

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
JANUARY 5, 2015**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, January 5, 2015, 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 and staff members were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mayor McDavid explained the previous meeting minutes had not yet been completed.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Chadwick asked that B380-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Ms. Nauser asked that B391-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Ms. Nauser and Mr. Thomas asked that B392-14 and B393-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Upon his request, Mayor McDavid made a motion to allow Mr. Trapp to abstain from voting on R12-15 due to a conflict of interest. Mr. Trapp noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he was employed by the Phoenix Programs, which was being considered for CDBG funding by this resolution. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid noted R13-15 would be added to new business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B380-14, B391-14, B392-14, and B393-14 being moved to old business, and R13-15 being added to the agenda under new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Maurice Harris, Columbia Vision Commission – Information regarding the Five-Year Vision Dialogue for the Columbia Visioning Plan.

Mr. Harris explained he was the Chair of the Columbia Vision Commission and stated the Commission would begin the five-year vision dialogue process next month. This dialogue process would allow the public to review the Vision Plan and submit input on the direction the

vision should take. The Commission planned to host dialogue sessions at several locations over the next four months to gather input, and would accept public comment electronically to ensure there were ample opportunities for the public to participate. He noted the goal was to gather as much information as possible to present recommendations for revisions to the vision. The Commission planned to report its findings and provide recommendations by December 2015. He encouraged the public, City Council, and City staff to participate in the dialogue sessions.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(A) Construction of traffic calming speed humps along Derby Ridge Drive, between Smiley Lane and Brown School Road and between Blue Ridge Road and Smiley Lane.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked how many projects similar to this were on the list for staff review. Mr. Nichols replied 45. Mr. Thomas asked how many projects were completed by the City each year. Mr. Nichols replied this would be the second project to be completed since the program started. Mr. Thomas understood only about 1-2 projects would be completed each year. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct and explained it was a very time intensive process that was staffed by one individual.

Mr. Thomas commented that he was supportive of an increase in funding for the traffic calming program in terms of the capital improvement sales tax so they could move through the list more quickly over the next ten years.

Mayor McDavid asked about the cost and effectiveness of signs showing people how fast they were traveling. Mr. Nichols replied the flashing signs were one of the first steps of the neighborhood program, and they only went to the next level if there was not compliance based on the flashing signs. In this situation, there was not compliance, so the City incrementally stepped up the calming process to hard infrastructure.

Mayor McDavid asked if police radar guns were effective. Mr. Glascock replied they were effective when personnel was present, but were ineffective when personnel was not present. Mr. Nichols pointed out radar guns were utilized as part of the program, and noted he believed the score in the 85th percentile had been taken after that and other measures had been in place. There were still speeds of up to almost 40 mph on the road because it was a long road without many curves.

Mayor McDavid asked what the 85th percentile at 39 mph meant. Mr. Nichols replied it meant 85 percent of people were traveling at 39 mph on that road. He explained some people were going at higher or lower speeds, but 39 mph was the 85th percentile average.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Curt Cunningham, 3807 Triple Crown Drive, commented that he had lived at his residence for almost 11 years and had walked his along Derby Ridge Drive, between Blue Ridge Road and Smiley Lane, nearly every day, and to his knowledge no one had ever been run over and a police radar had never been set up on the road. He stated he was concerned this traffic calming project would damage the undercarriage of vehicles and would require citizens that abided by the speed limit to replace the brakes on their vehicles more frequently,

and noted those costs had not been considered in the study. He felt if this speed bump was like the one on Rain Forest Parkway, between Range Line Street and Providence Road, people would be unable to negotiate it at 25 mph and would have to brake and slow to about 10 mph in order to prevent damage to their vehicles. He also did not believe the City had taken into consideration the damage that would occur when snowplows plowed the road, and pointed out the City had only recently repaired a curb that had been damaged by snowplows on Providence Road at the bridge at Bear Creek eight months ago. He noted any speed bump damaged by a snowplow would need to be repaired.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, asked for the classification of this road. Mr. Glascock replied it was a 38-foot collector street. Mr. Clark stated he was supportive of traffic calming on residential neighborhood streets, but was not supportive of traffic calming in terms of speed bumps, etc. on collector or arterial streets. He suggested staff look at other options as this was not a typical neighborhood street.

Matthew Foulkes, 3404 Derby Ridge Drive, stated his residence was near the corner of Blue Ridge Road and Derby Ridge Road, and that he was very much in support of this measure as he watched cars travel by his house at over 40 mph every day. He felt this proposal was great because there was a lot of cut-through traffic from Blue Ridge Road to the Phillips 66 gas station. He understood there were concerns with regard to slowing down vehicles in terms of damage, but thought that was the point since vehicles were currently traveling too fast on this road that had a lot of kids and a school. He noted the traffic patterns had changed immensely over the last ten years, and many people used Derby Ridge Road to get to other neighborhoods. He commented that there was not an ideal solution, and that this was a good solution. He urged the Council to move forward with this project.

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

Ms. Hoppe asked if these would be speed tables, speed humps, or speed bumps, and for a description. Mr. Nichols replied these would be speed humps. He explained speed tables had long tops and were generally placed at intersections and at pedestrian crossings, and speed humps were placed at locations in between streets. Ms. Hoppe asked for the length and height of these speed humps. Mr. Nichols replied they were generally six feet long with about an eight inch rise. Mr. Glascock noted the speed humps were not flat. Ms. Hoppe asked if speed humps created problems in terms of snowplows. Mr. Nichols replied no.

Mr. Glascock pointed out Derby Ridge Road had been built before the City stopped allowing driveways on collector streets, so it had many driveways and operated more as a residential street than a collector street, and was the reason staff felt speed humps would be appropriate.

Mr. Nichols explained the rating matrix accounted for traffic volumes and speeds, the number of pedestrians, whether there was a nearby school, if it was a bike route, and the number of collisions, and some of those categories had high rankings for this particular road. Ms. Nauser asked for clarification regarding the rankings. Mr. Nichols replied this road ranked the highest out of the 45 roads reviewed.

Mr. Thomas asked if the speed humps were designed for a particular speed as he wanted to address the concern of vehicles needing to slow down to 10 mph. Mr. Nichols replied he believed the speed humps were signed at 15 mph.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she lived on a street with speed bumps, and people had still been traveling fast when they were first installed, so larger humps were then installed to reduce the speed. She believed the speed bumps had been beneficial as cars now traveled much slower, and noted she was excited to see the City moving forward with traffic calming on other streets where it was needed.

Mr. Skala asked for the number of people that had attended the interested parties meeting. Mr. Nichols replied he thought there had been roughly 17 people at the meeting. Mr. Skala asked if these speed humps were the same as the ones on Upland Creek Road as it was a collector street with cut-through traffic. Mr. Nichols replied yes, and noted the City had a standard. Mr. Skala stated he was inclined to support this proposal.

Mr. Trapp explained there had been two interested parties meetings, and the first was essentially a listening session for staff. He noted he had suggested street trees since research had showed lowering sight lines would prevent many of the issues that had been raised, to include vehicle damage, but he was the only one that had seemed supportive of that idea. Many of the others wanted speed humps. He pointed out speeding on Derby Ridge Drive was a huge problem and had been the single biggest issue for that neighborhood when he had run as a candidate for the Second Ward. He believed a continued police presence was important as well, not only in terms of keeping speeds down, but also with regard to crime as that area had a higher property crime rate. He stated he appreciated staff using science and evidence to examine traffic calming projects, and noted he was not surprised this had been ranked the highest. He agreed speed humps were an inconvenience for those that traveled on Derby Ridge Drive, but believed people would be in their front yards more often if traffic was slower, which in turn would result in more eyes on the street and potentially an impact on property crime since it was a highly populated area. He stated he would support this proposal as many of the neighbors were in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid commented that he believed having a police officer on this road once a week for a few months would change behavior, but understood that was not an option since the City did not have enough police officers at this time, and because staff did not feel it was a successful option.

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing staff to move forward with the construction of speed humps on Derby Ridge Drive, between Smiley Lane and Brown School Road and between Blue Ridge Road and Smiley Lane. The motion was seconded by Ms. Chadwick and approved unanimously by voice vote.

R12-15 Reserving funding and designating Columbia Missouri Community Housing Development Organization as a Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO); approving an amendment to the FY 2014 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds; authorizing CDBG and HOME agreements with Phoenix Programs, Inc. and the Housing Authority of the City of Columbia; authorizing amendments to CDBG agreements with Services for Independent Living, Job Point and Reality House Inc.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

The vote on R12-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSTAINING: TRAPP. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B380-14 Rezoning property located on the southeast corner of Route K and Old Plank Road from R-1 to PUD-4; approving the statement of intent; approving the PUD Plan for Cobblestone Cottages.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Chadwick asked for clarification regarding the piece of property that would be rezoned tonight. Mr. Teddy described the particular piece of property that would be rezoned using a diagram from the presentation.

Ms. Chadwick asked for clarification regarding the open space required. She explained she was concerned with clear-cutting and wanted to maintain as much of the old growth as possible. She asked if only five percent would be maintained as she believed 25 percent was required. Mr. Teddy replied 20 percent was required, and most of it would consist of installed landscape. He noted no trees were required for R-1 zoning, but thought 6-9 trees would be planted for this PUD. He thought the modest numbers were due to the fact it was a mostly open tract right now. The City required an explanation of the overall percentage of open space in terms of how much of the existing cover would be maintained, etc. He noted it appeared there was a wooded area in the southwest corner, which would be away from the planned building footprint. Ms. Chadwick asked why the applicant was only maintaining five percent of the existing vegetation. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know and suggested the applicant address that question. He noted the plan actually had about 60 percent pervious cover, but most of it would be in the form of installed landscape.

Ms. Chadwick asked if this was the same piece of property they had discussed as including a park back in July. Ms. Nauser replied no, and explained the area they had discussed for a potential park was off of High Point Lane and closer to the other end. This property was directly across from the Cascades and Sinclair Road, and was essentially an open field with a few dispersed trees. She understood it would be difficult to save the sparse trees, and noted most of the trees along the perimeter would be saved by the developer.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with offices at 2608 N. Stadium Boulevard, explained the statement of intent and the PUD plan were two different items. The statement of intent provided for the minimum standards associated with the zoning, and it was the same as the statement of intent that had been presented for the original rezoning in July. He noted they were proposing 20 percent in landscaping as a minimum, and five percent of that would involve native preservation. In this instance, they would exceed the five percent. He pointed out there was not a regulated climax forest on this PUD site, but they wanted to preserve the trees along the south property line. He explained the minimum landscaping requirement was

20 percent, but the PUD plan they had presented tonight showed about 66 percent in landscaping so it would far exceed the minimums. Ms. Chadwick understood the minimum landscaping was about 60 percent based on the plan. Mr. Crockett stated it was at about 66 percent.

Ms. Nauser asked if a stream or ravine ran through this property. Mr. Crockett replied there was a regulated waterway. Ms. Nauser understood it would be subject to the 100-foot stream buffer and there would not be any disturbance along that creek. Mr. Crockett stated that was correct.

Mr. Crockett commented that there was discussion about the Parks and Recreation Department acquiring some land for a 100-acre park to the southeast of this development, and those discussions were still taking place. He pointed out the original thought for the PUD was for a multi-family structure, but the owner was now considering single-family detached structures, which would require more area. He noted they were not asking for additional units with the change.

Ms. Hoppe explained it was difficult to read the plans in the packet and asked that they be in a format that could be enlarged so they could see the percentages. Ms. Chadwick noted it was fuzzy when zoomed. Mr. Teddy stated he would look to see if they could do something to make the text portions more legible.

Mr. Skala commented that although this would be rezoned from R-1 to PUD, it was essentially the same density, and noted he was inclined to support it because he thought it was appropriate for the property. He explained he was always weary about landscape issues, but thought the owner appreciated the value of those trees to the property, and stated he would support this proposal.

Mr. Thomas understood one of the goals of the revisions to the zoning code was to reduce the number of planned unit developments by creating categories, and asked how a situation like this would be different. Mr. Teddy replied he thought there would be some bonus provisions, and provided an example of a bonus provision that would allow a developer to seek 20 percent more in density as a trade-off for increased environmental preservation. He explained the City currently had an open-ended structure whereby they had the means to allow for a creative development, but did not have a system of standards that would tell someone when something was considered a good development. He pointed out the open space percentage provision was a good example as it did not establish an expectation. The current code only required the developer to tell the City how much open space would be set aside. He thought situations like that needed to be refined as part of the zoning code revisions.

Mr. Thomas understood one reason developers wanted a PUD zoning was for greater density than would be allowed under R-1 zoning. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood the revisions to the zoning codes would allow for trade-offs in the R-1 zoning district. Mr. Teddy noted they had received some critical comments with regard to attached types of housing in the R-1 zoning district, so they would have to work through those issues, but it was a way to allow for something like a PUD without the long and involved PUD process.

Mr. Skala understood there could be incentives for higher densities in the future, and asked if that meant this developer could negotiate for a higher density in the future since this property had an open space percentage of higher than 60 percent. Mr. Thomas replied he thought this was denser than was allowed in R-1. Mr. Teddy stated the character of this site was not the best example since it had some sensitive environmental features associated with it. He thought it would be more appropriate when discussing a property that had a difficult terrain. Mr. Skala understood this proposal had about the same density as would be allowed with R-1 zoning. Mr. Teddy explained there was a theoretical density to R-1 zoning where a lot of factors had to be met to maximize density.

B380-14 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:

B389-14 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish a youth advisory council.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked who had volunteered to be the staff liaison. Mr. Matthes replied Heather Cole.

Mr. Skala understood this was on the agenda for the upcoming City/County/School Board meeting, and asked for clarification. Ms. Hoppe replied she had asked for it to be put on the agenda so the City could provide a report to the other entities. She noted the idea had initially been raised at a City/County/School Board meeting, and that she and Mr. Thomas has worked with School Board Members Tom Rose and Darin Preis and some high school counselors. In addition, Mr. Matthes had met with Sloane Scott, who had independently been working on the idea of a youth advisory council. As a result, they had all joined together to work towards the establishment of this youth advisory council.

Sloane Scott stated she was a junior at Battle High School and thanked Council for taking the time to consider the establishment of a youth advisory council. She commented that three years ago she was put into an Extended Educational Experiences (EEE) classroom with brilliantly gifted peers who had many ideas that were not taken seriously by adults, and as a result, her EEE teacher, Mr. Leuchtmann, inspired her to create a youth advisory council in Columbia. The Future Problem Solvers team of which she was a member, had collaborated with the Youth Community Coalition to host a youth summit and other meetings to discuss the establishment of the youth advisory council. She believed they could create a sustainable and effective group of students that could bring a new perspective to Columbia through the youth advisory council.

Becky Markt explained she was the Director of the Youth Community Coalition and noted she had witnessed the hard work of those poised to participate in the youth advisory council if established. She stated their talents and creativity in organizing the group to be ready to serve had been impressive and noted she was confident the work already expended would establish an effective and sustainable group for years to come. She explained this group would provide a voice for Columbia's youth on matters before the Council as some of

those matters significantly impacted the youth. She believed their perspective as a part of the overall conversation would be a positive for the Council and the community. She noted the youth that were able to participate would receive a one-of-a-kind experience that would shape them as leaders. She commented that as civics education became less prevalent, opportunities to learn how government worked would give participants an advantage. It would also send a clear message to all youth that their views mattered. She stated she believed this was good for the kids, which in turn meant it was good for everyone.

Matt Leuchtmann stated he was the EEE or Gifted Education Specialist for Battle High School and the Future Problem Solvers coach, and noted the solutions these students developed were phenomenal. Their insight and perspectives were not tainted by pessimism or reality, which brought a freshness of ideas. He stated the Columbia Public School District was available to work with the City as they had dedicated themselves to this idea and would follow it through. He urged the Council to create this youth advisory council.

Mayor McDavid thanked Ms. Hoppe and Mr. Thomas for their work in moving this proposal forward.

Ms. Hoppe encouraged the youth to apply to be on the youth advisory council as there would be 15-20 spots. She noted the applicants would have to fill out a formal city application, but it would be beneficial to have the previous applications completed as part of the Youth Summit as well. She asked when the next round of vacancies would be posted as she wanted to appoint members as soon as possible. Ms. Amin replied staff would advertise board and commission vacancies after the January 20, 2015 council meeting and appointments could be made in February. She noted applicants could go ahead and apply now without waiting for the vacancies to be posted. Ms. Hoppe understood the youth could apply through the City's website if the ordinance passed. She thanked everyone who had worked on this over the past year, to include the Youth Community Coalition, Ms. Scott, Mr. Leuchtmann, the Columbia Public School counselors, etc. as she believed this would bring important ideas from the youth to the City.

Mr. Skala thanked Ms. Hoppe and Mr. Thomas for taking the initiative to see this through as he believed an inclusionary process of encouraging youth to become future leaders was important. He stated he would enthusiastically support this proposal.

Ms. Nauser noted this concept had been discussed years ago, so she appreciated the work of Ms. Hoppe and Mr. Thomas in moving it forward. She thought it was important for the youth in the community to be given the opportunity to be involved and have a voice. She stated she looked forward to seeing this committee grow and prosper, and for the great ideas that would result from it. She noted Ms. Scott had been a great representative of Columbia at the National League of Cities conference, and thanked her for her hard work.

Mr. Thomas commented that his experience working in youth advocacy for a number of years, meeting the youth commissioners from other cities at two National League of Cities conferences, and the work of Ms. Scott and several other students interested in participating in local government made him certain this commission would have a positive impact on the decision making process, and noted he would enthusiastically support this ordinance.

B389-14 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:

B391-14 Authorizing a school resource officer agreement with the Columbia School District.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes and Chief Burton provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked how often the roles and responsibilities of the school resource officers (SROs) were reviewed. She explained she was concerned the schools were using the SROs as additional staff to implement their disciplinary issues and wondered if the community would be better served if the officers were out in the community. Chief Burton stated they were careful to ensure the schools understood the police officers had to take action in certain situations, and to his knowledge the individual relationship of the SRO and the school administration was good.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was also bothered by the cost share situation. She understood that for many years the schools did not contribute financially, but that there was now a 50-50 cost share. She felt they were using City staff on a full time basis for their issues. She understood there might be some law violations, but felt for the most part they were dealing with disciplinary issues and offenses that did not involve breaking the law. As a result, she wanted to see the School District take on a higher financial responsibility for the SROs. She reiterated she thought the community might be better served with these officers on the streets.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed the SRO concept was a form of proactive community policing in that the SROs educated children and prevented crime.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought they should be concerned about who paid and how much, but understood the benefit of a police officer in the school in terms of the exchange between students, the Police Department, and the community at-large. As a result, he believed the 50-50 cost share was reasonable at this time.

Ms. Hoppe stated she had attended a mobile workshop on youth violence in Seattle a few years ago, and one aspect of their program was to separate the law enforcement function of officers from their interactions with students at school functions as they felt that was valuable. She suggested the City look at that model and other models to determine the most effective way to approach this in the future.

Chief Burton explained they found the number of calls for service generated at the larger schools was high, and the presence of an SRO in the school helped deter some activity. He stated he did not believe this was a bad deal for the City now that the School District was paying 50 percent of the cost of the SRO.

B391-14 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:

B392-14 Appropriating federal forfeiture funds for the purchase of a patrol vehicle and associated equipment for the Police Department.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Chief Burton provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked about the flow of these funds. He understood this was not money placed in an account when found by police officers that were making arrests. Chief Burton stated that was correct. He explained some people felt forfeiture funds were supposed to go to the schools, but that only applied to state forfeiture funds. He pointed out that for money seized as a part of a non-federally related arrest made, a recommendation could be made to the prosecutor, who ultimately decided whether to seek forfeiture, but noted the City rarely made the recommendation to seek forfeiture. He stated it would have to be an extreme situation. He explained this money came from joint operations with the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the money was split amongst the participating agencies if determined to be ill-received gains resulting from criminal activity. He noted there was a link on the Police Department's website that listed everything purchased with forfeiture funds for the past five years, and it equaled \$349,617.

Mr. Matthes explained there was a difference between this and civil asset forfeiture, and noted the City did not participate in civil forfeiture. It only participated in criminal forfeiture so a crime must have been committed. Chief Burton stated that was correct. He explained there were two kinds of forfeiture, and administrative forfeitures came about in extreme cases. The vast majority of forfeitures went before the federal magistrate who decided what had been gained by illegal activity and whether to award it. He noted there was an equitable sharing agreement amongst the agencies involved if forfeiture funds were awarded, and the funds could only be used for certain law enforcement activities or items. He pointed out the ordinances approved by Council involving purchases with forfeiture funds listed the items or services being purchased.

Mr. Thomas asked Chief Burton if he had indicated all or most of the forfeiture funds received had come from drug-related crime. Chief Burton replied it was usually drug-related.

Mr. Thomas asked if the City had an internal policy in terms of how federal forfeiture money was spent or if it was based on what they felt was most important. Chief Burton replied it was one-time money, so they reviewed what could be purchased with those one-time funds. He noted they never knew if or when they would receive forfeiture funds. In addition, they were not allowed to budget for it by law, and there was no guarantee of receipt, even if they applied for the forfeiture funds. He thought they averaged about \$60,000-\$100,000 per year.

Ms. Nauser asked how the federal government decided which police department received funding. She wondered if there was a bidding process, if it had to be requested for by the department, or if they were randomly chosen. Chief Burton replied the department would have had to have assisted in the investigation in order to receive the funds. He noted the City had an officer assigned full-time to the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Ms. Nauser commented that the distinction between whether the funds were a result of a criminal or civil forfeiture was not clear in the reports to Council, and asked that this distinction be made in the future. She understood Chief Burton had indicated the City did not

participate in civil forfeitures, and asked if other communities in Missouri participated in them. Chief Burton replied he believed it was done by other communities. Mr. Matthes stated they would clarify the type of forfeiture involved in the future.

Mr. Skala asked if these funds were ever comingled. Chief Burton replied they had to keep them separate. He pointed out the website listed the rules they had to follow as well.

B392-14 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:

B393-14 Appropriating federal forfeiture funds for the purchase of flashlights for the Police Department.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Chief Burton provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if they City still had to purchase batteries. Chief Burton replied yes, and explained they were not as expensive as what they had to purchase for the older flashlights.

B393-14 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:

B394-14 Accepting a grant from the United States Food and Drug Administration for the Boone County voluntary national retail food regulatory program standards project; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Browning provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B394-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B394-14, 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:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

B379-14 Rezoning property located on the south side of Ash Street and approximately 400 feet east of Fairview Road from O-1 to O-P; changing the uses allowed on O-P zoned property located on the south side of Ash Street and east of Fairview Road; approving the statement of intent; approving the MBS South Site Development O-P Development Plan.

B381-14 Approving the Final Plat of Creeks Edge, Plat No. 2 located on the north and south sides of Sawgrass Drive and west of Scott Boulevard, authorizing a performance contract.

B382-14 Authorizing construction of sidewalk improvements along the east side of Bernadette Drive between Ash Street and Tiger Lane; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

- B383-14 Authorizing an application to Boone Electric Cooperative and agreement for electric service with Boone Electric Cooperative as it relates to service for the sanitary sewer pump station serving Parkside Estates Subdivision.
- B384-14 Authorizing a Right of Use Permit with 1013 Walnut, LLC for construction, operation and maintenance of a storm sewer line within a portion of the alley right-of-way located north of Walnut Street, between Tenth Street and Orr Street.
- B385-14 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to utility service fees.
- B386-14 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B387-14 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri to transfer radio site generators purchased with Missouri State Homeland Security grant funds and used by the Public Safety Joint Communications agency to county ownership; authorizing the transfer of vehicles used by the Public Safety Joint Communications agency to Boone County, Missouri.
- B388-14 Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget to add and delete a position in the Finance Department – Accounting Division.
- B390-14 Authorizing renewal of provisions pertaining to the operation of the Columbia Fire Department and conditions of employment of the Columbia Fire Department personnel.
- B395-14 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Cape Girardeau County Public Health Center Rural Health Clinic and the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services relating to deputizing and oversight of local public health agencies to provide vaccines for underinsured children.
- B396-14 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for the use of Children’s Services Funds (CSF) for the expansion of Teen Outreach Program (TOP) services; appropriating funds.
- B397-14 Authorizing an agreement for purchase of services with Boone County, Missouri for the use of Children’s Services Funds (CSF) for the expansion of the Healthy Families America program; appropriating funds; amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget to add a position in the Public Health and Human Services Department – Human Services Division.
- R1-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of the Timberhill Street connector to the Hominy Creek Trail.
- R2-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of renovations to the exterior of the Thomas G. Walton Building.
- R3-15 Authorizing an educational affiliation agreement with Maryville University to provide health clinical experience and instruction for nursing students.
- R4-15 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with TREKK Design Group for the development of a hydraulic model of the proposed Lower Southwest Outfall Relief Sewer as it relates to sanitary sewer overflows along the County House Branch watershed.
- R5-15 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Engineering Surveys and Services, LLC for the Peachtree connector and water quality basin project.
- R6-15 Authorizing agreements for professional engineering services with Engineering Surveys and Services, LLC for construction materials testing and geotechnical and subsurface exploration services.

- R7-15 Authorizing an operations agreement with Ragtag Programming for Film and Media Art for the 2015 True False Film Festival.
- R8-15 Adopting legislative tracking priorities for the 2015 federal and state legislative sessions.
- R9-15 Adopting a list of high priority improvement projects; requesting federal assistance in funding these projects.
- R10-15 Approving the issuance of bonds by the Housing Authority of the City of Columbia, Missouri for the Patriot Place – Apartments for Veterans and Stuart Parker and Paquin Tower Apartments projects.

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

R11-15 Authorizing the notice of the sale of Sewerage System Revenue Bonds, Series 2015.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes and Mr. Blattel provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood there was language that indicated a change could no longer occur at a certain point in the process and asked when changes could no longer be made. Ms. Thompson replied she believed the Council would make a commitment with approval of this resolution tonight because the Council would approve the preliminary official statement by this resolution, and that preliminary official statement would then be provided to the people that would purchase the bonds as the City's commitment of how those funds would be used to the extent the money was available in terms of projects coming in at or below budget. She stated the Council could not vary from this list significantly. She reiterated that some projects might not be built if there were not enough funds to build all of the projects, but pointed out they could not alter the list significantly by inserting and deleting projects.

Mr. Skala asked why the language regarding changes had been included if that was the case. Ms. Thompson replied it was because they needed to have some flexibility since they did not know how much each project would ultimately cost. She explained \$30 million worth of projects could not be funded with only \$20 million. The project list was subject to change, but not in the sense that a totally new project could be included with the deletion of an existing project on the list. Mr. Blattel pointed out some city-wide projects were included, and projects within those city-wide projects had not been specifically identified so there was some flexibility there. He stated Ms. Thompson was speaking of the twelve projects that were individually listed. Mr. Matthes noted the Henderson Branch sewer project was one of the twelve projects, so the project would have to be completed if the Council approved this resolution tonight. It did not, however, preclude them from negotiating a three-party approach to funding the project.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Council would have the opportunity disapprove the funding of the Henderson Branch sewer project if the three-party deal was not accomplished. Mr.

Matthes replied he thought the Council had flexibility as long as the bondholders were paid back. Mr. Skala stated he thought Ms. Thompson had indicated they did not have that flexibility. Mr. Matthes explained the Council could not bond knowing they would not complete the project as they had to act in good faith. There was flexibility for events that might occur after the fact that would affect the completion of the projects. Ms. Thompson recommended the removal of any project from the list the Council knew it would not do prior to the official statement being published and sent to bondholders because they had to act in good faith.

Mr. Skala commented that he was happy the Boone County Sewer District wanted to participate in the Henderson Branch project, and agreed the City should participate to some degree, but also believed this needed to be a true public/private partnership in which there was a substantial private contribution since it involved an area outside of the urban service area. In addition, he thought this needed to be addressed prior to approving this resolution. He commented that it was not that he did not want to build the Henderson Branch extension. He just did not want to fund it solely with taxpayer money, and believed some amount of private contribution was needed. He suggested this issue be tabled to the March 2, 2015 Council Meeting so the Council could be made aware of the funding agreement prior to voting on it. He stated he could not support this otherwise. Mr. Matthes understood he wanted more assurance with regard to the negotiations of the Henderson Branch project prior to moving forward. Mr. Skala stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed a lot of jobs would be at stake if the Henderson Branch project was not completed because MidwayUSA was the fastest growing company in the Columbia area. He noted he was concerned because this company, which employed about 500 people, had been recruited by Texas and Kansas City. He understood the company planned to triple its customer base by 2020, which would result in an increase in tax revenues to the City by 50 percent. He pointed out the Council voted on a list that included this project at its August 5, 2013 meeting, and the voters subsequently voted in favor of it. Mr. Skala stated the actual language on the ballot did not include specific projects. Mayor McDavid suggested the Council review the August 5, 2013 Council Meeting materials as the projects were listed in those materials.

Mayor McDavid noted he was also concerned by the requirement of an exaction, and believed the Henderson Branch sewer project would result in a financial windfall for the City. He understood the Midway Truck Stop would contribute about \$158,000 to the general fund per year in PILOT funds, usage fees, and taxes. He also understood MidwayUSA was projected earn \$17 million in sales within the State of Missouri by 2020, which meant the City would receive two percent of those sales in addition to other fees and taxes. He believed this project would pay for itself in about four years.

Mr. Thomas pointed out City would not receive the sales tax by just building the sewer as the property would need to be annexed. Mayor McDavid agreed and noted MidwayUSA would sign an annexation agreement as part of the deal. In addition, he thought they needed to assure annexation occurred. He stated he believed it would be a historic blunder to exclude this sewer project.

Mr. Thomas commented that he believed the three-way split in terms of funding the project was a step in the right direction in terms of recognizing the extra costs associated with serving new development outside of the city limits. He understood one of the conclusions of *Columbia Imagined* was for developers to pay more for areas served that were outside of the urban service area, and suggested they wait to approve the sale of these bonds until they knew what kind of contribution would be provided by the private sector.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed a decision should be delayed as they did not have all of the information necessary to make a decision tonight. She thought they needed to know all of the associated costs. She believed a third-party contribution would be valuable and set a good precedent, and felt it would be best to delay a decision until they had all of the information.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed this was a continuation of the ballot process as the Henderson Branch had been discussed as a project that would be funded if the ballot issue was approved. He noted there were other projects caught in this as this bond involved more than the Henderson Branch sewer project, and by delaying this, he thought there might be more uncertainty in terms of bond ratings as they were impacted by world events that could not be predicted. He did not believe creating an increased risk was in the best interest of the citizens, and suggested they move forward with the idea that their intent was tempered with the idea of a partnership.

Mr. Skala stated he believed the idea of the urban service area was to incentivize development within the city with taxpayer funds, and not to incentivize development outside of the urban service area with taxpayer funds unless augmented by other funding. He wanted resolution with regard to the other funding prior to moving forward with a decision.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table R11-15 to the March 2, 2015 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mayor McDavid stated he wanted to move forward as he was concerned with the potential of losing hundreds of jobs and believed not moving forward would violate a promise made to the citizens of Columbia. He also noted he felt this project would pay for itself many times over.

Ms. Chadwick commented that the adoption of this resolution did not preclude them from partnering with private entities on the sewer extension project, and noted she was concerned about further delays. She stated she would likely not support tabling this issue as it did not prevent any negotiation with MidwayUSA. She understood sales in Missouri totaled \$11 million this past year, and the City did not receive any sales tax on those sales at this time. She believed the City could receive about \$260,000 per year at the current sales level if the property was annexed, and did not think any other property annexed would result in that amount of money. She reiterated she was not in favor of tabling this at this time.

Mr. Skala commented that he was only asking for a few week respite to allow negotiations to determine what the private entities that were involved felt was fair in terms of a public/private partnership. Without some type of private contribution, it would be a totally public expense, which he did not believe was acceptable in terms of the Comprehensive Plan and the urban service area.

Ms. Hoppe understood staff had indicated there would not be an issue with tabling this item for a month, so she believed it was reasonable to do so. Ms. Thompson pointed out there was not a legal issue in tabling this item, but she did not know if there were timing issues associated with the completion of projects or financial risks relative to interest rates in the bond market.

Mr. Skala understood there might be some jeopardy in terms of promising something and changing it later. Ms. Thompson stated a legal issue would be created if the Council committed to a project through the official statement they did not intend to build. They needed to be certain as to whether they would proceed with the projects regardless of any partnership.

Ms. Nauser commented that she did not recall ever specifically naming projects on the ballot when asking for voter approval. There had been discussions and presentations to the community indicating what projects would be built with the approval of the bonds, but those projects had not been listed on the ballot. She stated she felt the public discussion had occurred when the issue was discussed at the Council Meeting. In addition, they had presented these projects when talking to civic groups and others as ones that would be completed if the citizens voted in favor of the ballot issue. As a result, she believed it would be disingenuous to now change those projects. She noted she would not support tabling this issue, and planned to support proceeding with these projects that would help protect the environment. She stated the Henderson Branch project would also help keep jobs in the community and result in additional sales taxes for the City.

Mayor McDavid noted the Comprehensive Plan had indicated that annexation and the extension of services to land outside of the urban service area should be considered only in situations where it could be proven that the City's return on its capital investments would result in a net fiscal gain, and should include reasonable consideration for long-term public infrastructure and service maintenance costs. He believed the Henderson Branch project would result in a gain. Mr. Skala stated he was not sure that case had been made.

Ms. Hoppe asked Mr. Blattel if he had financial concerns with tabling this issue tonight. Mr. Blattel replied he was not concerned with a tabling tonight, but noted there would be a problem if the Council voted in favor of the sale of the bonds tonight and then decided to table the issuance of the bonds at the next meeting. He thought that would affect the City's standing in the marketplace in terms of good faith. Mr. Matthes noted the main risk financially was that they could not predict the bond market and associated interest rates so they would not know if the interest rates would be higher or lower in March if the Council decided to proceed then.

Mr. Trapp commented that he was supportive of the project, but thought it might be riskier to not table this item after hearing the discussion.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Thomas to table R11-15 to the March 2, 2015 Council Meeting was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser, Mayor McDavid, and Mr. Trapp voting against it.

Ms. Thompson suggested the Council table B1-15 after it was introduced and given first reading, so the second reading did not occur until the March 16, 2015 Council Meeting. Ms. Amin suggested the motion to table be made during council comments.

R13-15 Calling a special election to be held on Tuesday, April 7, 2015 to elect a council member for Ward 1 to fill the remainder of the unexpired term.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she had campaigned through one semester of graduate school and had no intention of campaigning through another semester due to the recall petition effort. She explained she would graduate this year with a Master's in Public Health, and planned to pursue a PhD in Public Health as well, which might require her to leave Columbia in August. As a result, she did not think it was wise to utilize City resources to hold a recall election in April when she might resign in August. She noted every decision made by the Council required the support of the majority, so no decision she made was the sole reason a particular path was chosen, and she stated she stood firmly behind every decision made. She explained her resignation, effective at noon tomorrow, would allow the Council to take action tonight to hold a special election for the Ward 1 Council Member position in April. If the recall had been successful, the First Ward would have been unrepresented from April to August. Her resignation and this action would allow for a shorter period of time without representation. She commented that while serving on the Council was an honor, her family and personal career were more important to her. She noted this was a volunteer position with a \$6,000 per year stipend that took a lot of time, but it was also a position of power, which she had used to uphold the laws in place and to not put into place laws that could not be upheld despite certain groups of citizens being angry with her decisions. She commented that she was ready to go back into the community as one of the 90 percent of people that were happy with Columbia, but unaware of the day-to-day dealings, and after working with City staff and the City Council for this short period of time, she knew the City had great individuals guiding Columbia in the right direction.

Shawn De Voudrey, 8708 N. Cedar Court, thanked Ms. Chadwick for resigning.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, asked if the Charter, Code of Ordinances, or Missouri State Statutes called for using a resolution to call a special election. Ms. Thompson replied Section 119 of the Columbia City Charter required a resolution to be prepared for the Council to consider when calling a special election for this situation.

Mr. Skala commented that he appreciated Ms. Chadwick's grace in recognizing and providing an opportunity for someone else to succeed her, and thanked her for that magnanimous gesture.

Ms. Nauser stated that although they did not always agree, she believed Ms. Chadwick had represented the First Ward with passion. She noted they could not please every citizen in the community, and thanked Ms. Chadwick for her service to Columbia. She wished her well on her future endeavors.

Ms. Hoppe commented that although they disagreed on some crucial issues, she appreciated Ms. Chadwick's diligence, especially with regard to the items they had worked on together and for her leadership on the smoking ordinances. She stated she had hoped Ms. Chadwick would have served through April, but understood her reasons for resigning now, and noted they would carry on with six council members.

Mr. Trapp stated it was tough to serve in the First Ward as it had taken a large personal toll on former Council Member Fred Schmidt as well. He noted he had seen a sincere desire to serve and do right by the First Ward by both Mr. Schmidt and Ms. Chadwick. He thought it was unfortunate that the process was personally painful, and encouraged everyone to carry on with a certain amount of decorum as comments were sometimes hurtful.

Mayor McDavid commented that Ms. Chadwick had been very engaged from the start, and noted that although they were on opposite sides of many votes, they had also come together on some important votes. He stated he had admired her position on the marijuana ordinance as she had taken into consideration the recommendation of the Superintendent of the Columbia Public School District, the Board of Health, and the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission, and on the Opus development. He noted she was unfortunately the swing vote many times, but had always done her diligence and was thoughtful in those decisions. He believed Columbia was a better place because Ms. Chadwick had served on the City Council, and wished her the best in her future endeavors.

Mr. Thomas stated it had been a pleasure to serve with Ms. Chadwick, and noted he hated to see her go. He wished her the greatest of successes in her studies and future career.

Ms. Thompson explained Ms. Chadwick had resigned, and this particular resolution would call for a special election to be held on April 7, 2015 for her replacement. She noted Columbia had a nominating petition process for council candidates, and this resolution also set the time frame for that process. She stated nominating petitions could be submitted no sooner than 8:00 a.m. tomorrow and no later than 5:00 p.m. on February 10, 2015, and that the petition packets could be picked up at the City Clerk's Office. In addition, she pointed out the nominating petitions needed to be signed by at least 50 registered voters that lived within the First Ward, and not more than 75 signatures could be submitted so they had to be good, quality signatures. She noted the time frame to submit petitions would be different for Ward 1 council candidates than it was for Ward 2 and Ward 6 council candidates as the period to accept petitions for Ward 2 and Ward 6 was 5:00 p.m. on January 13, 2015. In addition, this resolution would call for the election of the Ward 1 Council Member for the remainder of the unexpired term, which was approximately two years.

The vote on R13-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

The following bills were introduced by the Mayor unless otherwise indicated, and all were given first reading.

B1-15 **Authorizing the issuance of Sewerage System Revenue Bonds, Series 2015.**

B2-15 **Approving the Final Plat of Bellwood, Plat No. 6 located north of West Broadway, west of North Strawn Road and west of the terminus of McMickle Drive; authorizing a performance contract.**

- B3-15 Approving the Final Plat of The Residences at Old Hawthorne, Plat 2 located north of Route WW and east of Rolling Hills Road.
- B4-15 Approving the Final Plat of Veterans Campus, a Replat of Lots 11 and 17 of Conley and Gordon’s Subdivision, located on the south side of East Business Loop 70, approximately 1,000 feet east of Old Highway 63; authorizing a performance contract.
- B5-15 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to group homes in R-1 zoning districts.
- B6-15 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Ralph C. Powell and Rodney L. and Beverly J. Hayes for property located at 110 Lynn Street.
- B7-15 Authorizing a Contract of Obligation with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources to satisfy financial assurance requirements for proper closure and post-closure care with respect to a permit for operation of a solid waste disposal area.
- B8-15 Authorizing an agreement with Summit Eateries, L.L.C. for the removal of a sign and the installation of a new sign on property located at 206 West Business Loop 70.
- B9-15 Authorizing construction of the Timberhill Street connector to the Hominy Creek Trail; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B10-15 Authorizing the acquisition of an easement for construction of the Timberhill Street connector to the Hominy Creek Trail.
- B11-15 Amending Chapter 5 of the City Code relating to off leash areas for dogs.
- B12-15 Appropriating funds received from donations and miscellaneous revenue to the Parks and Recreation Department.
- B13-15 Authorizing an amendment to the PCS tower agreement with SBA 2012 TC Assets, LLC relating to the lease of City-owned property located at 1808 Parkside Drive.
- B14-15 Appropriating funds to the Law Department for litigation expenses.
- B15-15 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for HIV prevention.
- B16-15 Appropriating funds relating to the construction of repairs and upgrades to the Thomas G. Walton Building.
- B17-15 Calling the municipal election to be held on Tuesday, April 7, 2015 to elect council members for Wards 2 and 6.
- B18-15 Calling a special election on Tuesday, April 7, 2015 relating to the issuance of Water and Electric System Revenue Bonds.
- B19-15 Calling a special election on Tuesday, April 7, 2015 to authorize an increase in monthly stormwater utility charges.
- B20-15 Calling a special election to consider the recall of Council Member Chadwick.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP1-15 Petition to Recall First Ward Council Member Virginia “Ginny” Chadwick Certification.

Mayor McDavid understood this report was now moot as there was no longer any reason to discuss the recall effort due to the resignation of Ms. Chadwick.

REP2-15 COMO Connect Update.

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

Mr. Thomas asked how many shelters would be funded. Mr. Brooks replied the number was dependent on the cost at each site, but he thought they would be able to fund about 30 shelters. If they had to pay for right-of-way, etc., the cost for a particular shelter could increase, which would mean the total number of shelters would be reduced.

Mayor McDavid commented that there were different systems, which created a problem with evaluating the transit system. The core route was currently called COMO Connect and provided people in neighborhoods the opportunity to get to hospitals, work, etc., and the Tiger Line was a shuttle system between parking lots. He noted he did not consider the Tiger Line a part of the transit system as those riders were commuters that drove to parking lots to be shuttled to campus. He wanted to see the COMO Connect ridership grow as those were the true riders of the transit system, and noted he was concerned with the numbers. He believed the fundamental problem was that there was not a demand for transit in this community, and that the trend in ridership was disturbing and needed to be changed. He pointed out he planned to meet with Mr. Thomas to brainstorm for ideas that might help the situation.

Mr. Thomas stated he supported the rerouting of the gold route as had been originally proposed by staff. He agreed the ridership numbers were disappointing and felt only those that had no other choice than to ride the bus utilized the transit system due to the current set up of the City's entire transportation system. Those that had a choice would use alternative means. He commented that many cities had found a way to grow their transit system so people that had a choice also used the bus as part of a multi-modal routine, and noted they needed help to determine how to get to this healthy mix as it allowed for transportation resources to be used more efficiently in the long run. He thought a market analysis was needed along with an understanding of modern trends and a review of the route designs and funding systems. He understood staff was working on a request for proposals (RFP) and noted he and Ms. Hoppe had suggestions for other items to put in the RFP based upon meetings with 2-3 potential consultants. He reiterated there were examples of communities in which a consultant conducted an analysis, had a stakeholder and a public engagement process, and provided planning advice and recommendations, which included funding sustainability, in order to help turn the bus system around. He hoped staff was able to get the RFP out fairly quickly so they could have a serious in-depth analysis of the City's transit system compared to modern approaches and potentially attain an increase in ridership and a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

Mr. Skala understood ridership was up in northeast Columbia, and noted he already had constituents asking him to fight for bus shelter in the area. He understood the number

and location of shelters was not yet known, and would be discussed at a later date. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked how many shelters were needed. Mr. Brooks replied he thought the customers felt a shelter was needed at every stop, but the Council would have to make the final determination based on the ridership data since funding was limited. He noted 20-30 would be needed if they tried to accommodate every connection point. Ms. Nauser understood all of the shelters would be constructed based upon a certain prototype and each would cost about \$11,000. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. Ms. Nauser asked if they could find less costly bus shelters. She did not believe they all needed to be as fancy or ornate as the prototype. She thought the goal of a shelter was to provide some security, a place to get out of inclement weather, and a place to sit, and felt if they wanted people who had a choice to ride the bus system, shelters would need to be provided because those with a choice would not stand in inclement weather to ride the bus. She suggested caution in using only ridership data to determine the location of the bus shelters if the goal was to entice more people to ride the bus.

Ms. Nauser commented that if the private sector was successful in terms of student ridership, they might want to leave it to the private sector to provide the service since the City only had limited funds. Mr. Glascock stated the private sector had more flexibility because they did not have to follow many of the rules the City had to follow, such as accessibility.

Mayor McDavid stated he agreed with Ms. Nauser in that the private sector could solely provide the transit services if the University, the students, and the apartment complexes were all satisfied. He thought the City could then put its resources elsewhere, and provided additional buses in the core routes as an example of where to place additional resources. Mr. Glascock explained the private shuttles were not usually ADA accessible, which was required by the University.

Ms. Nauser suggested looking at public/private partnerships in terms of the bus shelters as that could help with costs. Mr. Glascock stated staff planned to work with property owners for locations and consider allowing advertisements on them.

Ms. Hoppe stated she appreciated the detailed information they were now able to collect as she believed it would be valuable going forward. She also appreciated the change in the gold route, and noted she hoped it would help solve some problems. She understood the City had spent a lot of money constructing shelters throughout the years that had ultimately been abandoned and that the City would soon hire a consultant to review the City's transit system, so she suggested the shelters be located in places where it was most likely the shelters would be used regardless of any future system. She stated she also liked Ms. Nauser's idea of installing some basic shelters and some fancy shelters so the money could be stretched further. She agreed with Mr. Thomas in that a consultant could help improve the system with their expertise and knowledge of other systems and communities so it was more convenient and accessible to those that wanted to use it. While the current ridership numbers were discouraging, she believed there was an interest in public transit in the community, and felt it could be successful if they were able to attain the right design. She understood in talking to some consultants, the loop systems tended to not be as successful

as more direct systems that got people to the places they wanted to go more quickly and easily, so she thought the assistance of a consultant would be beneficial.

Mr. Trapp commented that a lot of the bus riders he knew had found the massive change disruptive, which he believed hurt the numbers. He also noted it was intrinsically difficult to address some issues and that they might have moved the ball in some areas that had not yet shown up in the numbers. He pointed out Columbia was fundamentally a sprawling, low density community, and the transit system would be benefited as the City became more compact and denser. He stated he was supportive of the change in the Second Ward as it made sense. He noted the main expense associated with bus shelters was the pads, and thought they should consider that when discussing the shelter design as the cost difference between a basic design and the prototype was likely not significant.

Ms. Chadwick understood the need to move the gold route, but noted she had some concerns as the students loved the Student Union as their bus stop as it was a place they could go to wait for the bus. Mr. Brooks pointed out there were already a couple of pads with benches on University Avenue where shelters could be located. She thought that should be a priority so they did not lose ridership as this part of the gold route had some of the highest ridership numbers.

Mr. Thomas asked if this changed the City's position with regard to whether Greenway Shuttles could use Rollins Street. Mr. Brooks replied he understood the University had created a commission that was still working through the details. Mr. Glascock noted staff would notify Council when they received the recommendations of that commission. Mr. Thomas asked if the reason the City had not wanted Greenway Shuttles using that street was because it would contribute to delays in the gold route. Mr. Glascock replied that had been one of the reasons.

Mr. Thomas explained one of the transit consultants he had spoken with had indicated the best transit plan was a good land use plan, and thought the consultant reviewing the zoning codes had indicated proposing land use rules around certain transit connection points. He felt the bus routes should be in locations where land use and bus frequencies supported one another.

Mr. Matthes commented that ridership tended to rise when rides were free and would decrease every time there was a change in the system.

Mr. Matthes asked if the agreements the City had with student apartment complexes were included in the COMO Connect numbers or the Tiger Line numbers. Mr. Brooks replied they were included in the COMO Connect numbers. He pointed out three apartment complexes that participated on the black and gold route last year no longer participated, which was a reason for the drop in the numbers. Mr. Matthes asked how many of the 55,000 riders in November were due to those contracts. Mr. Brooks replied he thought about 1,300 bus passes had been sold. Mr. Matthes asked how many times those stops had riders. Mr. Brooks replied he did not know, but thought that information could be provided. Mr. Matthes stated he believed it would be beneficial to have that information because that would help determine what the numbers really were if the upward trend of the private sector handling transit services from apartment complexes to the University continued.

Mr. Matthes noted some fundamental choices had been made with COMO Connect, and that included the ability for people to use the bus system to get back and forth from work and the fact they were in more neighborhoods than they had ever been previously. He thought they could expect increases in ridership as a result of those changes, but reiterated those changes might have caused a decrease in ridership as well since that tended to happen with change.

Mr. Thomas asked if the three apartment complexes that no longer contracted for services with the City had signed with Greenway Shuttles or another private service. Mr. Brooks replied he assumed they had contracted with some private entity, but did not know the details.

REP3-15 2014 Annual Infrastructure Report.

Mr. Matthes and Ms. Buffaloe provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that understanding how the City spent its money was complicated and had been the biggest challenge for him since he was elected to the Council. He believed staff needed to embark on something like this 14-page report in other areas as well, and stated he liked the fact it was simplified in that there was a synopsis on each item. He thought they needed to do a better job of improving the financial literacy for their citizens and managing money in general. He commented that there were citizen groups that wanted another audit because they felt the City had a surplus in funds or was not using it efficiently and effectively. He believed they needed to determine how to articulate current conditions because it had not been done well in the past, and this was an excellent first step.

Mr. Skala commented that he appreciated the interface between this report and public access, particularly with regard to the interactive links. He agreed a multi-page synopsis was difficult to understand and to explain to people, which in turn resulted in a lot of the miscommunication, and felt this was a solid first step in communicating in a way that most people were receptive.

Ms. Hoppe noted the report indicated the Parks and Recreation Department projects were mainly funded through the one-eighth cent park sales tax, but pointed out the City actually had two park sales taxes. One was a permanent sales tax and the other was a sales tax that required a renewal, and those totaled about one-fourth of a cent. She thought it was important to specify whether these projects were funded with the permanent sales tax or the sales tax that needed to be renewed every few years. Mayor McDavid pointed out there was also \$4.5 million from the discretionary general fund that went to the Parks and Recreation Department. Mr. Matthes explained the focus of this report was infrastructure, and it was funded with the renewable tax. The permanent tax funded operations. Ms. Hoppe stated that was the reason she thought it should be specified.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she appreciated the interactive component of this report as well. She thought one thing that was lacking in the report was information regarding infrastructure maintenance, repair, etc. as there was a backlog of projects, which she believed needed to be reflected somewhere so the public was informed of these other needs.

REP4-15 Taxicab and Transportation Network Company Regulations.

Mr. Rehard provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood Uber was still operating, and noted if they were still operating illegally, she would vote against the transportation network ordinance when it came before them again. She did not believe they should tolerate someone coming into the community with a blatant disregard for rules and processes. If they wanted cooperation from her, she expected the same cooperation from them or any other organization. She also thought the City needed to take formal legal action if they were operating illegally.

Mr. Matthes explained a City credit card had previously been used by police officers to issue tickets to Uber drivers, but Uber had now blocked the City's credit card so City staff could no longer see if cars were available on the Uber app. Uber was operating and knew they were violating the law. The only option he felt was left in terms of enforcing the law was through the court system.

Mr. Skala commented that he wanted to see a successful rideshare company in Columbia, but felt that company needed to abide by the rules. The delay in moving forward with a transportation network ordinance was to ensure there was a level playing field. He understood defining a level playing field was arguable, but operating with impunity was not acceptable, especially in terms of trying to evade it by controlling the circumstances under which they were trying to enforce legal jurisdiction. He agreed with the comments of Ms. Nauser.

Ms. Chadwick asked if a motion was needed for the City to take court action. Mr. Matthes replied staff was working on regulations to try to allow them to function while also being fair to the cab companies. He noted an ordinance would come back to Council in a month.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was in favor of Uber operating, but did not appreciate them operating while knowing they were in full violation of the law. Mr. Skala asked what assurance the City had that Uber would follow the rules once they were established. Mr. Matthes replied he had no expectation that Uber would respect any of the regulations the City put forth, which was why the opinion of staff had changed in terms of background checks, etc. Staff did not trust Uber to do the background checks any longer. He noted there would be changes in the proposed ordinance. He stated he would talk with the Law Department staff to determine what could be done, and in the meantime, staff would continue to work on an ordinance they felt was rational to come before the Council next month.

Ms. Thompson explained given the state of technology, the exploration of other enforcement mechanisms was not something they could discuss in a public meeting. The litigation aspects of this would need to be discussed in a closed meeting so Council could be fully advised of its options. She commented that to the extent the City was able to identify violators, they planned to prosecute them. She thought it was important for the public to understand there was no assurance the driver had been adequately screened for the protection of the public or that the driver had insurance coverage in the event of an accident for those vehicles-for-hire.

Ms. Chadwick thought it was clear the Council wanted staff to take every legal action possible to prevent this company from continuing to operate within the city limits.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she was interested in looking at the existing taxi cab stands and their hours, particularly on Cherry Street. She understood enforcement began at 9:00 p.m., but the taxi cab stands were really not used until 11:00 p.m., and felt those spots could be used by the general public for those two hours. She asked how long it might take to report back on that issue. Mr. St. Romaine replied he hoped to have some idea of the objections to regulations the taxi cab companies might have by the end of the week. He understood the taxi stand hours was one complaint as they were currently in place seven days per week from 9:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. He pointed out the taxi stand ordinance was written to address the specific problems of a massive number of patrons on the streets and taxis blocking traffic on downtown streets when bars closed, but agreed that was not a problem at 9:00 p.m. or 10:00 p.m. so there was a potential for modifying the hours and days of enforcement. Ms. Hoppe understood suggested changes might come back to Council next month. Mr. St. Romaine stated the goal was to provide Council a revised transportation network company ordinance and changes to the existing taxi cab ordinance in February.

REP5-15 Citywide Neighborhood Organization.

Mayor McDavid understood this report had been provided for informational purposes, and believed the next step was for the neighborhood associations to determine how they wanted to proceed.

REP6-15 FY14 Volunteer Hours.

Mayor McDavid commented that he was always impressed with the number of people in Columbia that would give their own time to make it a better place.

Ms. Britt provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe asked why the number of hours had declined. Ms. Britt replied that was difficult to pinpoint, but one of the things they often saw was a fluctuation in the number of volunteer hours when there was staff turnover or a change in staff assignments. She explained volunteers shared their time, but it took a good deal of staff time to manage and provide those volunteer opportunities. There were also some variations in the programs offered as some programs had been discontinued due to priority changes or other reasons, and other programs were new. She noted that although they had two years of decline, they previously had six years of increases, so they still had a strong program and would continue to determine how they might be able to increase those numbers in the coming year. Ms. Hoppe commented that it would be helpful to know if there was anything Council could do to help in terms of resources as those volunteer hours were valuable to the City.

REP7-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

REP8-15 Correspondence regarding the Business Loop Community Improvement District.

Mayor McDavid commented that he was an advocate for the formation of the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) and hoped it was successful as it was a part of town people passed to get to the University, and he believed they all felt improvements could

be made to the area. He stated community improvement districts elected to charge more sales tax and the clientele of those businesses within the district elected to pay more, and it was a user fee as the money was retained and used for capital improvements for the area. He understood the issue was that by ordinance the City required a \$15,000 payment from the petitioner to verify 74 signatures, and questioned the appropriateness of that amount for a CID which he felt was important to the City. He recommended the cost solely reflect the cost of staff verifying the signatures, which he did not believe was more than \$1,000.

Mr. Matthes explained the intent of the ordinance was to recover the actual cost, but Council could make an adjustment, and noted he would be supportive of an adjustment if that was the desire of Council.

Ms. Chadwick asked how the \$15,000 cost had been determined. Ms. Thompson replied the ordinance required the expenses be reimbursed by the applicant, and staff reviewed how much it would cost if the City used resources that were available in any other community. She understood Columbia had a different history, but in communities in the Kansas City and St. Louis metro areas, special legal counsel would be hired to verify the signatures, which involved the encumbrance and ownership reports to ensure the ownership information was accurate. This was a part of the due diligence that really needed to be done to ensure the documents for the creation of this district was what was needed and was accurate. In the past in Columbia, staff would set aside time as available and review ownership based upon the Assessor's website, and while they hoped that information was accurate, it was not the same as having a copy of the last deed on every property. The burden was placed on the City in terms of verification, so staff was trying to put the resources in place so that could happen within the required 90 day time frame. She noted this was a more complicated CID than many due to the number of parcels involved. She explained there would also be a negotiation piece in terms of a development agreement between the City and the CID as CIDs took a portion of the sales tax and the property tax available to the City in terms of producing revenues for public services. The estimate received was \$15,000 given the size and scope of the project.

Ms. Nauser asked what had been done with the Downtown CID. Ms. Thompson replied she had not been with the City when that had been submitted, but understood it had been reviewed in-house and ownership and encumbrance reports had not been required. From a legal perspective, she believed ownership and encumbrance reports were needed in order to have the latest and most accurate information on the ownership of a parcel within the district. Mr. Matthes commented that another difference was that the Special Business District existed prior to creating the Downtown CID so they had resources available. In this case, the circumstances were different in that there was a lack of resources.

Ms. Chadwick understood the City would only bill for the cost. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and felt their suggestion was fair. The City could pay for it and keep track of costs, and could be reimbursed after the formation of the district.

Ms. Amin asked what they would do if the petition was found to be invalid. She explained one of the reasons for this ordinance was that there had been situations where the petitions had been determined to be invalid, and provided the attempted Keene Street CID as an example. The City would then not be reimbursed the costs to review the petition.

Ms. Chadwick stated she assumed the petitioners would make it all of the way through the process, and wondered when the reimbursement would be required by since it would take time before they started collecting money based on the formation of the CID.

Ms. Nauser suggested as a compromise for some portion of the cost to be paid up-front. She thought the City wanted to be reimbursed for the work as they had a philosophy of cost recovery. She understood the thought that \$15,000 might be unreasonable, but felt some sort of down payment could be made with the difference being billed later. Mr. Matthes thought it was reasonable to request half of the estimated cost as a down payment.

Ms. Chadwick thought the concern of the applicant was that they did not have any funding right now as they were not currently an entity or collecting any revenues at this time.

Mr. Trapp thought they should consider assuming the risk that it might not pass because of the need for redevelopment and improvements in that area. He believed this area was highly important and noted he viewed the Business Loop as the downtown of the Second Ward even though it was not all officially in the Second Ward. He thought the City could absorb the cost better than a few civic-minded volunteers if there was a miscalculation in the petition and it did not move forward. He commented that the ordinance was appropriate so they did not receive spurious requests, but felt it was worth making a special accommodation if they had that right for larger issues affecting the City.

Mr. Matthes stated he believed this was a perfect use of the council reserve funds. The Council could front the cost, and the applicant could pay back that fund. Mr. Trapp noted he would support that suggestion.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she believed a down payment of half as had been suggested by Ms. Nauser seemed reasonable as well.

Mr. Matthes pointed out there were other expenses, such as advertising and mailings. Mr. Amin explained the petitioner had already provided a deposit for the estimated costs of the notice and mailings. This discussion was solely for the costs associated with the review of the petition since the ordinance discussed those issues separately. They were supposed to have provided the money for the mailings and the public hearings when they submitted the petition, which they had not realized and had provided a day later. Per the ordinance the City was required to provide an estimate for review within two weeks, and within a week of receiving the estimate they were supposed to provide payment, and they were appealing to the Council with regard that payment.

Mayor McDavid asked for a staff recommendation. Mr. Matthes recommended the Council front the cost from the council reserve fund. Staff would keep track of actual costs and bill for it after the work was done. Ms. Hoppe understood the cost would be paid back.

Ms. Chadwick made a motion to use council reserve funds for the costs associated with the review of the Business Loop Community Improvement District petition and to bill the CID for reimbursement of those costs once it was formed and generating revenue, and to bill the representatives of the CID if the petition failed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Terry Nickerson stated he owned a business at 1200 Wilkes Boulevard and thanked Ms. Chadwick for her service to the City. He noted she was the first Council Member he had ever reached out to as he had never had a reason until Uber came to town, and she had listened and provided feedback, which he appreciated. He thanked the Council for representing Columbia well in terms of standing up to Uber.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, thanked Ms. Chadwick for her service to the City.

Mr. Clark commented that he agreed the Business Loop 70 corridor needed to be improved and noted it was good that a CID would be formed to raise money for those improvements, but noted he did not believe it was good for the CID to plan the corridor. He believed the City needed to facilitate and pay for the process to develop the corridor rules in terms of the width of the streets, the type of buildings that would be allowed, land use requirements, etc. as the petitioners were not in the position to do that kind of planning. He suggested the formation of the CID be delayed while this planning was done, and stated the CID could then implement the plan.

Mr. Clark stated he was impressed by the goal setting work that had been done and presented at today's Pre-Council Meeting, but was unimpressed by the fact it was only related to residential trash. There was no information on how much trash other entities, private companies, the City's commercial customers, etc. contributed to the landfill, which he felt was important. He urged the Council to demand that information before moving forward with changes to solid waste.

Mr. Clark suggested the Council say no to Uber, and direct City staff to investigate how to file injunctions and start the suit process. He thought the legal processes should be started as soon as possible.

Mr. Clark thanked those that had worked on the neighborhood organization report. He noted past efforts to form a standalone (c)(3) organization had failed, but believed it was time for that to be reconsidered.

Jim Loveless, 2404 Topaz, thanked Ms. Chadwick for her service and for always serving with diligence and grace.

Mr. Loveless commented that over the years he had served on a number of promotional committees, to include water and light issues, sewer bond issues, parks and recreation issues, etc. Since he was not good at raising money or a great planner, he normally spoke to various organizations when promoting issues. He stated he had been involved in the last sewer ballot, and they had promoted the Henderson Branch sewer as a project that would be funded if the ballot issue passed. Regardless of whether it was written into ordinance, it was presented to those that the speakers talked to throughout the City. If there was not an attempt to complete that project, he believed it would affect the confidence of the public and would be poor public policy.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, thanked Ms. Chadwick for her service and noted understood it was difficult to try to represent very diverse interests.

Mr. Cullimore commented that demolition had begun on at least six properties with single-family residences on the south side of Rogers Street, between Eighth Street and Fifth Street, and no signs had been erected indicating they were legal demolitions. As a result, he made an inquiry, and the day after he had inquired, signs had been erected. He discovered the City had sent an inspector to the sites who had looked at the exterior of the buildings and taken the word of the contractor that the exterior damage was a result of trees falling on the structures. He understood the contractor had not gone inside or looked through the windows to see that demolition to the interior of the buildings had already begun. He noted he was provided information regarding the possible consequences of illegal demolition activity, and when he had asked if the City tracked contractors or property owners that had participated in illegal demolition activities in the past, he was told no. This concerned him because the City had no way of assessing how many contractors or property owners did things illegally on a consistent basis. He asked the Council to encourage staff to track these situations so penalties could be assessed when needed in a just manner.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, stated he had not seen the signs on those properties on Rogers Street either, and asked the Council to consider the negative public perception created by one person.

Mr. Elkin commented that he saw a meter maid today at the corner of Ninth Street and Elm Street that had taken a hammer to a parking meter in order to get coins out of it, and thought the Council might want to look into the reason behind that strange action.

Mr. Elkin was glad the City was still looking into transit.

Mr. Elkin understood all plastics were now recycled and suggested recycled plastic shelters with anchors in the ground to hold them down.

Mr. Elkin commented that he was concerned with how quickly some of the structures in town were being built and the weather conditions in which they were being built as he believed there could be some structural issues in the future. He was also concerned with the cost of maintaining lesser quality infrastructure installed by developers, such as streets, as it would cost the City more in the long term, and suggested a funding mechanism to address these issues.

Mayor McDavid commented that the mayors of Columbia were members of the Regional Economic Development, Inc. (REDI) Board, and he was a fan of its past success. He noted Stacey Button, who was in the audience, was selected to replace Mike Brooks, who had retired. She came with a lot of experience and he believed Columbia was lucky to have her. He urged the Council to engage Ms. Button. He understood some had concerns regarding REDI's position on Proposition 2, which had been on the ballot in November, and he thought the REDI Board would discuss policies regarding political issues at their January 14 meeting. He noted the meeting was open to the public, and encouraged the Council to attend. He also welcomed Ms. Button to Columbia, and stated the City was happy to have her.

Mr. Thomas explained he had not voiced a public opinion with regard to REDI and had only asked his constituents for their thoughts. In general, he did not have an issue with people expressing their opinions.

Mr. Thomas commented that a few months ago the Council had considered two variances to the requirement to build a sidewalk due to the subdivision, redevelopment, or development of a property, and in both situations, the Council felt it did not make sense to build the sidewalk segment because it was a dead end street or because the likelihood of it connecting to another sidewalk segment slim. He noted there were other areas of the City that desperately needed sidewalks, primarily on arterial and collector streets, but understood the City could not take money from one property to build a sidewalk on another property unless a nexus could be demonstrated. He commented that he understood Austin, Texas had been divided into neighborhood districts that were typically about a square mile in size, and if there was a situation whereby the construction of a sidewalk on a particular property was not a high priority, a payment was made into a fund that had to be used for a missing sidewalk elsewhere in the district. He asked staff to create districts using the Fourth Ward as a demonstration, and thought 8-10 neighborhood districts were needed per ward. He thought the maps should identify missing sidewalks or sidewalk gaps on collector and arterial streets. He also wanted staff to develop an ordinance that would allow the City collect a contribution from the property owner if a sidewalk was not built on the property.

Mr. Thomas noted there had been two pedestrian deaths in the last three months. He understood Dianna Barney had been killed on Range Line Street and Jackie Cheatom had been killed at the corner of Stadium Boulevard and Worley Street. He stated pedestrian deaths were preventable with appropriate traffic laws and asked for an updated report on the two incidents, to include how they were investigated. He thought that would allow for a discussion with regard to what could be done to prevent pedestrian deaths.

Mr. Skala welcomed Ms. Button to Columbia, and noted he had met with Todd Cully, the REDI Chair, about three weeks ago to discuss some issues. He thought a lot of headway had been made and stated he looked forward to participating with REDI in the future.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table B1-15, which had been introduced and read tonight, to the March 16, 2015 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala commented that there had been a lot of e-mail exchanges and controversy surrounding electric and water meters in terms of how certain properties were metered, and noted Bill Weitkemper had been involved in a lot of these e-mail discussions. He stated he was not completely satisfied with the discussion, and proposed the City hold an interested parties or town hall meeting on a Saturday so City staff, Mr. Weitkemper, and the public could discuss the issues in an effort to address them.

Mayor McDavid stated he thought that was a great idea and would support it. He noted he thought Mr. Weitkemper had participated on a billing task force that had addressed this issue during 2010-2011, and that Mr. Weitkemper had been the sole dissenting vote on

that task force. He believed it would be helpful for information from that task force to be presented.

Mr. Thomas stated he supported the suggestion of Mr. Skala as well.

Mr. Skala understood the electric bond issue had been reduced from about \$87 million to about \$60 million, and noted he would love to reduce it some more. He also understood the argument that bonds were the best way to pay for work needed, and that many felt confident this ballot issue would pass, but explained he was skeptical and thought they might want to look at what portion of this was tied to capacity and new growth as he felt it would be helpful in the discussion.

Mr. Skala understood the Environment and Energy Commission would soon submit a report regarding plastic bags. He stated he was not sure a ban was the appropriate way to go, and thought they might want to ask some of the retail grocery stores for potential solutions prior to deciding how to proceed.

Mayor McDavid stated he agreed as grocery stores were stakeholders.

Mr. Matthes stated a letter would be sent to the grocery stores for their input on this issue.

Ms. Nauser commented that a constituent had communicated several concerns regarding the Activity and Recreation Center (ARC). The constituent had indicated there were wet tiles in the locker rooms caused by pool users not drying off poolside as had been required, and that after several complaints and injuries, the ARC management eliminated the rule. In addition, there was sharp grit on the pool floor, which she felt came from outside materials from people's feet or shoes. The constituent indicated chemicals were being poured into the pool and hot tubs while patrons were in the water, and that people were being allowed into the pool with open sores and bloody Band-Aids. Ms. Nauser asked that staff review these complaints and respond.

Ms. Hoppe noted bow hunting was allowed in the Waters-Moss Memorial Wildlife Area, but there were not any signs indicating where hunting was allowed on the property. She had been told hunters were shooting across the walking trail and telling walkers they were not allowed on the trail. She pointed out the Grindstone Nature Area had a nice map that clearly delineated where hunting was allowed, which was at least 50 feet from the trail and not in the direction of the trail. She asked staff to put similar signs up in the Waters-Moss Memorial Wildlife Area so everyone could enjoy the property safely.

Ms. Hoppe stated an interested parties meeting would be held on January 26 regarding the Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street East-West Trail Connection, and noted the maps did not show one of the options being considered on the west side of the Hinkson Creek. She understood staff had indicated they would consider placing the trail on University property instead of Clyde Wilson Memorial Park, and asked staff to include that alternative as well for the interested parties meeting.

Ms. Hoppe stated the Ward 6 check-in would be held on January 21 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Learning Center at the Waters-Moss Memorial Wildlife Area.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there had not been any movement in the East Campus neighborhood residential parking program and she had not heard of any future meeting dates, and asked for a status. Mr. Matthes replied he would follow up and get back to Ms. Hoppe.

Ms. Hoppe stated there was a traffic box with a lot of graffiti and a rusted electric box at southwest corner of College Avenue and Rogers Street across from Walt's Bike Shop, and asked staff to look at those boxes as it did not help the aesthetics of the area. She felt upgrades could be made with not much of an expense.

Ms. Hoppe understood the steep slopes was scheduled for an August Planning and Zoning Commission work session. She noted it was something that had been requested by Council in 2009 and a memo from August 2014 had made it appear they were on their way to finishing their review of the issue. She asked that the Planning and Zoning Commission make it a priority so it was finished well before August of this year. She understood they did not have any work sessions scheduled for January or February so some of the work could be done then.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing the Planning and Zoning Commission to make the steep slope issue a priority. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe asked staff to look into ways for businesses and apartments in the downtown to recycle. Mr. Matthes stated staff planned to include that in its review of recycling and solid waste.

Ms. Chadwick thought they should direct staff to draft a commercial recycling ordinance as it was long overdue. Mr. Matthes explained this would be a part of the community-wide discussion and staff would work with the Downtown CID to develop an ordinance as they felt it was a real gap as well. Ms. Chadwick pointed out she wanted commercial recycling in the entire City to be addressed, and not just in the downtown. Mr. Matthes understood and noted all of the stakeholders would be included.

Ms. Chadwick made a motion directing staff to draft a commercial recycling ordinance for Columbia. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe asked that staff track violations in terms of the City's demolition ordinance, and noted she wanted to know if any fines or penalties could be assessed.

Ms. Chadwick understood the Historic Preservation Commission had not had the opportunity to look at the homes prior to demolition, and noted she was perplexed and appalled by the process. She thought they needed to ensure historic houses were not demolished without the proper notices and reviews.

Mr. Matthes stated he would look into the situation and respond.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had been approached by some people that were upset about the recycling bins being removed from Gerbes and there was a strong desire to have a replacement location in that part of town. He was told the bins at Moser's were at capacity as well. He understood staff was looking into a replacement location, but thought an interim solution might be to add more bins to existing locations.

Ms. Chadwick stated constituents in her ward that resided in apartment complexes were very upset with the removal of the recycling bins at Gerbes. She noted that might have been an oversight by her when they approved the development of the gas station on that lot as she failed to require recycling bins since the site already had one. She did not think they would be removed. She suggested a temporary bin at the ARC since the Farmers Market would not use the property until March.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she thought it would be beneficial for each Council Member to be notified about an event in their ward in advance and prior to a press release being issued, so they were more prepared for the calls from their constituents.

Mr. Matthes explained staff was considering the ARC as a location, but they had some concerns with how to fit the bins on the lot without affecting traffic patterns. They were also looking for alternate and better locations. He pointed out staff had been surprised with the request for the removal of the recycling bins as well, and noted he did not know if that was a permanent or temporary decision.

Mayor McDavid understood it was a temporary decision to allow space during construction. Ms. Chadwick noted the letter from Gerbes indicated it was a permanent decision. Mayor McDavid stated that was not what he had been told. Mr. Matthes pointed out Shelter Insurance was the landlord of the property so they would make the ultimate decision.

Ms. Hoppe asked if a temporary site could be found by the next council meeting. Mr. Matthes replied the problem was that they did not own the land so they could not force people to place bins on their properties. Ms. Chadwick pointed out the City owned the ARC property. Mr. Matthes stated staff was sorting through all of the issues to find the best location.

Mr. Matthes commented that he was sorry to see Ms. Chadwick leave, and noted it had been a pleasure to serve with her. He thanked her for her service to Columbia.

The meeting adjourned at 11:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk