake Park on Broadway. She suggested a plan that was safer while helping the residents of the East Campus neighborhood.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, explained she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and asked if revisions could be considered to address the concerns of the public. She noted College Avenue was an extension of the only scenic roadway in Columbia and suggested the addition of trees to this median project as there were many benefits to trees, to include aesthetics and shading for urban heat islands.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, asked how this proposal had been initiated. Mr. Glascock replied the University of Missouri had conducted a traffic study in October 2009, and it was then submitted to the Community Development Department as part of a grant application package. Mr. Cullimore understood they had applied for the grant and had engaged the public afterward. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and explained they wanted the funding to be available prior to starting a project. Mr. Cullimore felt that had created this problem. He believed the public should have been given the opportunity to comment as soon as the project was proposed, and prior to applying for the grant.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to table B283-14 and B284-14 to the October 6, 2014 Council Meeting to allow time for staff to write a letter to MoDOT asking if a left turn into Wilson Avenue could be supported and within the parameters of the grant.

Ms. Hoppe thought the left turn could be similar to the left turn at Broadway going into Stephens Lake Park, and did not believe they had received clear or definitive information when they had voted to proceed with this project. It would also help alleviate the \$770,000 in improvements that would be needed as a result of the project.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe to table B283-14 and B284-14 to the October 6, 2014 Council Meeting to allow time for staff to write a letter to MoDOT asking if a left turn into Wilson Avenue could be supported and within the parameters of the grant was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mayor McDavid stated he would not support this motion as he believed it had been thoroughly adjudicated with multiple public meeting and hearings. It was a proposal that was driven by the University of Missouri, the City, and MoDOT. He understood this was an inconvenience issue for the East Campus neighborhood, but it was a safety issue for pedestrians as there had been multiple injuries in the past.

Mr. Skala commented that they all wanted this dangerous situation to be addressed, but did not believe a two week delay to obtain an opinion from MoDOT was unreasonable.

Ms. Nauser felt MoDOT had already answered the question by stating they were not supportive of left turns. She noted they had gone through the same situation on Providence near Stadium and Burnam whereby MoDOT limited the access since it was their road. She felt they would again say they would not allow the left turns. She understood the change in traffic patterns as a result was frustrating, but thought they needed to proceed as it was a safety issue.

Ms. Chadwick asked when the project would begin. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it would likely be May, 2015. Ms. Chadwick understood a two week delay would not affect the project start time. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct assuming MoDOT responded within that two week time frame. Ms. Chadwick asked if U-turns would be allowed at College Avenue and Rollin Street. Mr. Glascock replied he did not believe there was enough width to allow for the U-turn for large vehicles, and he thought it would be impossible to obtain the necessary right-of-way because Sanborn Field was at that location.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Skala to table B283-14 and B284-14 to the October 6, 2014 Council Meeting to allow time for staff to write a letter to MoDOT asking if a left turn into Wilson Avenue could be supported and within the parameters of the grant was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Skala, Ms. Hoppe and Ms. Chadwick voting in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed it was time to move forward with this project as it had been adjudicated and was a safety issue that needed to be addressed.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she had concerns about the process with regard to this project. The grant had determined the parameters of the solution, and not the problem. As a result, staff had applied for a grant that had a solution, which eliminated solutions the community had proposed. She noted she would ask that similar grants go through a public process prior to applying for the grant. She felt situations could be improved without going to an extreme in terms of constructing a wall to block turning movements without consideration of the traffic flow. She pointed out the City would now have to come up with \$770,000 to improve the situation created by this project.

Mr. Skala agreed they needed to address safety for students, and there would be an inevitable change to ensure that safety was provided. He commented that he did not feel the City was helping itself in terms of public confidence due to some of their processes, and thought they could improve the relationship by being reasonable and prudent. He felt they

could have waited two weeks to allow for the question to be asked and for a response, and stated his disappointment.

Ms. Chadwick understood the majority of Council felt MoDOT had already responded even though they wanted to ask the question again. Since this project was partly in her ward, she wanted to ensure the students had a safe way to cross College Avenue. Although she would have liked to see the left turn issues addressed, she noted she supported the project overall.

B283-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: SKALA, HOPPE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B284-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: SKALA, HOPPE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B285-14 Authorizing a transportation enhancement funds supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to the College Avenue safety enhancement project.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

B285-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: SKALA, HOPPE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

- 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.**
- 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 latan 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.
- 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.
- R167-14 Setting a public hearing: construction of the Ridgemont Road PCCE #20 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.
- R168-14 Setting a public hearing: construction of a 6-inch water main along Kathy Drive, south of Texas Avenue.
- R169-14 Setting a public hearing: consider an amendment to the FY 2014 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.
- R170-14 Authorizing submission of a FY 2015 Historic Preservation Fund Grants Predevelopment and Development Projects Application to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources to fund the repair and restoration work on the interior of the historic Maplewood House.
- R171-14 Transferring funds for the ERP software project.
- R172-14 Transferring funds to the Mayor’s Task Force on Community Violence to be used for community forums.
- R173-14 Authorizing an agreement with Circular Productions, LLC for design of a disc golf course at Strawn Park.
- R174-14 Authorizing a waterline relocation contract with Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Boone County, Missouri relating to the relocation of an existing waterline at Gans Creek Recreation Area.
- R175-14 Authorizing the modification or amendment of the terms of the 457 deferred compensation plans for the City of Columbia, Missouri in order to authorize loans to participants of such plans; authorizing the City Manager to execute documents necessary as it relates to the definition of “spouse” in such plans.

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

**NEW BUSINESS**

- R176-14 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Engineering Surveys and Services for surveying and design of the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 1 (Stadium Boulevard to Elm Street).

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been contacted by Bill Weitkemper, who had indicated this relief project would relieve the sewer infrastructure exigency and would do little to relieve the sewer back-ups many residents had dealt with for a long time, and asked for clarification. Mr. Glascock replied he could not respond without knowing the specific locations of the back-up issues. He noted this would add capacity for inflow and infiltration and downtown development.

Mr. Thomas asked if this relief sewer would be needed for new development even if the inflow and infiltration was reduced to the greatest extent possible. Mr. Glascock replied that was a difficult question to answer because he did not know what developments would be constructed. He understood there had been discussion regarding a 24-story building and did not believe the sewer would be able to handle a development of that size. Mr. Thomas asked if that was the case regardless of the inflow and infiltration situation. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Ms. Chadwick asked what area this sewer project would service. Mr. Glascock replied it was an area shaped like a funnel all of the way to the Business Loop. He believed it involved portions of College Avenue, Walt's Bike Shop, and portions of West Boulevard. It was not only the downtown core. It was essentially the Flat Branch area.

Ms. Nauser commented that she thought it was fair to say this project was not only for new growth because the lines were not large enough to handle current capacity. Mr. Glascock stated they had asked the design engineer to determine if any existing pipes could be replaced instead of installing a brand new relief sewer because they would then have four pipes to maintain.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the City would provide for reimbursement from new development for the cost of this sewer. Mr. Glascock replied this was only an engineering agreement, and that was something the Council would need to address as they moved forward in terms of connection fees or impact fees.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, asked if either Project No. 1 or Project No. 3 would increase capacity at what had been described as a bottleneck on the Flat Branch trunk line. Mr. Glascock asked if he meant where it tied into the Hinkson Creek line. Mr. Cullimore replied yes, and asked if these projects would increase capacity at that point. Mr. Glascock replied no. He described the location and explained the relief sewer would help with flow in the Flat Branch area. The capacity was already there. Mr. Cullimore understood the bottleneck that was downstream of Project No. 1 was currently causing back-ups and overflows in the Flat Branch area when it rained. Mr. Glascock stated he believed the problem was leaky pipes, and not the bottleneck. He explained that when it rained there was a back-up from the Plant all of the way to that point. Mr. Cullimore understood these projects were funded due to postponed bond projects, and asked if any funds from the recent or expected development agreements would pay for either the design or construction of these projects. Mr. Glascock replied he did not recall.

Ms. Chadwick understood these projects were not from the reallocation of bond funding. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. It was from the reallocation of projects, and not bond funding. Mr. Matthes explained there was a little bond funding in each, but it was from the amount that was for annual sewer system improvements. Ms. Chadwick understood they were not reallocating a bond issue. Mr. Thomas thought they had allocated almost all of their uncommitted sewer money for a period of 2-3 years.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and commented that it appeared that the taxpayer and ratepayers would be paying for this improvement. She understood this project would primarily benefit new development, and was concerned about the potential of a 24-story building as none of the plans of the City had envisioned something of that nature. She reiterated her concern with regard to the citizens paying for development because many could not afford it and others did not feel it was fair or right. She asked that the Council require developers to pay 80 percent of various costs instead of only 20 percent as was paid now.

Mr. Thomas pointed out the Council had approved an increase in the sewer connection fee for FY 2015, and had discussed phasing it up to \$2,400 in FY 2018, which meant they would then be recovering 70-80 percent of those costs.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, commented that he felt these projects were for expansion, and thought Mr. Weitkemper was the expert on sewer issues and his concerns should be addressed. He pointed out flooded basements impacted the lives of people.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the \$2,400 connection fee from new development would pay for this sewer and how long that would take in terms of the number of connections. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know as it was dependent upon the number of units because the connection fee was a per unit charge. Ms. Hoppe thought they should know how much more capacity this would create. Mr. Glascock explained he could provide the capacity amount after it was built. Ms. Hoppe asked if the connection fees would ever pay for the project or if another type of fee was necessary to ensure new development paid for the new sewer. She understood the developers wanted to be treated equitably and would prefer a policy that was applied to everyone so the City did not collect money from some developers and not others on an ad hoc basis. She noted her goal was to try to determine what the policy should be so the City was reimbursed by new development for their portion of the sewer. Mr. Glascock reiterated they would look to replace existing sewer lines with this project. They would try to take an old line out of service and increase the capacity with a larger pipe. If they replaced an 18-inch line with a 36-inch line, he wondered who would pay to take the 18-inch line out of service or the maintenance of the new 36-inch line. Ms. Hoppe understood some of this would service existing customers and new development per the staff report, and stated she wanted to know if new development would pay for its portion and how that was calculated. Mr. Matthes explained it was hard to provide a number for this project because it involved the downtown, which was already built out. He thought there were different answers to the questions of how much was due to growth and who benefited as they could likely argue everyone on the system would benefit. He stated it was dependent upon philosophy and assumptions about particular projects. He noted the cost of service consultant would say

\$2,400 was the amount that would recover the cost of the expanding system on a universal level.

Mr. Thomas stated he would roughly agree as he thought it was likely about \$3,000. He explained a sewer system of a given size would cost a certain amount of money, and thought it was possible to calculate the cost of expanding a sewer system to accommodate each new individual or home. He believed it would be helpful if they calculated the cost for every public infrastructure system and then charged that amount or another amount if the public was agreeable to a subsidy of some level. Money from new development would then go into a fund to pay for expansion throughout the community, and would likely keep up with the pace of growth given an error margin. They could then get away from the ad hoc negotiated exactions because that was not a fair situation.

Mr. Skala understood this would authorize an agreement for engineering services. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala commented that he was bothered by the fact they were arbitrarily addressing the problems of some people while others that had sewer problems for years were still waiting for their problems to be addressed. He was concerned by the shifting of projects due to the unforeseen growth in the downtown area as it displaced some project that people had been waiting on for a long time.

The vote on R176-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: HOPPE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R177-14 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Engineering Surveys and Services for surveying and design of the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 3 (Elm Street and Sixth Street).**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, explained that although staff had indicated these projects would benefit everyone, many did not feel benefited. She reiterated that City plans had not envisioned the size of developments these sewer projects would accommodate.

Ms. Nauser commented that this sewer project had been on the CIP list for many years, and had been in the 6-10 year group for future funding. It had been moved up because there had been an unanticipated increase in development in the area. She also assumed this had been on the list because of current capacity issues in addition to planning for the future.

Ms. Hoppe agreed it had been on the 6-10 year list, but noted the City had many other demands, and the urgency of those projects had not decreased. She stated she was particularly disappointed by the fact they were not receiving enough of a contribution from new development.

Mr. Skala noted the Council had increased the sewer connection fees, and felt that would go a long way in terms of equalizing the distribution of costs. He pointed out he was still very concerned about the fact they had displaced others by moving this project forward. He explained he would vote for this like he did the other since it was specifically for engineering services.

The vote on R177-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: HOPPE. 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.

- B298-14**     Voluntary annexation of property located approximately 800 feet west of Thompson Road (4097 Thompson Road); establishing permanent R-1 zoning.
- B299-14**     Changing the uses allowed on C-P zoned property located on the south side of Grindstone Parkway, approximately 415 feet west of the Grindstone Parkway and Grindstone Plaza Drive intersection; approving a revised statement of intent; approving the C-P Plan for Lot 5A of Red Oak South, Plat No. 1-A.
- B300-14**     Rezoning property located on the west side of Tiger Avenue, approximately 220 feet south of Rollins Street (809 and 811 Tiger Avenue) from R-3 to C-P; approving the Alpha Chi Omega C-P Plan; approving less stringent screening, landscaping and parking requirements.
- B301-14**     Approving the Final Plat of Alpha Chi Omega Subdivision Plat 1, a Replat of Lot 60 and part of Lots 59 and 61 LaGrange Place, located on the west side of Tiger Avenue, approximately 220 feet south of Rollins Street (809 and 811 Tiger Avenue).
- B302-14**     Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation planning services.
- B303-14**     Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on portions of Scott Boulevard from Wales Drive to Route K and on both sides of Wales Drive.
- B304-14**     Accepting conveyances for sidewalk, utility, drainage, street and temporary construction purposes.
- B305-14**     Accepting conveyances for Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants purposes.
- B306-14**     Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B307-14**     Authorizing a right of use permit with The Curators of the University of Missouri to allow for the enforcement of the University’s smoking policy on portions of Conley Avenue, Hitt Street, Ninth Street and Rollins Road when lawfully closed to vehicular traffic.

### REPORTS AND PETITIONS

#### **REP90-14**     Compensatory Mitigation.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if it would pay for itself over time. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it would, and explained people outside of the community could use it, but they would pay the City the cost to complete the project and potentially even more.

Ms. Hoppe understood a variety of improvements along the Hinkson Creek could be done. Mr. Glascock stated staff would bring forward suggestions.

Mayor McDavid stated he thought it was a great idea. Ms. Nauser agreed.

Mr. Trapp commented that it was better for other communities to pay to improve Columbia's environment than for the City to pay to improve another community's environment. Mr. Glascock noted the City would have to front the money.

Ms. Nauser noted it was more beneficial to the environment and society to have large swaths of property that they could protect instead of isolated pieces that did not connect.

**REP91-14 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

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

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Rick Shanker, 1829 Cliff Drive, asked that the consultant working on the solid waste cost of service study be required to hold a public forum prior to finalizing a report. Ms. Hoppe had indicated she planned to bring that issue up. He understood the solid waste utility was in the hole by about \$2 million and pointed out that was solely due to residential trash collection. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Shanker also understood a large portion of the workers compensation expenses were due to the MRF, and in FY 2013, the Finance Department actually had more workers compensation losses than residential trash collection. He asked that this information be provided during the public forum as well.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, wondered if any progress had been made on a homeless shelter. He noted he saw an individual provide a blanket and two bags of food to another individual at the Highway 63 and Interstate 70 interchange.

Mr. Elkin stated he had seen a lot of democracy as there had been few no votes tonight.

Mr. Elkin suggested the City educate the public on the benefits of recycling.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, asked the Council to follow its guiding documents, especially the documents that were created with public input. She noted she was not aware of any document indicating the desire of a 24-story building, and wondered why an excessive amount of infrastructure capacity was needed.

Ms. Hoppe understood downtown commercial customers paid 80 percent of the regular trash rate for recycling per policy, and suggested the Council ask staff to not increase that cost until the cost of service study was completed.

Mr. Thomas understood that when a downtown business requested a recycling bin, the City provided it and charged that business per pull. Mr. Matthes noted there were about three different methods of calculating the charge. Mr. Glascock noted the business also indicated the size bin, i.e. two yard, four yard, etc., and the rate set was based on trash. He explained the recycling of cardboard had a rate of 80 percent of a trash pull. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the trash pull. Mr. Glascock replied it was regular garbage for which they had a dumpster. Mr. Thomas understood the budget had proposed a 10 percent increase. Mr. Glascock stated that increase was applied to the trash collection rate. Mr. Thomas understood there would be a ten percent increase for recycling as well. Mr.

Glascock stated the recycling would increase by the 10 percent of the 80 percent. Mr. Thomas asked what would happen if a customer did not recycle, and threw everything away. He wondered if his bill would increase by 10 percent. He understood trash was not weighed. Mr. Glascock replied they picked up whatever was in the trash bin. It could be half-full or overfilled. Mr. Thomas understood there was also an issue of other businesses placing their recycling in the bin for a particular business, and was not sure that could be addressed unless they billed the entire district. Mr. Glascock noted the only thing that would help the situation would be to lock it.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted to delay the increase in the recycling charge as she did not want to discourage people in the downtown from recycling. Ms. Nauser asked why they would choose a geographic area to encourage recycling. She thought the fees should be frozen for everyone.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to not increase the commercial customer recycling rates until the Council had a chance to review the cost of service study.

Mr. Skala understood the City was looking at the possibilities of expanding the MRF and using an outside entity for recycling, and those possibilities would be a part of this discussion. If the City contracted with another entity for recycling, he thought it would obviate the workers compensation issues at the MRF as well. Mr. Glascock stated the cost to expand the MRF was a part of the proposed rate increase since the facility would need to be built.

Mr. Thomas asked if the trash bills for customers were a part of the utility bill. Mr. Glascock replied yes, and noted it also included recycling costs. They had set fee, and then a charge based on the number of pulls per week. Mr. Thomas understood businesses did not use blue bags. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood bins were used for trash collection and recycling for all commercial customers. Mr. Glascock noted some used compactors for trash as well.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe to not increase the commercial customer recycling rates until they had a chance to review the cost of service study was seconded by Ms. Chadwick.

Mayor McDavid stated he would oppose this because he did not feel comfortable legislating this without an analysis. He was not sure how much money this would involve and whether it was a problem. He commented that although it might be a great idea, he thought it needed to be developed and presented with a financial analysis.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was concerned with the idea of creating a policy and rate structure and then excluding certain groups as it would impact the financial stability of the utility.

Ms. Hoppe stated she would withdraw her motion and ask for a report instead. Ms. Chadwick, who had seconded the motion, was agreeable. Mr. Matthes stated a report would be provided.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to instruct the solid waste utility consultant to hold 1-2 public input or interested parties forums prior to completing their final report.

Mr. Glascock asked why the consultant needed to hold those public forums, and asked if staff could do it instead. The consultant was conducting a cost of service study, and was not determining whether to go to a “pay as you throw” system at this time.

Mr. Thomas felt it would make more sense to hold the forums after the report was completed because the report was not policy.

Ms. Hoppe understood the staff would hold interested parties meetings after the cost of service study was completed to obtain public input and for the public to ask questions. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe withdrew her motion.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Community Development Department would likely apply for a MoDOT grant for a crossing at Lee School, and asked that they hold a public input meeting prior to applying for the grant.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to hold a public input meeting prior to applying for any MoDOT grant for the crossing at Lee Elementary School. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe explained the marijuana ordinance was scheduled for the October 6, 2014 Council Meeting, and noted she would ask that it be tabled to the October 20, 2014 Council Meeting. In addition, she would provide potential revisions for the ordinance so people had time to review them prior to the October 20, 2014 Council Meeting.

Ms. Chadwick asked if a recommendation from the Board of Health and Substance Abuse Advisory Commission would be sought with regard to the proposed amendments. Ms. Hoppe replied she had not planned to direct them to review the changes, but noted they would be able to view the proposed changes and provide input. Mr. Thomas noted many of the amendments were in response to the concerns of the Board of Health and the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission.

Mr. Trapp asked if there was a limit to the number of times an issue could be tabled. Mr. Skala replied he thought the limit was two. Ms. Thompson replied there was not a limit to how many times it could be tabled.

Mr. Trapp asked for a staff report on compliance with the mandatory server training and whether any enforcement action had been necessary. He noted this request was a result of the Alcohol Summit he and Ms. Chadwick had attended with regard to underage drinking.

Ms. Chadwick asked for a staff report regarding all ordinances affecting alcohol consumption in the City so they could determine if a law needed to be strengthened or if enforcement needed to be emphasized with regard to the overconsumption of alcohol, especially with regard to minors.

Ms. Chadwick asked for a report regarding the establishment of regular fee review cycles.

Ms. Chadwick asked for report regarding the collection of unpaid parking tickets as it was an issue.

Ms. Chadwick noted a constituent had contacted her regarding the lack of enforcement of the sound ordinance. She wondered about the number of violations and complaints as well, and asked for a report.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she believed a sufficiency of resources test would be useful and understood staff was working on it.

Ms. Chadwick noted she had received a lot of comments on the bus system in terms of how dissatisfied people were with the fact the shuttle buses could not travel on Rollins Street. She thought those shuttles could be accommodated and assumed staff was looking into the issue.

Ms. Chadwick provided a handout and asked for the support of Council in amending the City's ordinances with regard to tobacco and nicotine products. She asked the Council to consider amending the ordinance specific to smoking in indoor places so the restriction was extended to e-cigarettes. She explained e-cigarettes mimicked smoking, allowing the user to inhale synthetic nicotine, and this nicotine cartridge contained toxic chemicals and carcinogens that expelled poisonous chemical aerosols. She understood middle and high school students had used e-cigarettes, and the marketing was not restricted with regard to youth. She also understood young users were more likely to initiate e-cigarettes than any other demographic, and the use of one tobacco product increased the willingness to use multiple tobacco products. She suggested this issue go to the Board of Health and the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission for their review and recommendations. She also wanted the Council to consider raising the legal purchase age of tobacco products to 21 years old. She explained tobacco was the leading cause preventable death, and 90 percent of smokers tended to pick up smoking before the age of 18 and had obtained those cigarettes from 18-21 year old people. She commented that Missouri had the most lax tobacco tax, charging only 17 cents per pack, but the Missouri Charter prohibited municipalities from raising the tobacco tax. Municipalities could however increase the age of purchase. She suggested this issue be submitted to the Board of Health and the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission as well for their review and recommendation.

Ms. Chadwick made a motion for the Board of Health and the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission to review and provide recommendations with regard to restricting e-cigarettes in indoor places and raising the legal purchase age of tobacco products to 21 years old. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a model for roll carts, whereby there were different sizes of bins and the fees per month were based on the sizes of the bin. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mr. Thomas asked for the size of the smallest bin. Mr. Glascock replied 32 gallons. Mr. Thomas noted many felt the bins were as big as their house. Mr. Skala thought there had been three sizes. Ms. Hoppe understood only three were displayed, but there were

other sizes, to include one that was less than 32 gallons. Mr. Trapp thought there were issues with the smallest size in terms of pick-up.

Mr. Thomas asked if staff had a procedure for reviewing small changes to the existing routes or if the system needed to stay the same for a year. He understood a lot of bus users lived at the corner of Nifong and Bethel, and they had concerns. In addition, a route used to serve Central Missouri Subcontracting Enterprises (CMSE), which was a facility that provided employment for people with disabilities, and now it was no longer serviced by a route. Mr. Glascock thought that had been a commuter route and they had eliminated all commuter routes. He noted they were not opposed to revisiting and tweaking routes. They just did not want to change the entire system. Mr. Thomas stated he understood.

Mr. Thomas asked for a report on the two issues.

Mr. Thomas wondered if it might be useful to have a sewer advisory commission due to the varying issues, such as inflow and infiltration, master meters, billing, connection fees, long lists of projects, etc., and asked the Council to think about whether they thought it should be pursued.

Mr. Skala asked when Clark Lane would be striped. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure.

Mr. Skala understood there were mounds of mulch, junk, iron, etc. at the corner of Rice Road and Riney Lane and the only resource the City had was if it harbored vermin/disease, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Matthes replied staff was looking into the issue.

Mr. Skala understood someone was running a business out of a home in the Woodridge area, but this had not been verified as of yet since the person indicated he was doing work for friends. He assumed staff was working on that issue as well.

Ms. Nauser asked for a synopsis with regard to the bioreactor. She wanted to know the cost, life expectancy, the amount paid by the utility, etc.

The meeting adjourned at 12:16 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk