

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
FEBRUARY 2, 2015**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 2, 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 NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA and THOMAS were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 5, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Trapp and a second by Mr. Skala.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas asked that B26-15 and B29-15 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B26-15 and B29-15 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

SPECIAL ITEMS

Oath of Office – Randy White, Fire Chief.

Mayor McDavid invited Fire Chief White, Mr. Matthes, and Ms. Amin to the podium.

The City Clerk administered the oath of office to Fire Chief White.

Mayor McDavid congratulated Chief White.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Cheryl Price – COMO Connect/Consultant/Public Transit Advisory Commission (PTAC).

Ms. Price, 511 Parkade Boulevard, stated she was the Vice Chair of the Public Transit Advisory Commission (PTAC) and noted the PTAC recognized and supported the tremendous job Drew Brooks and his staff, to include the drivers and schedulers, had done in the transformation of Columbia Transit to COMO Connect given the citizen input received and time and budget constraints. She commented that they understood COMO Connect had not worked as they had anticipated or hoped, and explained the PTAC planned to devote its entire February 19, 2015 meeting to the discussion of hiring of a consultant, and would provide Council with comments as soon as possible after the meeting. She believed they

were at a true crossroads in terms of transit, and an outside consultant needed to be added to the already excellent transit team. She thought the request for proposals needed to include a steering committee instead of technical committee as the word technical tended to indicate only official representatives would be included in the process. She noted she believed the steering committee needed to include all of the major community stakeholders, and could later transition into an implementation committee in order to ensure the work was carried out. She felt a budget neutral plan and one that positioned the transit system for growth was needed. In addition, she thought the consultant hired should have a track record in transit design similar to the needs of Columbia, and that references should be provided. She suggested this consultant be paid for from the budget surplus funds. She believed more money would ultimately be needed in order to have a comprehensive transit system, and suggested the consultant assist with the development of a transportation tax or with finding grant money. She stated the PTAC expected to and wanted to be a driving force behind this process, and thanked the Council for their time and commitment to the citizens of Columbia.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

B369-14 Amending Chapter 28 of the City Code to add a new article pertaining to transportation network services.

The bill was read by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine and Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend B369-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to table B369-14, as amended, to the February 16, 2015 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B23-15 Authorizing an annexation agreement with Matt and Dana Schofield and Phillip M. and Lynette T. Collier for property located on the east side of Olivet Road and north of Turner Farm Road (706 S. Olivet Road).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood the property owners would pay 1.5 times the sewer rate. Mr. Teddy stated they were Boone County Regional Sewer District customers.

Mr. Skala understood this property was within the urban service area. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the financial arrangement between the property owner, the Sewer District, and the City. Mr. Teddy replied the City would not have a direct relationship with this property owner because those in this area were to become customers of the Boone County Regional Sewer District since at least 2005, so the City's relationship would be with the Sewer District. He was not sure of the portion of the wholesale

charge that was attributable to this property, but thought \$72,000 per month came to the City based upon all Sewer District customers.

Ms. Hoppe stated this was in the area of the Northeast Area Plan, which was a City and Boone County collaboration.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, thought this would have been a great opportunity for staff to walk the Council through the history of the cooperative agreement, etc. and how it related to the connection fees, etc. He wondered if the \$72,000 was adequate or made sense, and suggested the Council ask for a much more detailed reporting. He understood the fiscal impact section of the memo indicated that upon the annexation, costs would be incurred for trash and public safety services and that those costs would be offset by increased taxes and user fees. He asked that this be stricken from future annexation related memos as he did not believe adequate data was available to make that statement. In addition, he did not believe it was true or good public policy to repeat it routinely.

B23-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B24-15 Authorizing construction of the Scott Boulevard Phase 3 Street Improvement Project, from Vawter School Road to Route KK; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B25-15 Authorizing the acquisition of additional easements for construction of the Scott Boulevard Phase 3 Street Improvement Project, from Vawter School Road to Route KK.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

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

Mr. Skala asked if these hydrodynamic separators had been used in other places. Mr. Nichols replied they had been used in private industry, but the City had not used them in the past for any project. Mr. Skala understood this would require an additional layer of maintenance. Mr. Nichols stated staff thought this might make it easier to get to the heavy pollutants without encroaching into the cell, which would allow for less damage to the access points. He commented that it would function better with the under-drain and the type of turf grass and plantings proposed. Mr. Skala asked for the estimated expense associated with this. Mr. Nichols replied he understood a 6-foot diameter cell was about \$24,000 and the diversion box to help with grade and velocity was about \$11,000.

Ms. Nauser commented that it appeared as though staff had addressed most citizen concerns. Mr. Nichols stated staff had reached out to explain the City's position. He explained the pool had been decreased, but the actual footprint was the same. Ms. Nauser asked if this was the first time the City was using these digesters. Mr. Nichols replied yes. Ms. Nauser asked if this would be larger than the one at Fire Station No. 7. Mr. Nichols replied yes, and pointed out the project by Fire Station No. 7 was not yet complete.

Mr. Thomas understood the cost of this project was just under \$12 million and the length of the improvement was right at two miles, and felt this expensive project had been driven by growth. He stated every Columbia resident would pay about \$85 for this project, and the project also entailed a \$30,000 annual maintenance bill. He thought they really needed to consider the costs to expand the City and its infrastructure systems.

B24-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B25-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B26-15 Authorizing a municipal agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for bridge improvements along I-70 at the Business Loop 70 (West Boulevard), Garth Avenue crossing and MO Route 763 (Rangeline Street) interchanges.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser stated she was glad these bridges would be improved, and asked for a status of the bridge at the Sorrels Overpass. Mr. Glascock replied that since there was not a lot of traffic on it, he doubted anything was planned.

Mr. Thomas asked if the existing bridges would be dismantled and replaced with new bridges. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know yet as it was a design-build project. He pointed out they had been built with the original interstate so they were old, and he did not know if they would use the substructure or widen the bridges. He assumed they would add a shoulder at Garth Avenue. Mr. Thomas asked if the City would contribute any money toward this \$18 million project. Mr. Glascock replied no, but explained the cost of any relocation of City utilities would be a City responsibility.

Mr. Thomas commented that this was another extremely expensive road and highway project, and he believed the City needed to look for more efficient ways to run its transportation systems.

Mr. Trapp stated he believed a lot could be done in terms of enhancement at the Garth Avenue crossing, and asked that it be considered in discussions and negotiations with MoDOT. It was the least unsafe way to cross I-70 and the sidewalk there was regularly washed over by sand and brush pushing people out onto the street. He reiterated he hoped it could be enhanced. Mr. Glascock stated he assumed riprap would be included so that was no longer a problem, and noted they would relay this information to MoDOT.

B26-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B29-15 Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotions and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Buckler provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe asked if there had been an improvement in claims. Ms. Buckler replied this last year the City was at an increased rate of less than three percent while the average was 6.5 percent. She noted it was hard to tell if someone participating in the program had averted

anything as a result of the program. She thought it would take a long time to see real metrics, but they were working on it.

Mr. Thomas stated he had asked for this item to be moved to old business, and believed Ms. Buckler had already addressed his questions. He thought it was a great example of how there was a financial incentive to promote healthy living and noted he was glad the City had these programs and was receiving money back from the insurance company.

B29-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. 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.

- B21-15 Approving the Final Plat of The Crossing-EPC, Plat 3 located on the north side of Southland Drive, approximately 500 feet west of Rock Quarry Road; authorizing a performance contract.
- B22-15 Approving the Final Plat of Heritage Village, Plat No. 2 located at the western terminus of Southampton Drive; authorizing a performance contract.
- B27-15 Accepting a conveyance for utility purposes.
- B28-15 Authorizing an educational affiliation agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of the University of Missouri Sinclair School of Nursing, to provide health clinical experience and instruction for nursing students.
- R18-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of park improvements on property located between Barberry Avenue and Zinnia Drive (3405 Zinnia Drive).
- R19-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements to the MKT Trailside Building located adjacent to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial at Battle Garden.
- R20-15 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of St. Charles Road and on the west and east sides of Battle Avenue.
- R21-15 Setting a public hearing: consider an amendment to the FY 2014 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.
- R22-15 Authorizing an agreement with Sustainable Farms & Communities, Inc. for the use of Clary-Shy Community Park located on the west side of Clinkscales Road and north of Ash Street for the operation of a farmers' market and community education garden.
- R23-15 Authorizing the City Manager and City Counselor to make federal fiscal year 2015 Certifications and Assurances for Federal Transit Administration assistance programs.
- R24-15 Authorizing an agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for professional engineering services for bioreactor landfill operational support services.

R25-15 Authorizing a Declaration of an Equitable Servitude with Jennifer Building, LLC to guarantee that appropriate fire-rating protection is provided between private property located at 217 N. Ninth Street and City-owned property located at 805 E. Ash Street.

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

NEW BUSINESS

None.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B30-15** Approving the Minor Subdivision and Replat of River Region Credit Union, a Replat of Lot 1, Providence South Plaza, located on the southeast corner of Huntridge Drive and Carter Lane; authorizing a performance contract with River Region Credit Union.
- B31-15** Approving the Final Plat of Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 8 located on the east side of Rolling Hills Road and north of State Highway WW; authorizing a performance contract.
- B32-15** Authorizing a road maintenance cooperative agreement with Boone County for 2015 pavement preservation projects.
- B33-15** Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B34-15** Naming property located between Barberry Avenue and Zinnia Drive (3405 Zinnia Drive) “Barberry Park”; authorizing the construction of park improvements; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B35-15** Authorizing construction of improvements to the MKT Trailside Building located adjacent to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial at Battle Garden; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B36-15** Accepting and appropriating donated funds for the Parks and Recreation Department’s Holiday Toys for Columbia’s Youth Program.
- B37-15** Accepting a donation from the Missouri Division of Tourism to be used by the Convention and Visitors Bureau to offset expenses associated with travel writers attending the True/False Film Festival; appropriating funds.
- B38-15** Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for the Healthy Eating Active Living in Local Communities program; appropriating funds.
- B39-15** Amending Chapter 14 and Chapter 28 of the City Code as it relates to taxicab businesses and taxi stand hours.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP20-15 Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Directors - Annual Membership.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to appoint Tony Grove, Blake Danuser, Michael McClung, Tom Schwartz, and Andrew Waters to three year terms beginning on February 1, 2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP21-15 Zoning Text Amendment to the Accessory Dwelling Standards of Section 29-7.

Mayor McDavid asked for clarification as he understood the report indicated Section 2 had been inadvertently written in such a way that it would not allow the conversion of a floor area contained within a principal single-family dwelling to be used as an accessory dwelling. He thought that change would allow people to rent bedrooms to college students, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Teddy replied it would have to be a self-contained apartment unit, so there would have to be a kitchen, bath, and sleeping room that was self-contained in the house.

Mayor McDavid stated he would support sending this to the Planning and Zoning Commission for consideration, but did not believe people in the Grasslands Neighborhood would be supportive of their neighbors inviting college students to live in their basements. Mr. Teddy pointed out accessory dwelling units would still be excluded from the R-1 zoning district. This would apply only in the R-2 and R-3 zoning districts.

Ms. Hoppe understood an owner-occupancy provision had not been included for either the prime residence or the accessory dwelling unit, and believed that provision had been included in most other communities with a few exceptions. She asked if that provision could be included with these amendments.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to make the necessary text changes to Sections 29-7 and 29-2 along with the addition of an owner-occupancy provision in that either the primary residence or the accessory dwelling unit had to be owner-occupied and only one of those units could be rented out to a non-owner unless an exception was granted pursuant to a recommendation of staff, and to refer the matter to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their review and recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mayor McDavid stated he supported sending this to the Planning and Zoning Commission, but felt it needed some work.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Skala directing staff to make the necessary text changes to Sections 29-7 and 29-2 along with the addition of an owner-occupancy provision in that either the primary residence or the accessory dwelling unit had to be owner-occupied and only one of those units could be rented out to a non-owner unless an exception was granted pursuant to a recommendation of staff, and to refer the matter to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their review and recommendation, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP22-15 Water and Light Advisory Board: Solar Rights Ordinance.

Mayor McDavid understood the intent of this was to prevent a neighborhood association from prohibiting solar panels from roofs. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. He thought there were a number of areas in the report that tried to show an endorsement for this type of development. He noted there were some initiatives at the state level as well.

Mayor McDavid noted he wanted clarification that the discussion involved the rights of a solar panel structure because they did not know the future of solar technology and their might be stand along solar technology that could cover the entire front yard of a property.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was not sure the City's legal staff had reviewed this issue, and suggested the Law Department review it and provide a recommendation in terms of legal compliance as well.

Ms. Nauser asked if any stakeholders had been included when this was discussed and reviewed by the Water and Light Advisory Board since this would override some neighborhood covenants and restrictions. If that had not been done, she recommended the Planning and Zoning Commission involve stakeholders.

Mayor McDavid stated he agreed, and hoped this would be vetted with all stakeholders to include neighborhood associations with those types of covenants prior to coming back to Council. He noted he would like to know how wide spread the restrictive covenants were, and what kind of opposition there might be with regard to this initiative.

Mr. Skala thought this was complicated because it did not necessarily involve the neighborhood associations as much as homeowner associations, and agreed that needed to be vetted as part of this discussion at the Planning and Zoning Commission level.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to refer this issue to the Planning and Zoning Commission and to include appropriate stakeholders. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Ms. Hoppe asked that it be referred to the Law Department as well so they were not considering items that were illegal. Mr. Skala thought that was a good idea.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Ms. Nauser to refer this issue to the Planning and Zoning Commission and to include appropriate stakeholders was approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP23-15 Downtown Columbia Leadership Council: Blue Ribbon Commission.

Mayor McDavid stated he was not in support of this recommendation, but thought the City could do a better job of defining the current infrastructure conditions, needs, financing, funding, etc. He believed the material was already there, and the problem was that it was segregated. He noted the financials were in the 600 page budget document, the long-term plans were in the 520 page Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Plan, and current condition analyses were done as part of each bond presentation, so he felt the it was within the ability of staff to put all of this information into a document that was more understandable by the public.

Mayor McDavid reiterated that he believed the current conditions of the enterprise infrastructure were knowable and best evaluated vertically by enterprise. He noted the financials had been confused by a local blogger, who repeatedly posted inaccurate

information about the stated finances at the city level and enterprise level, and assumed this was due to not understanding the meaning of the certified financial report and the fact that cash allocated to projects that were in process were included in the unassigned funds. He pointed out there were known comparables for sewer, electric, and stormwater, and that the comparables for the utilities needed to be pulled together to determine how Columbia stood compared to other communities. He stated he believed the cost of utilities in aggregate in Columbia when considering the cost of living was the lowest in Missouri. He commented that he believed the current conditions were known as well because many were evaluated by third parties, such as the North American Electric Regulatory Corporation (NERC), the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In addition, the Infrastructure Task Force had reviewed and provided recommendations about three years ago. He reiterated the plans were knowable because they were spelled out in great detail in the CIP Plan. He pointed out he did not believe this blue ribbon commission could address the unknowable issues, such as funding at the state and federal level for streets due to the declining gas tax revenue or if the loss of sales tax revenue due to e-commerce would be rectified at the state and federal level. In addition, they would not know the willingness of citizens to pay for infrastructure. He noted the citizens had different views as some felt Columbia should grow slower, while others did not, which meant the blue ribbon commission would likely become more political than technical. He explained infrastructure needs tended to vary by ward, and noted a lot of money had been spent in Ward 5 for Scott Boulevard while a lot of money had been spent on sewer infrastructure in Wards 1 and 4. He stated he respected the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) for its contributions, but believed this was a citywide issue that exceeded its mission. He felt the blue ribbon commission already existed in the form of the City Council, and they were obligated to become experts on the subject of infrastructure as it was one of the two main priorities the citizens of Columbia believed was the responsibility of its government. He commented that he would be happy to provide his presentation to the DCLC, and reiterated he would not support the establishment of a blue ribbon commission as recommended as it would duplicate the obligations of the Council.

Ms. Nauser agreed with some of the comments of Mayor McDavid, but also saw a potential need for an infrastructure commission of some sort. She noted her concern with the recommendation of the DCLC was that it appeared to supplant the professional and technical expertise of City staff and the CIP Plan as that document was reviewed, updated, and changed based on community needs on an annual basis. She did not believe any blue ribbon commission should be able to prioritize infrastructure projects as that was the role of City staff and the Council. The experts needed to be relied upon to notify the Council of the needs of the systems as they worked with them every day. She noted the concerns of the public seemed to have stemmed from a couple developments in the downtown that had brought some of the infrastructure shortcomings to light as very few people had commented on the CIP Plan in the past when given the opportunity. She did not believe placing these decisions in the hands of a commission that could become political was in the best interest of the community and the infrastructure issues as a whole. She pointed out she was willing to

consider some of the suggestions of the DCLC, but could not support this as it was recommended.

Mr. Skala stated he did not believe there was any reason to eschew the political component as the community was very technical and political at the same time, and noted he sought balance. He pointed out there had been lots of infrastructure groups over the years that had provided advice, but part of the problem with the most recent Infrastructure Task Force he had participated on was that it was highly imbalanced and only focused on roads. He wanted to see a more balanced group look at the issues as his sense was that this started due to the downtown infrastructure exigency as a result of high density student residential. He thought the citizens were concerned that the City had not previously considered the maintenance costs of all of this hard infrastructure, and believed a well-balanced blue ribbon commission could take a holistic approach with the assistance of professional staff in addressing the issue of worn out hard infrastructure. In addition to the vertical approach suggested by Mayor McDavid, he felt a horizontal approach was needed to encompass all infrastructure so they knew where they stood and how the CIP Plan fit in that regard. He believed that would be the value of a blue ribbon commission, and was what the DCLC had in mind. He thought they could work out the details with regard to the representatives, but that they desperately needed a simplification of how much infrastructure was needed for how much growth they wanted to occur and how long it would take before new infrastructure was worn out because he believed the public would then be more comfortable with the City's decision-making.

Mr. Thomas noted the Council had asked the DCLC to study this issue, which they did over a considerable amount of time, and to make recommendations. He thought the Council should accept the recommendation of forming this committee, and explained one of the reasons was because many residents of Columbia felt expensive infrastructure decisions were made with a lack of transparency. He believed the two ballot issues had failed last November due to a feeling that the people were not being properly represented in those decisions. He saw this blue ribbon committee as placing a spotlight on how the CIP Plan and funding worked in a transparent manner so the community could weigh in on a philosophy of planning for sustainability of existing infrastructure and planning for growth in terms of how it would be paid for and how much it actually cost. He stated he would like to see the committee formed.

Mr. Trapp stated he was concerned the establishment of a blue ribbon commission would be done in place of dealing with the issues and finding a way to increase funding, and felt that standing still was the same as falling behind. They had not dealt with stormwater in the past, and it had only gotten more out of step with what other communities charged and what it took to do projects. When discussing infrastructure in general, he believed they were pulled into ideologies and talks that were so large it caused them to lose the specific nature of each infrastructure. He pointed out each infrastructure was unique and required a certain base of knowledge and understanding, and the role of Council was not only to explain people to the City but to explain the City to the people, as people tended to gravitate to headlines. He thought they needed to take the time to explain the choices, etc. He explained he was disheartened to know this proposal would be a replacement for trying to address the issues,

and thought they should continue to try to address the problems. He agreed some conversations were needed, but did not believe a blue ribbon commission was the appropriate vehicle as it was ultimately the role and duty of the Council to look out for the best interest of the community. He appreciated the recommendations of the DCLC, but noted many of these issues, such as stormwater, transcended the downtown area and was an aging infrastructure issue instead of a new growth issue. He stated he was not prepared to support this at this time.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she agreed with Mr. Trapp in that she did not believe a commission should put on hold any actions of the City to address real and imminent infrastructure maintenance problems, but noted she felt a commission could be useful if it reviewed long-term maintenance issues by identifying those problems, determined ways those issues could be funded, determined how the City could grow while reducing infrastructure costs, etc. She also believed a year 2050 review might be too long, and suggested a review in the range of 2030. She noted the City had a Water and Light Advisory Board that delved into the details and provided recommendations to the Council, and felt it was useful to have groups that focused on specific infrastructure needs. She reiterated she thought a blue ribbon commission could be useful, but not in the form or period recommended by the DCLC, and not if it deferred action in the meantime.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to accept the report of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas stated they could discuss whether they wanted to form a commission. Mayor McDavid suggested he make a motion if that was his desire. Mr. Matthes pointed out the Council was owed a staff review of all of the recommendations of the DCLC, and thought they might want that report prior to moving forward. Mr. Thomas asked when the Council might receive the report. Mr. Matthes replied he did not know, but noted it was a priority item of staff. Mr. Skala asked if they would wait until April when there was again a full Council. Mr. Matthes replied he did not think the response to the report would change with a full Council so staff would bring it forward when they were able.

Mr. Thomas stated he heard some common ground for a committee that would provide a vehicle for public engagement for infrastructure issues. He thought accepting this report and not establishing a blue ribbon commission would fuel the criticism of the City of not being transparent. As a result, he wanted to keep this option open for when they received the analysis of all of the recommendations of the DCLC.

REP24-15 Administrative Public Improvement Project: Parkade Park Improvements.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp stated he had attended the interested parties meeting and it appeared as though staff was trying to incorporate the input received in terms of keeping trees, addressing stormwater issues, and focusing on items for little kids.

REP25-15 Water and Light Advisory Board: Efficiency Score and Home Energy Score.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked if the City would obtain something from the property owner indicating they did not mind this information being made public. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought it was likely a verbal request. Ms. Nauser suggested a written disclosure be signed indicating they do not mind this information being public. Mr. Johnsen stated they would ensure it was in writing if it was not already. Ms. Nauser commented that she did not have an issue if it was done on a voluntary basis, but did not believe it should be mandatory.

Mayor McDavid stated he thought the Council should know if they planned to publish information on individual property owners. Mr. Johnsen explained it would be voluntary, and would involve a score tied to the residence. Mayor McDavid understood he could contact the City to find out how his home compared to other homes, but that the information would not be published. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not believe they would release information on similar type homes. They would only determine a score and provide it to the property owner, and the score would be published on the website if the property owner was agreeable. They did not have enough scores to establish standards for neighborhoods at this time.

Ms. Nauser asked if someone would go back and reevaluate the score after the suggested efficiency improvements were made during the initial inspection. She was concerned the public data would be incomplete. Mr. Johnsen replied a motivating factor was for people to understand how their score could be improved and to obtain a new score. The goal was for people purchasing or renting homes to ask for the score as property owners would then have an incentive to improve the scores of the homes. He pointed out it was voluntary at this time, but they were trying to approach it from a customer-driven perspective. Ms. Nauser stated she was supportive of energy efficiency, and her only issue was private data being made public without the consent of the property owner just because they had the information.

Ms. Hoppe understood a benefit for her allowing her score to be public was that it would allow her neighbors to compare their scores to hers and potentially make improvements to their homes. It could promote energy efficiency and make people aware of what others were doing. Mr. Johnsen agreed, and noted they were receiving increased enthusiasm from the realty community as it could be a promotional tool. They wanted this to be something requested by the people.

REP26-15 North 763 Community Improvement District (CID) - Report on Services, Revenues, Expenditures - Fiscal Year 2013 and Fiscal Year 2014.

Mayor McDavid understood community improvement districts involved the addition of sale tax revenue. It did not defer sales tax revenue that would otherwise be received as would occur with a tax increment financing or enhanced enterprise zone program. It was a voluntary increase, and if the citizen did not want to pay the extra half-cent sales tax, the citizen did not have to consume a product or service within the community improvement district. It was an elective of the district and the consumer, and the district funded infrastructure in the area with the half-cent sales tax. Ms. Thompson stated she was not certain of the exact structure of the North 763 CID as some community improvement districts received funds through a property tax assessment as well. Mayor McDavid stated he did not see a line item for property tax so he assumed it was sales tax only for this CID.

REP27-15 Citizens Police Review Board: 2014 Annual Report.

Mayor McDavid commented that in view of the national turmoil over police relationships with communities, he thought the former Council that established the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) should be proud of that effort as he believed it was helpful to have a process in place. He understood there had only been two appeals, and one had been a re-appeal of the first appeal, and felt the low numbers showed its effectiveness.

Ms. Hoppe noted it had not been easy to establish the CPRB as it had taken a lot of work, but the hope was exactly this would happen, so it was great.

REP28-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he disagreed with most of the reasons stated by Mayor McDavid in his opposition to a blue ribbon commission, but noted he supported his disagreement. He believed the blue ribbon commission was a terrible idea, and it obscured the real value of the report of the DCLC, which was to think and plan for the long-term through a trusted source. He noted he believed they needed to get away from short-term, ad-hoc planning, such as the CIP Plan, and stated he did not trust most of what staff said because he did not believe they had the time, energy, etc. to review and plan for the long-term. He thought they needed to use outside professionals that dealt with this on a citywide basis across multiple departments. He commented that he knew a long time ago that infrastructure was not being maintained properly due to growth, and was glad the Council was beginning to get on board. He reiterated the blue ribbon commission was a bad idea.

Pat McMurry provided a handout and explained he was requesting the City consider an alternative location for a power line that would go across the heart of his property. He received notification on Friday at 4:30 p.m. that construction would begin the following week, and wanted the City to use one of the alternative routes that had been discussed this past summer. He noted he was in the Third Ward, and Mr. Skala had suggested he bring this issue up at tonight's Council Meeting.

Mr. Thomas stated he had attended the Smart Growth Conference, which had been held in Baltimore, Maryland, last week, and noted Baltimore was a good smart growth example right now as there was a lot of development investment in the urban center creating a more walkable and transit-rich place. They were also preserving public open spaces into the urban fabric on a small scale. He explained it had not always been this way and he had learned the history of Baltimore from the keynote speech of Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake. He noted the population of Baltimore in 1950 was just less than a million and over the next 50 years a third of the population left for a variety reasons, which resulted in jobs and the tax base disappearing. He stated he had never thought through what it would be like to live in a city that was in a declining spiral, and explained it had given him a new appreciation for the concerns of the people that wanted Columbia to continue to grow. He did not

necessarily agree that they should always continue to grow, but had a better appreciation for the opposite, which was a bad situation.

Mr. Skala commented that he wanted to follow up on the request of Mr. McMurry and asked for a status of the project and whether any of his concerns could be accommodated. Mr. Johnsen replied it involved the Rebel Hill line, and construction had already begun on various pieces last summer. This portion was a small piece that was fairly close to the substation, and was an area where they already had some platted easements. He understood Mr. McMurry wanted them to go closer to the road right-of-way, and noted staff would be happy to meet with Mr. McMurry to discuss plans and options as there were some options, but going to the road right-of-way was not a good option for the City. Mr. Skala asked that a meeting take place and noted he would be interested in participating. Mr. Johnsen stated he would set up a meeting.

Ms. Nauser stated a constituent had contacted her concerned with the proliferation of drones within society, and suggested the City review its trespassing laws in light of this new technology. She thought they might want to consider other potential issues as she understood drones could get in the way of law enforcement at crime scenes, etc.

Ms. Nauser noted she had been contacted by residents of The Den with regard to the utility billing cycle. She understood an allotment for utilities was included in the rent at The Den and that the December utility billing cycle was only 22 days while the January utility billing cycle was for 42 days, and this had caused people to go over their allotment and pay the difference. She asked why there would be such a huge difference in the billing cycles and why the City did not have a standard 28- or 30-day billing cycle.

Ms. Nauser explained she had been contacted by a constituent regarding someone vandalizing the green space near Fire Station No. 7, and asked staff to work with the neighborhood in terms of potentially using cameras to stop the vandals. She understood people were driving through the green space where there was a community garden and knocking over mailboxes.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she was disturbed to learn a letter had been sent to the residents of Woodlea Drive informing them that the City was proposing to eliminate parking on the entire length of north side of Woodlea Drive at all times and that there would be a hearing on the issue on March 2, 2015. She noted she had been unaware of this and did not know that any residents had been in conversations with staff regarding any problems or options. She stated she was surprised to have received this without any background, and noted she planned to perhaps have a meeting with affected residents as it was an area which had on-street parking for over 50 years. She noted it was the same street that had been originally proposed to have a sidewalk on it for a trail option that was later dismissed as Southwood had been determined to be a better street for the sidewalk. She believed receipt of the letter would cause some unnecessary concern, and hoped there was a better procedure in the future.

Ms. Hoppe agreed with Mr. Clark regarding his comment on the statement under the fiscal impact associated with B23-15, and suggested that statement not be made because they did not have any analysis or documentation that fees and taxes would offset the cost of services to the property to be annexed. She thought a better statement would be that costs might or might not be offset by fees and taxes if they wanted to make a general statement. She thought this issue might be something a blue ribbon commission could further delve into as well. Mr. Matthes asked that staff be able to review the issue and get back to Council. He thought it was likely not an issue, but understood there had been a request to have that information in the past so he wanted to ensure it was not issue.

Ms. Hoppe understood KOMU had done a story on the use of City vehicles by staff to respond to emergencies, and reported the City did not track when the cars were used or if they paying for gas to only get to the emergencies or if they were paying for gas to routinely go to and from home when they lived well outside of the City limits in places such as Blackwater. She asked for a report to Council on the issue. Mr. Matthes replied staff would provide a report.

Mayor McDavid stated he concurred with the request of Ms. Hoppe as he believed citizens would want a response to the allegations made on KOMU because the allegations implied an impropriety.

Mayor McDavid noted the City recently had a cluster of pedestrian accidents which they all viewed with alarm. He understood the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) had created an action plan to increase walking and biking and to reduce walking and biking fatalities and injuries. He asked the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission to recommend appropriate actions in Columbia in response to the DOT initiative of a Mayor's Challenge for Safer People and Safer Streets.

Mayor McDavid stated he intended to continue to focus on jobs as there was too much poverty in Central Missouri, and noted the only way he knew to get out of poverty was through a quality job. He invited Regional Economic Development Inc. (REDI) to evaluate some of the recent indicators of job creation in Boone County, and to tell the City what significance, if any, there was to the fact building permits were down 34 percent in Columbia while they were up 3.5 percent in Boone County, what significance, if any, there was to the decline of the Purchasing Managers Index in Central Missouri to levels well below that of Missouri and nationally, and what significance, if any, there was to a decline in job creation in Boone County over the most recent twelve month reporting time to the point where they were ranked at 140 out of 179 of reporting cities under 200,000 in population.

Mayor McDavid invited REDI to conduct an analysis of the Sutter property, which had been purchased in early 2010 with the intent of development. He thought it might have been the first certified site in Missouri. He noted he was unaware of a plan or policy for the property, so he invited REDI to review the issue with City staff. He wondered what the value was for it being a certified site, and what criteria they had or should have for applicants. He pointed out a data center would involve \$1 billion, but only hire twenty people. He wondered

if they would limit it to a manufacturing facility as it would involve more jobs. He noted he wanted to see ideas as to how they viewed the property and the intent, and whether they would have to offer incentives to people to get them to use it.

Ms. Hoppe commented that when the property was acquired there had been particular goals for the property, and she suggested those goals be reviewed and revised since they had not come to fruition.

Mr. Skala invited REDI to take a look at the end of the year review report completed by Rob Wolverton and his associates for Boone County as well, so they could then discuss it.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk