

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
FEBRUARY 16, 2015**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 16, 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 HOPPE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS and NAUSER were present. Council Member MCDAVID was absent. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe asked that “he” be changed to “she” during her part of the Hominy Creek Trail discussion and that “as it more” be removed from the second to last line in paragraph four under REP18-15 for the January 20, 2015 Council Meeting minutes.

The minutes of the regular meetings of January 20, 2015 and February 2, 2015 with the changes requested by Mayor Pro tem Hoppe were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Trapp.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Upon her request, Mr. Thomas made a motion to allow Ms. Nauser to abstain from voting on R31-15 due to a conflict of interest. Ms. Nauser noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that her family business involved alcohol sales. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe explained she and Mr. Thomas had worked toward the establishment of a Youth Advisory Council for over a year, and noted they along with Ms. Nauser planned to present the rest of the City Council with a slate of the 21 students they would suggest be appointed. She stated their goal was for broad representation in terms of different high schools, wards, school class years, backgrounds, and experiences.

Mr. Thomas provided a breakdown by high school, school class year, and ward, and noted the students that were seniors would have to resign once they graduated.

Mr. Skala commented that he was agreeable to the slate, but thought they should discuss process in the future. He agreed this was unique since they were appointing members to a new and very large group, but noted they had gone through a matrix exercise in the past in order to get to a more manageable level when filling vacancies. He thought they needed to discuss this as a policy issue for the future.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe pointed out that anyone that was not chosen could contact the City Clerk's Office and ask for their application to be reactivated in May or June when the four seniors appointed graduated. She noted there could be other vacancies in the fall for other reasons as well.

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

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Reape, Kevin, 5004 Betty Jean Way, Ward 5, Term to expire December 15, 2016

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Dakopolos, Persephone, 1712 Hinkson Avenue, Ward 3, Term to expire March 1, 2018

Smith, Stacye, 1802 N. Charleston Circle, Ward 3, Term to expire March 1, 2018

PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Anderson, Ann, 1008 Claudell Lane, Apt. 106, Ward 1, Term to expire March 1, 2018

Hanson, Steven, 2904 Lynnwood Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire March 1, 2018

Price, Cheryl, 511 Parkade Boulevard, Ward 2, Term to expire March 1, 2018

YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

Armistead, Jonathan, Ward 3, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Bledsoe, Maryam, Ward 6, Term to expire February 15, 2017

Butler, Taja'Mir, Boone County, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Edwards, Chris, Ward 2, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Gabel, John, Ward 5, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Goyal, Dishti, Ward 2, Term to expire February 15, 2017

Henry, Brett, Boone County, Term to expire February 15, 2018

Hernandez, Guillermo, Ward 5, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Livingston, Taylor, Ward 3, Term to expire February 15, 2017

Logue, Mary, Ward 2, Term to expire February 15, 2017

Malloy, Kieran, Ward 3, Term to expire February 15, 2018

Nguyen, Dzung, Ward 5, Term to expire February 15, 2018

Ridgel, Kamaya, Ward 2, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Ryberg, Catherine, Ward 4, Term to expire February 15, 2018

Sarafianos, Katherine, Ward 4, Term to expire February 15, 2018

Scott, Sloane, Boone County, Term to expire February 15, 2017

Steinhauer, Dane, Boone County, Term to expire February 15, 2018

Vaughan, Scott, Ward 1, Term to expire February 15, 2017

Wang, Derek, Ward 4, Term to expire February 15, 2017

Washington, Justin, Ward 5, Term to expire February 15, 2018

Zhang, Junyi, Ward 4, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Leuchtman, Matt, Columbia Public School Representative, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Rowe, Ron, Youth Community Coalition Representative, Term to expire February 15, 2016

Thomas, Ian, Council Member Representative, Term to expire February 15, 2016

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B34-15 Naming property located between Barberrry Avenue and Zinnia Drive (3405 Zinnia Drive) “Barberrry Park”; authorizing the construction of park improvements; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood fruit and nut trees were not typically planted in City parks. Mr. Huffington stated that was correct. He explained this was a trial project and would include items like blueberries, gooseberries, bush plums, etc. Signage would also be included for educational purposes and to try to explain their intentions for the park. He stated these types of plantings would be considered for other parks if it worked well here. Ms. Nauser asked if this would be a community garden in that people could pick blueberries, etc. Mr. Huffington replied yes, and explained the difference between this and a community garden was that the City staff would maintain these landscaping beds. Ms. Nauser asked if anything would be done to address issues with raccoons, possums, etc. Mr. Huffington replied fencing could be considered if there was a problem with animals. Mr. Griggs pointed out the City had several nut trees throughout the parks systems, and there had been instances in which commercial vendors had tried to harvest those nuts. As a result, a policy would be established for individual use. Ms. Nauser stated she was in favor of this, and only wanted to ensure potential issues were addressed.

Mr. Trapp asked why Barberrry Park was chosen for the name over Zinnia Park. Mr. Griggs replied it was because Barberrry Avenue was the primary road, and explained Louisville Park had been named for Louisville Drive even though most people accessed it off of Manhasset Drive. He agreed it could have been named it Zinnia Park, and staff just chose Barberrry Park.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor Pro tem Hoppe closed the public hearing.

Mr. Trapp stated he believed the citizens would be happy with the development of a park in this location. He felt there was a local food orientation to this park due to the fishing pond and the planned landscaping, and thought that fit well within the City’s effort to individualize parks. He appreciated the ecological educational components as well, and thought it was a great design.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe understood edible parks had been established in other communities, and thought it was a good experiment for Columbia.

Mr. Thomas stated he also liked the edible landscaping features and asked that a report on this pilot project be provided after a year or so.

B34-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: MCDAVID. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

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.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked how many weddings tended to occur at this site. Mr. Griggs replied there were 20-25 weddings per year at Battle Garden, and most of those wedding parties also rented the shelter adjacent to it. Mr. Skala asked if there would be a fee. Mr. Griggs replied yes, and explained they would likely charge a fee of about \$22 per hour similar to the fee for the Rock Quarry House in order to recover some of the costs of utilities, etc.

Mr. Thomas asked when the building had been built. Mr. Griggs replied he did not know, but believed it was a long time ago as it had been a part of the sewer treatment plant at that location.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor Pro tem Hoppe closed the public hearing.

B35-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: MCDAVID. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

(A) Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of St. Charles Road and on the west and east sides of Battle Avenue.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood there was sensitivity in terms of time for this annexation due to the opening of the elementary school, and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied the Columbia Public School District had envisioned the annexation process moving faster even though they had known there were intervening properties that needed to be annexed since the City could not leap frog properties in terms of annexation. He understood the School District wanted their property within City jurisdiction upon the opening of the elementary school.

Mr. Thomas understood these properties, when developed, would be served by City sewer under an agreement with the Boone County Regional Sewer District (BCRSD), and asked if that meant the property owners would pay sewer utility fees to the Sewer District, and not to the City of Columbia. Mr. Teddy replied they would be City customers per the agreement between BCRSD and the City, and those customers would pay the standard rates effective of the time of connection. Mr. Thomas understood the 50 percent additional cost would not apply since they would be in the City if annexed. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe opened the public hearing.

Rob Wolverton, 2504 St. Regis Court, stated he and others involved with this development were available to answer any questions.

Mary Hussmann, 201 Ridgeway Avenue, asked how much this development would cost the City in terms of transportation. Mr. Teddy replied the consultant had indicated an

estimate of \$6,975 per single-family home based upon assumptions regarding growth, land use, and needs in the area. He noted there were also recommended strategies for recovering the majority of those costs, which would be presented at the next meeting when the zoning was discussed along with the annexation. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe noted that would occur at the March 2, 2015 Council Meeting. Ms. Hussmann stated she had heard a figure of \$50 million and asked if that was accurate. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it would be higher if they were discussing the build-out per the CATSO Plan, and thought the question was how much would be attributable to the development. Ms. Hussmann thought the amount attributable to the development needed to be known. Mr. Teddy explained there were likely \$30 million in transportation needs in the 1,800 acre area, but that was based on an assumption of a certain pattern of growth and involved more than this 127 acres. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe understood there was an agreement with the developer regarding a transportation development district (TDD) and other funding options that would be discussed at the next meeting. Ms. Hussmann understood a TDD involved sales taxes and was a cost to the consumer and not the developer. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe noted the details were included in the paperwork associated with B40-15, which would receive first reading tonight and be discussed at the following meeting. Mr. Skala pointed out TDDs could be structured to involve property taxes as well, and stated the details would be discussed at the next meeting.

Sid Sullivan, 2980 Maple Bluff Drive, commented that this was one step toward the annexation of the northeast area, and believed the Northeast Area Plan, which included this area was incomplete. He thought the Plan should have included an approximation of the volume of that 4.5 square mile area, the estimated costs to the City, and a strategy for connection into the City. Since it did not include those items, a lot of the expenses had been abdicated to the discretion of the developers, and in this instance, the developer had used its discretion to create a TDD that the City would administer and the taxpayers would fund through a sales tax. He explained that generally speaking, commercial property did not develop with residential development, and there was usually a 5-10 year lag so a 30 year TDD would likely not create any revenue for a while. He commented that a road was needed that would extend north of Battle Avenue to Mexico Gravel Road, and this developer was only responsible for the north extension. An east-west connection was also needed for access to the elementary school. He stated he believed the elementary school had been poorly placed as students would not be able to walk to school.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, understood the urgency was due Boone County not wanting to inspect the elementary school because most of this area would ultimately be annexed into the City so he suggested the Council to ensure the elementary school was adequately inspected and received an occupancy permit from Boone County based upon City standards while taking a long look at the annexation and development agreement associated with this development. He thought a ten-year projection of revenues, expenditures, capital costs, etc. was needed for the entire 1,800 acres prior to moving forward. He commented that he believed there were innovative ideas in terms of the TDD, but noted innovative ideas when rushed into had a lot of collateral consequences. He thought it would take 3-6 months for staff and the Council to carefully review this development, and reiterated the City work with Boone County in terms of the inspection, etc.

There being no further comment, Mayor Pro tem Hoppe closed the public hearing.

Mr. Matthes pointed out the Council would not vote on this issue tonight, and the development agreement was included with the supporting documentation for B40-15, which would receive a first read later tonight. He noted the development agreement referred to a TDD that would involve a ½ cent sales tax in addition to a special assessment, so it was unique in that respect.

Mr. Thomas asked for a response to the suggestion of Mr. Clark for the City to work with Boone County so that the County inspected and provided the occupancy permit for the elementary school in case the annexation and development agreement were not approved in a timely manner. Mr. Teddy replied he believed each issue needed to be reviewed on its own merits. He thought they needed to determine whether this proposed development made sense in terms of whether it had a well-conceived agreement and good zoning plan, and they could then look at the situation with the elementary school as it was a moot point if the Council felt this development proposal was good since it would allow for annexation of the elementary school and an inspection by the City. He understood the Boone County officials they worked with preferred this area to be annexed into the City. Mr. Matthes agreed and noted he would communicate with the School District to determine if there was any change in timing.

Mr. Skala commented that City staff had been working on this issue in excess of a year, and there had been communication with some of the Council Members as the project had evolved, so it was not as if they had not been attending to this issue. It was now just being driven by school exigencies. He understood this would only set a public hearing to take a look at this issue in detail, and that detail included the development agreement, zoning, and the development in general. Ms. Thompson pointed out this was the public hearing on the annexation, so the Council was not setting a public hearing. She explained they were actually holding the public hearing on the annexation now, and B40-15, which would approve the annexation, was being given first reading later tonight, and there would be another opportunity for public comment at the next meeting.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe reiterated the Council would not vote on this annexation tonight. The annexation and permanent zoning of this property would be considered at the March 2, 2015 Council Meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

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

B39-15 Amending Chapter 14 and Chapter 28 of the City Code as it relates to taxicab businesses and taxi stand hours.

The bills were read by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine provided a staff report.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe asked for clarification regarding the amendment sheet associated with B369-14A. Mr. St. Romaine replied the amendments would correct a few issues that were overlooked at the prior meeting. Section 28-131(d) would be removed as it was a carryover from the initial ordinance where the City would have allowed transportation network companies to be able to pre-pay for their drivers. That was being removed because

staff felt it would be difficult to manage. Section 28-140 would be altered so the fees for transportation network companies would be the same as taxicab companies. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe understood the changes would also require each vehicle to be permitted if more than one vehicle was used by a driver. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

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

Mr. Thomas asked if the rules on vehicle inspections and background checks were based on how other communities had regulated transportation network companies. Mr. St. Romaine replied the standard requirements for vehicle inspections of taxicab companies had been mirrored. He noted this was not a vehicle condition check in terms of the type of check done as part of a state inspection. It was a check on the aesthetic conditions of the vehicle to determine whether it was suitable for that type of service. Mr. Thomas asked if other communities had taken this same approach. Mr. St. Romaine replied there did not appear to be a standard when looking at this issue across the country. It varied from community to community. Mr. Thomas asked if some communities had handled it in this manner. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes. Mr. Thomas understood there was a range of options and staff had reviewed those options and had decided to recommend this proposal.

Mr. St. Romaine continued the staff report.

Carla Jacobs explained she was a Public Policy Associate for Uber Technologies and commented that since their launch this past fall, they had been overwhelmed by the amount of positive support from riders, drivers, residents, and visitors. She stated she and her colleagues had talked to the Council and staff about smart, new regulations focused primarily on public safety, but the City had decided to move forward with a rigid proposal that would lower safety requirements, while mounting additional barriers that would prevent hundreds of drivers from using Uber as a way to make money, and thereby, preventing thousands of safe rides. She believed the City's intent was to ensure ridesharing as an industry was not welcome. She commented that Uber used a third-party provider to check federal, county, and multi-state records going back seven years, and they cross-checked the national sex offender registry and driving records obtained from state departments of motor vehicles with regard to the background checks. In addition, a social security number trace was conducted to ensure the check included all locations of residence within the previous seven years. She noted their background check process and policies were currently being reviewed as well. The City's background check process screened for various crimes, but provided discretion to a member of City staff with regard to whether an individual would be allowed to drive in Columbia. In addition, it did not include a scan for crimes committed in other states, if the resident had lived in Missouri for five years or longer. She commented that the vehicle inspections proposed by the City would not be conducted by certified mechanics, and would be conducted by untrained Columbia police officers. The City also only currently gave drivers the option of receiving inspections on Thursdays and when an appointment was made. Since many Uber drivers drove part time while also working other full-time jobs, the option of one day a week during traditional working hours would not provide sufficient opportunity to meet the requirement. She understood the City had stated the goal of a level playing field for taxicab companies and transportation network companies, but felt that was insincere as the

proposal included a requirement for transportation network companies to provide \$1 million in liability coverage, which was 20 times that required for vehicles for hire in Columbia. The City also required uninsured and underinsured motorist coverage at the \$1 million level. She commented that since the policies of Uber went above and beyond the requirements included in the current proposal, the City would require drivers to spend time and money to go through processes that were duplicative and did not add any safety assurances for the public. This created significant barriers for entry to part time drivers, and would hurt their ability to provide a safe and reliable ride for people in Columbia. She urged the Council to consider the benefits Uber would provide the City of Columbia, and to delay voting until the proposed ordinance reflected the unique aspects and benefits of transportation network companies.

Ms. Nauser understood Uber utilized a third-party vendor for background checks and likely contracted with local mechanic shops for inspections, so they would likely no longer incur those costs. As a result, she wondered why Uber could not reimburse drivers for those fees. She noted many employers reimbursed licensing and other fees. Ms. Jacobs replied Uber would continue to run their own background checks because they believed they were more thorough than the City's proposal. In addition, the concerns of Uber were not only associated with costs associated as they were also concerned about the time involved in meeting the requirements since drivers would have to come to the City to apply in person and would likely have to wait several days to hear back. Ms. Nauser commented that when she had applied for jobs in the past, she had been forced to take time out of her day to apply for the job even when she had another job, so she did not understand why it would be such an inconvenience for someone looking for optional employment. Ms. Jacobs explained they had seen a reduction in the number of drivers that actually went through the process in other markets that required in-person applications. She noted Uber had an application process as well, but it was available on-line, so individuals could apply in the middle of the night. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe asked if that information could be provided to the City. Ms. Jacobs replied the proposal before the Council involved the City's application. She explained other communities had put into code the requirements that would exclude someone from driving, but Uber would conduct the checks, and those documents could potentially be audited by the City.

Mr. Thomas asked for an overview of the way Uber operated in different cities with different regulations. Ms. Jacobs replied the most common model was that the City would put into place an application process that included requirements that Uber had to meet with regard to vehicle inspections, background checks, etc., and the onus would be on Uber to ensure those were completed by the drivers. In cities where there was a more hands-on application process, they saw a significant drop in the number of drivers that completed the necessary processes, which resulted in Uber not being able to serve the residents in need of it.

Ms. Nauser understood Uber had been operating when it had been asked to cease, and asked why the City should be confident in the ability of Uber to provide adequate background checks, etc. when they chose not to cease operations while working through the issues of this proposed ordinance over the last few months. She noted that if Uber had cooperated, an ordinance would likely have been approved sooner. Ms. Jacobs replied the

model described was in place in at least two dozen cities and states across the country, and some of those models had been in place for a year and were working very well. Ms. Nauser stated that response did not answer the question as Uber had been operating for months illegally and without a business license. She asked why the Council should believe the background checks, vehicle inspections, etc. completed by Uber would stand up to what the City would do when Uber could not even cease operations while the City could work on these ordinances. Ms. Jacobs replied Uber was operating in response to the individuals in the City that requested rides through their app. Ms. Nauser noted she had used Uber and other similar companies in other communities, and pointed out her concern was the fact Uber had operated without a business license when they had been asked not to operate.

Deshelle Cain, 1209 E. Ash Street, commented that she was an Uber driver, and asked if the police officers that would conduct the vehicle inspections were qualified. Mr. St. Romaine replied they did those inspections for the existing taxicab companies. Ms. Cain asked if the City had a sufficient police force to conduct the inspections or if more police officers would be needed due to the potential for many applicants. She asked if there would be an issue with the background checks as well. Mr. St. Romaine replied the City had asked Uber numerous times as to the number of independent operators in Columbia and had never been provided an answer. It could be handled through normal operations if it was only a few dozen people, but if it was a large number, the City would look at other ways to accommodate these needs. He noted they did not intend to hold up applications for a long time. Ms. Cain understood it took approximately seven days from the time of application to the time a person was able to drive through Uber, and asked how long it would take to get through the City's process. Mr. St. Romaine replied it would depend on a few factors. He explained the vehicle inspection could potentially be scheduled for Thursday if an applicant applied on Monday and the background check results were returned within 1-2 days. Ms. Cain believed opportunities would be reduced for drivers that did not have the ability to apply during the day and could only apply in the evening. Mr. St. Romaine agreed with the comments of Ms. Nauser in that most people applying for optional employment had to make the time to apply in person. Ms. Cain felt this would restrict opportunities for those in Columbia.

Mr. Thomas understood the City was covering its costs through a fee so they could hire additional staff to process applications if needed.

Steven Craze, 2412 Santa Rosa Court, explained he was a driver and a rider of Uber and commented that he felt the City had worked with the taxicab companies in terms of surveying to them, but had not provided the same opportunity for Uber drivers. He noted he was not an employee of Uber and was considered a sole proprietor as he drove on his own time. He commented that having to apply in person would be a hindrance for him and others with full-time jobs. He understood the vehicle inspection was an aesthetic check by the police, and noted Uber provided those checks as well. He explained an Uber representative took pictures of his vehicle to approve it when he had applied to be a driver. He stated he felt his vehicle was in much better condition than many taxicabs, and felt safer riding with Uber than in a taxicab because, as a rider, Uber provided the driver name, photo, etc. in case something were to happen. In addition, Uber had a rating system that would address

concerns such as aggressive drivers, and a driver would no longer be able to drive if the driver had a rating of less than a certain level. He did not feel some pertinent distinctions between taxicabs and Uber had been considered.

Ms. Nauser understood photos of the car had been taken, and asked if that had been the vehicle inspection. Mr. Craze replied yes.

Nathan Fuchs, 200 West Boulevard South, commented that he had used Uber in Kansas City, and it was a fast, efficient, clean, and progressive process. Taxicabs and the regulations on taxicabs were archaic and too strenuous for today's world. He wondered how this would work if it was a carpool app and money was paid into a gas fund, and whether the City would have been able to regulate it in terms of vehicle checks, etc. He understood this was a business model that involved more people and more rides and rides to people they did not know, but noted he had been approached by strangers for rides before, and did not believe he needed a chauffeur's license or \$1 million in insurance coverage to provide rides in those instances. He agreed regulation was needed and the job of government in an effort to protect its citizens, but felt those regulations needed to be more business-friendly and progressive so Columbia was not left behind.

Brandon Fredman, 301 Campus View Drive, Apt. 122, explained he was a student at the University of Missouri and did not have a car so he relied on COMO Connect for transportation since it was affordable and had consistent hours. He noted he also relied on Uber as a secondary source of transportation and used it about twice a week. He stated he needed it because Uber allowed him to get to and from work when the buses were not running or when he was not feeling well enough to ride on the bus due to the amount of time it took to get to and from his apartment utilizing COMO Connect. He understood he could receive that type of service with taxicabs, but explained he had not had the best results in terms of how long he had to wait for the taxicab and his feelings of being safe. He explained he liked Uber's innovative GPS system as it was similar to the COMO Connect DoubleMap system, and believed Uber drivers were held more accountable than taxicab drivers since they were rated. He was provided the driver's photo and vehicle license in order to report any issues. He noted he had experienced a couple of minor customer service issues with Uber, but those issues had been fixed promptly so he only had positive experiences with them. He asked the City to continue to work with Uber and to consider a grace period so they could continue to operate without any disruption in service.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, suggested the City move forward in a deliberate and set way, and not concern itself with being progressive compared to other cities as that could have a negative result. He provided the auditing process and Enron as an example of what could happen in those situations. He reiterated he was not interested in Columbia basing itself on other cities that might likely have bigger problems, and asked the City to move slowly, steadily, and thoroughly as he thought all involved would likely adjust in time.

Joyce Mayfield, 1423 Boyd Lane, stated she owned Metro Taxi and explained the reason a survey was not sent to Uber drivers was because the City did not know who those drivers were since they were not registered. She pointed out taxicab companies and drivers were not provided a transaction period so she did not feel it should be provided for Uber. She noted Uber had already operated for three months without a business license.

Mr. Thomas asked why the insurance requirement for transportation network companies was different than that for taxicab companies. Mr. St. Romaine replied the minimum insurance requirement for taxicab companies was mandated by the State of Missouri and he believed it was about \$200,000 in liability insurance. He explained that Uber had told the City they had \$1 million in coverage when staff started working on this transportation network company ordinance in October.

Mr. Thomas understood Uber had a way to prevent investigations by the Police Department in terms of potential driver violations, and asked if that would be different once this ordinance was passed. Mr. St. Romaine replied the hope of staff was that they would comply once the regulations were in place. If the City was made aware of instances of non-compliance, staff would take action like they did with any other company.

Mr. Matthes commented that the corporate culture of Uber was poor although they had a wonderful model in terms of the app. Staff was concerned with the background checks as there had been horror stories in other communities without a good response or any response from the company, and that was why they were recommending the City conduct those checks.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe understood the Uber representative had indicated the City did not check for crimes in other states and asked if that was correct. Mr. St. Romaine replied he thought the City only conducted in-state checks for taxicab drivers if they lived within Missouri for those past five years. If they had not lived in Missouri for the entire five-year period, the City would work with the Missouri State Highway Patrol and a third-party to conduct a national criminal background and driving check. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe understood only the last five years would be reviewed by the City, but Uber could conduct its own check for a longer period of time. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser stated she liked the idea of Uber as she believed its technology and concept was great, and she did not believe it was burdensome to require insurance, background checks, and vehicle inspections, or for those checks to go through the City. She explained she and her husband owned a company and their vehicles had to be insured and inspected. In addition, their drivers had to have special licenses. She reiterated she did not feel this was too burdensome as she believed public safety was important. She stated she would support the ordinance as it was amended and hoped Uber would comply with those rules.

Mr. Skala commented that he was willing to accept the staff recommendation for Uber and the legacy taxicab companies. He believed the primarily responsibility of the Council was public safety, and they had to ensure those using legacy taxicabs or transportation network companies received safe rides. He pointed out these regulations were borne as a result of mistrust since Uber chose to operate illegally and not provide a reasonable respite. He noted the Council was a legislative body and had been elected as representatives of the citizens of Columbia, and not complying with the law undermined respect between Uber and the Council and its other partners in the transportation system, the legacy taxicab companies. He commented that would respect Uber when it respected the Council. He pointed out the City was also trying to establish equity in accommodating two very different transportation systems, the legacy taxicab companies and the transportation network companies. He

thought Uber had tremendous potential in Columbia, but noted they needed to follow the rules. He stated he would support the recommendations of staff.

Mr. Trapp explained he was supportive of both ordinances as well. He noted Metro Taxi had identified issues with the taxicab company laws prior to starting the company, but followed those laws when starting the company despite their feelings with regard to fairness. He stated he appreciated the survey process in terms of reaching out to taxicab companies to consider regulation changes and maintaining the core integrity of the taxi stands while allowing for changes to it. He pointed out he loved the idea of transportation network companies in terms of the sharing economy as it was powerful and innovative, but the Uber corporate culture did not engender trust. A promise had been made that Uber would operate without charge, and that obligation had not been fulfilled as they began charging for rides short of their self-proclaimed deadline. In addition, Uber had a rating of F from the better business bureau and had been opaque with regard to how background checks were conducted. He stated he believed this was a good starting point in terms of a transportation network services law, and felt if Uber complied with the requirements and engendered trust, the City could likely consider other reforms as technology and the business culture changed. He thought they needed to end the period of lawlessness and disrespect for the law, and hoped this did not result in expensive litigation. He encouraged those that were associated with Uber to comply with the laws of the City, and reiterated he thought they could reopen negotiations with compliance and reassurances.

Mr. Thomas understood the frustrations of the drivers and passengers of Uber as he like Mr. Trapp appreciated a sharing economy as it created efficiencies by allowing people to travel by a range of different modes if they were not locked into the expensive and burdensome privately-owned automobile mode of transportation for all journeys. He noted he also liked the Uber rating system as it was effective in guarding against the risk of a bad or dangerous driver or awkward customer. He pointed out, however, the corporate culture of Uber created the need for the City to regulate transportation network services in a way they felt the public good would be protected. He hoped over time the regulations would evolve to allow a more free-flowing exchange of services provided by Uber and other similar companies, but at this time, he would support the bills as proposed.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe commented that she had used Uber in the past and had positive experiences so she hoped it would be successful in Columbia, but noted it was a legitimate City function to regulate business and to provide for public safety. She stated the City was trying to establish reasonable regulations that would allow Uber to operate while protecting the public safety of its citizens, and she felt what had been proposed had satisfied that goal. She noted she was happy to see this would provide students and other community members an opportunity to earn money and reiterated she hoped Uber was successful. She explained she was also pleased with the changes to the taxicab company ordinance as they were overdue, and the changes to the taxi stand hours would help the taxicab companies and the residents of Columbia that wanted to park in those spaces. She stated she would support both bills.

The vote on B369-14A, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: MCDAVID. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B39-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: MCDAVID. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

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.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B31-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B31-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: MCDAVID. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- 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.**
- B32-15 Authorizing a road maintenance cooperative agreement with Boone County for 2015 pavement preservation projects.**
- B33-15 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.**
- 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.**
- R26-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of the County House Trail Phase 2 project from the intersection of College Park Drive and Stadium Boulevard to Rollins Road.**
- R27-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of the Shepard to Rollins East-West Connection trail project.**
- R28-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of pavement improvements along Broadway, between Providence Road and Hitt Street, including the reconstruction of some curb ramps to meet ADA requirements.**

- R29-15 Setting a public hearing: renovation of the water slides at Albert-Oakland Family Aquatic Center and Douglass Family Aquatic Facility.
- R30-15 Setting a public hearing: consider the FY 2014 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).
- R31-15 Granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages for a Ninth Street SummerFest concert.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER (except for R31-15 on which she abstained). VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: MCDAVID. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

R32-15 Establishing a Community Tree Task Force.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Christian, Mr. Rehard, and Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe suggested two amendments. She noted she wanted the Task Force to recommend to the Council whether a permanent tree commission was needed, and suggested that be added as a duty. In addition, she wanted to change the composition of the Task Force so there were three expert members, three members of the public, and one Environment and Energy Commission member. She pointed out City staff had expertise, and the purpose of this Task Force was to allow for community input on the City's approach to trees. She explained they could appoint more than three experts as well. This change would provide flexibility.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe asked for clarification regarding the professional certification as she wondered what the difference was between that and an expert as she would hate to restrict people from applying because they did not have a professional certification and instead had a Doctorate or Masters. Mr. Rehard replied he thought a Doctorate or Masters would suffice, and noted most of them would likely be a certified arborist or hold one of those other titles. Mr. Matthes stated he thought the intent was to use those as examples. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe wondered if the wording should be changed to accommodate that thought, and suggested they require the person to be an expert and not require them to hold a certification. Ms. Christian thought they could use expert and those titles as examples.

Mr. Skala commented that this Task Force would develop the groundwork necessary for a much broader and permanent commission that would be in the position to establish a mission, purpose, etc., and asked if that was what was envisioned. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe replied she thought one of the tasks of the Task Force would be to make a recommendation to the Council as to whether a permanent commission was necessary.

Ms. Thompson understood the change regarding membership would read something like three members shall be an expert in an applicable field such as arborist, forester, urban forester, or dendrologist. She thought that would allow the flexibility suggested. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe agreed. Ms. Thompson suggested the recommendation be a recommendation to establish a tree commission as opposed to making it a permanent commission as most

boards and commissions were not necessarily deemed to be permanent and could be changed from time to time. Mayor Pro tem Hoppe understood and agreed.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe made a motion to amend R32-15 by adding a duty of the task force to recommend whether an on-going tree commission should be established, changing the number of at-large members to three and experts to three each, and changing the expertise membership to one where those members would have applicable subject matter expertise such as an arborist, forester, urban forester, or dendrologist without a requirement for a certification to be held in those fields. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nausser voting against it.

Mr. Skala noted there were tree experts in the Parks and Recreation Department and in other areas of the City, and historically some of these tasks had fallen to the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) in terms of commenting on or helping to draft land use ordinances related to climax forests, etc. When reviewing the City's boards and commissions, the Council decided not to task the EEC with tree board type issues. He commented that Columbia was a Tree City USA community, and part of the responsibility associated with that was to have a tree board and ordinances to support that board. He believed a permanent citizen tree board to discuss issues such as a tree canopy and to provide recommendations to the Council in addition to the advice of City staff was necessary as it would provide a different perspective. He suggested this Task Force preserve these distinctions so the Council could receive as much advice as possible on this issue as it was important to a lot of community members.

Mr. Trapp stated he was supportive of the Task Force as it would create another avenue for citizen input with regard to tree policies as was desired by some members of the City Council without creating a commission since the energy towards issues tended to change. He noted one of the reasons the Council had reviewed the City's boards and commissions was because some of those boards and commissions perennially operated with less than a full membership due to the lack of applicants. This would allow the Council to gauge citizen interest. He commented that he believed the City had excellent tree policies, but felt it was good to revisit them. In general, he believed decisions with regard to trees in parks should be made by City staff instead of coming to Council as was done now, and this Task Force might be another vehicle in this effort. He believed this was a nice middle ground approach to gauge interest and determine needs prior to committing resources.

Ms. Nausser explained she was not supportive of this as she believed it would result in more government intrusion on private property owner rights. As a property owner, she owned her land and had purchased and taken care of the trees on that land, and she did not need a task force or a future commission to tell her what she could do with the trees on her property. She saw this as the start of a path leading to people having to obtain permission to cut down or plant a tree. She commented that she loved trees, which was why she purchased property with a backyard full of trees, and noted she had to remove five trees last year due to fungi and the stress of the drought from the year before. She thought this would ultimately become burdensome to people with dying or infested trees. She also felt City staff did an excellent job in terms of tree policies, which was evident from the awards received. In addition, the aerial views of Columbia showed the wonderful tree and canopy cover in the

community. She stated was supportive of trying to preserve trees as much as possible in terms of the City's development policies and street treescapes, but did not feel they needed to intrude on private property rights, and noted she would not support it.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe stated she had been approached by a variety of experts and non-experts in the community who wanted to provide input on trees, and not necessarily in terms of regulation or over-regulation. She noted one of the tasks of this Task Force would be to review the regulations and make recommendations of what made sense and could potentially be done better. She understood there was an interest in street trees and types of treescapes in the downtown. She noted there was a wealth of expertise within the community due to the University, and explained many were willing to donate their time so Columbia could be an even better community. She stated the results of this could be recommendations and not requirements as well, and believed possibilities could include recommendations with regard to tree replacement, the identification of trees that were special and unique to assist property owners, and a notable tree designation. She felt this was a great opportunity to obtain free expertise and advice from people in the community.

Mr. Skala commented that he had a different perspective than Ms. Nauser and thought the government might be able to help its citizens in terms of advice on what they did on their private property.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed this was a good idea and noted he did not fear over-regulation as any proposed regulations recommended by the Task Force would have to be approved by the Council at that time. He thought they could benefit from the advice if there were people with the energy to look into this issue and share best practices.

The vote on R32-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NAUSER. ABSENT: MCDAVID. 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.

- B40-15** **Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of St. Charles Road and on the west and east sides of Battle Avenue; establishing permanent R-1, C-P and O-P zoning; approving a development agreement with St. Charles Road Development, LLC.**
- B41-15** **Authorizing an easement release agreement with Missouri CVS Pharmacy, L.L.C. and the Mary M. Hackett Trust No. 1 relating to the vacation of sewer easements located on the southeast corner of Providence Road and Broadway.**
- B42-15** **Approving the PUD Plan Major Revision of Bedford Walk Plat 9 located on the southwest corner of Nifong Boulevard and Bethel Street; approving a revised statement of intent.**
- B43-15** **Approving the Final Plat of Boone Medical Park Plat 2, a Replat of Lot 101 of Boone Medical Park Plat 1, located on the southeast corner of Nifong Boulevard and Forum Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract.**

- B44-15 Authorizing a performance contract with Lifestyle Development in connection with the approval of The Villages at Arbor Pointe Plat 3 located west of the intersection of Waco Road and Brown Station Road.
- B45-15 Authorizing a state aviation trust fund project consultant agreement with Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. for development of a Terminal Area Master Plan, a Stormwater Master Plan and an Airport Plan Layout Update for the Columbia Regional Airport; appropriating funds.
- B46-15 Accepting conveyances for sewer, sidewalk, drainage, temporary access and temporary construction purposes.
- B47-15 Authorizing renovation of the water slides at Albert-Oakland Family Aquatic Center and Douglass Family Aquatic Facility; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.
- B48-15 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B49-15 Authorizing a subaward agreement with the National Association of County and City Health Officials relating to the FDA Voluntary National Retail Food Program Standards (VNRFPS); appropriating funds.
- B50-15 Authorizing an agreement for sale of real estate with Vicarious, LLC for the purchase of property located at 309 and 307 St. James Street; appropriating funds.
- B51-15 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code to add a new Article XII pertaining to the regulation of single-use plastic bags.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP29-15 Historic Preservation Commission: Request for Sale of Accumulated Architectural Salvage Materials Stored in Rock Quarry Park.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked if people were donating items to the City prior to demolishing buildings, and if there was an architectural salvage firm in the area that was interested in any of these items. Mr. Teddy replied he was not aware of any, and understood they were usually found in larger, urban markets. He noted a store front operation had been discussed. Ms. Nauser suggested an internet-based operation. Mr. Teddy stated he thought the dilemma there was that the goal was to target the local population so on-site sales would be better.

Mr. Skala thought this issue had come up with respect to the Hagen Academy when older buildings had been demolished as they had advertised some of the stone pieces of the building that were salvageable.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe understood this would allow historic items that were taken from homes scheduled for demolition to be reused in the community.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe made a motion directing staff to work with the Historic Preservation Commission in developing a process for the sale of architectural salvage materials stored in Rock Quarry Park. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP30-15 Vision Commission Implementation Status and Media Mention Reports.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe noted the charts related to affordable housing only showed information through 2010 instead of 2014, and asked for clarification. Mr. Skala wondered if this was a census issue in terms of the data being available. Mr. Matthes replied he thought that was the case.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe pointed out social services funding in Columbia was about \$903,000 in FY 2009, but had been reduced in FY 2010 by about \$10,000. In consideration of tonight's pre-Council meeting in terms of the poverty simulation, she thought they might want to think about increasing the budget back to where it had been previously.

Mr. Trapp stated he appreciated the work of the Vision Commission as they had done a good job of checking on the progress of specific measures. He noted the Vision Commission perennially had openings if anyone was interested and pointed out this was a great year to participate since they would develop a process to guide the review of the vision. He commented that he thought the Commission had done a good job of identifying appropriate measures, but felt they missed on the measure for 11.3.1, which was that there was an assertive community treatment program in place. The assertive community treatment program was considered innovative in some places because Missouri was behind in terms of best practices in the social service model. He explained the assertive community treatment program involved a multi-disciplinary treatment team that worked as a group for high need individuals, primarily with mental illnesses. In his experience, the program resulted in amazing outcomes and had been a transformative experience for his agency, the Phoenix Programs because the lessons learned in applying this model had helped their co-occurring competency efforts across the board. He noted there was not currently an assertive community treatment team in Columbia, which was a gap in the services the community provided. The most natural service providers in terms of capacity would be New Horizons or Burrell Behavioral Health. He commented that the health home model utilized by the Family Health Center, New Horizons, and Burrell Behavioral Health was the closest to capturing the assertive community treatment model. He noted an assertive community treatment program was missing in Columbia, and if they wanted to accept a better a model than the CIT program through the Police Department, he would recommend the health home programs at the agencies he previously mentioned as those were the closest programs to the assertive community treatment program. He reiterated he believed this was a gap for the community at this time.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe asked that the Vision Commission receive the comments of Mr. Trapp.

REP31-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Thomas commented that he understood OppSites was a company that matched cities with particular plans for certain areas of the community with potential developers that had a similar vision to that of the community, and asked City staff to review the program to

determine if it might be of value. He noted they had a booth at the Smart Growth Conference, and the company representative indicated the community could market the property and a plan if there were property owners that were not proactive with regard to their property. He pointed out there was a gas station at Providence and Broadway that many wanted to see developed in some manner consistent with the downtown vision and the H3 Charrette. He stated the East Area Plan had ideas for a vibrant mixed-use of the Cinnamon Hill area, but they had not seen any projects with those ideas come forward for that land.

Mr. Thomas explained he had walked down Walnut Street to come to City Hall today, and noted he was impressed by the Public Works Department staff that had been scooping snow from the center of the street. There were 4-5 front loading buckets and a row of large dumps trucks working together in a choreographic and synchronized manner.

Mr. Skala thanked the Public Works Department staff for their work given the amount of snowfall received.

Mr. Skala commented that someone in the Evergreen area either had an auto repair hobby, home occupation, or a commercial venture. He noted the neighborhood was upset and there was difficulty in determining which category it fell into by City staff. He understood a home occupation that was compatible with the residential neighborhood would be permitted, but it needed to promote peace, quiet, and freedom from excessive noise, traffic, etc. He asked how they could make a distinction between a hobby, a home occupation, and a commercial venture, and wondered if legal action would be needed. Mr. Matthes replied it was a difficult problem, and staff had tried to brainstorm as to what could be done. He understood it was clearly an irritation to the neighborhood, but it did not clearly cross a line. He noted they would continue to look into the issue. Mr. Skala asked if there was anything the Council could do to help staff deal with the issue. Mr. Matthes replied there was a gray area in the City's code in terms of commercial in residential areas, and that was the problem. Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the amount of work that had already been done, and hoped for resolution.

Ms. Nauser asked staff to consider making Steeplechase Drive a first priority street in terms of snow removal as there was now more traffic on that street due to development and it had a hill.

Ms. Nauser stated she wished those that reported the news would report it correctly. She had heard multiple times today that the Council would discuss the bag ban tonight, but that was not the case because it was only an introduction and first reading item. She felt they should know the City's process in that those items were not discussed unless an individual came to speak on the topic at the end of the meeting under general comments. She pointed out it would be discussed at the next meeting, which was the March 2, 2015 Council Meeting.

Ms. Nauser commented that she found it interesting that those that felt there was too much governance would contact state representatives asking them to get involved with local politics. They essentially wanted to increase the powers of the state while taking it away from

local government, which was closest to the public in terms of representation. She understood the public might not like a decision of Council, but noted representative government was extremely important. She asked the public to come to the City's meetings and become more involved. In addition, she believed the state representatives should focus on state level issues instead of the City of Columbia.

Mr. Skala pointed out it was easier to participate in City meetings than State Legislature meetings. Ms. Nauser agreed.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought the ban the box ordinance had been reflective of a community consensus of the principles in general, and now people that had not participated had gone to the State Legislature to try to restrict the City's ability to set laws to address public safety. He commented that the City had exempted those that had to comply with state and federal laws that restricted the hiring of felons, and thought it would cover those that sold lottery tickets at gas stations such as BreakTime. He asked that the Human Rights Commission review the situation, and report back to Council with regard to any necessary amendments. Mr. Matthes stated he would follow up on the issue, and noted he believed Mr. Trapp was correct in that there were exemptions. Ms. Thompson agreed with Mr. Matthes as she thought there were exemptions if there were state and federal laws prohibiting a person from being employed in positions due to certain type of criminal backgrounds.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe commented that she appreciated the comments of Ms. Nauser and Mr. Trapp in terms of the need for an emphasis on the rights of cities.

Mayor Pro tem Hoppe thanked the Public Works Department staff for their snow removal work and for meeting with her and the Woodlea Drive residents regarding on-street parking. The residents in that area were able to get together to discuss the issues to come up with a solution that did not involve the City or result in no parking on the street

The meeting adjourned at 9:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk