

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

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 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 MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER and HOPPE 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 February 16, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Trapp and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

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

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

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

None.

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Sutu Forte – Shepard to Rollins GetAbout trail project.**

Ms. Forte stated she was representing It's Our Wild Nature Community Association, a 501(c)(3) organization, and explained Jerry Wade, the former president of the organization, had developed an alternative to the three established trail options that had been surveyed for consideration. She noted Option 4 was elegant, created a direct route to campus, and did not cause any environmental damage, and It's Our Wild Nature Community Association felt Option 4 was the perfect solution if done properly. She believed that option was being neglected and stated they did not plan to allow the Council to forget about it. She provided each Council Member a packet and thanked them for their attention to this matter.

**Gretchen Maune – Electric rates in the city and its contract with the Prairie State Energy Campus.**

Ms. Maune stated she was speaking on behalf of Grass Roots Organizing (GRO), and explained that in 2006, the City of Columbia along with 200 other Midwest communities had entered into a contract to allow for the building of the Peabody Energy Corporation - Prairie State Energy Campus for coal fired electricity. This plant ended up costing over twice as much as had been estimated, and had only started producing power in 2012. Columbia

along with many other communities had entered into the contract because they had been promised consistently low-cost electricity for many decades in order to address the power needs of its citizens. Unfortunately, the \$45 per megawatt hour that had been promised had rarely, if ever, been met. She stated many communities across the Midwest were facing terrible financial woes due to the contract, and she listed a few of those communities. She noted GRO felt the 40-year term of this contract was too long considering the financial hardships it had caused, and believed the residents of Columbia did not want to continually pay more for electricity or want to be responsible for contributing more CO2 emissions due electric generation from the coal plant. She provided the City a petition signed by about 500 people, asked the Council to hold a public hearing whereby questions could be asked of Peabody Energy and the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission in an effort to obtain a better deal for Columbia and its citizens. She asked for those in the audience in support of holding a public hearing to stand and about 20 people stood.

**Nellie Owen – Concerns for the Shepard to Rollins connection.**

Ms. Owen commented that pedestrians included anyone with disabilities that used modalities to get around town, and noted she did not understand why GetAbout funds had not fully funded sidewalks in Columbia. A study on the GetAbout website indicated a relationship between walkability and real estate values in that there was an increase of \$700,000 - \$300,000 in assessed values for every one point increase in the walk score. She pointed out Columbia had 350 miles of sidewalks in 2005, and by 2014, Columbia had only built 2.1 miles of sidewalks and crosswalks, which she felt was low. She also felt the conditions of the sidewalks around town were horrible. According to the pedestrian and bicycle information website, households with an annual income of less than \$25,000 were nine times more unlikely to own a car, and African-Americans made up 20 percent of the pedestrian fatalities even while only accounting for 12 percent of the population. She noted only 0.7 percent of the federal transportation funds were spent on improving pedestrian facilities. She did not understand why GetAbout funds were not targeting the lowest-income people as they had the highest obesity rates and the lowest educational levels according to the National Health Interview Survey. Better walking conditions provided intangible benefits to quality of life in communities, and the level of walking was considered an indicator of the livability of a community, which impacted the attraction of businesses, workers, and tourism, as communities were considered safe and friendly when people were regularly seen walking. In addition, the possible social interaction of people walking was a major factor for improving quality of life, and comfortable and accessible pedestrian environments provided alternatives to personal vehicles. She understood people biked for recreation, exercise and health, and to run personal errands, but noted a very low percentage of the population biked, while more people walked and did so for some of the same purposes. She stated she was in favor of Option 4, which involved the Stadium pedway/walkway, as it was environmentally safer and a better outlet for people coming to Columbia for the hospitals, stadiums, and schools.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### **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.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

B47-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

### **(A) Consider an amendment to the FY 2014 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.**

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala made a motion to cancel this public hearing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

## OLD BUSINESS

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

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

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

Ms. Hoppe asked when the agreements mentioned by Mr. Matthes would come forward. Mr. Matthes replied staff would continue to work toward agreement, and believed everything should be finalized within six months. He thought the agreement would be broad and include complicated language with regard to trigger dates, etc., but noted it would also be loose enough to be a workable agreement.

Mayor McDavid asked for the other projects that would be funded with this \$20 million bond. Mr. Blattel replied with a list of specific projects, and pointed out it would also include some citywide projects, such as 100-acre point sewer projects, private common collector elimination projects, sewer main and manhole repairs, and inflow and infiltration projects.

Mr. Matthes noted the previous ballot initiative involved costs of about 80 percent for extension projects and 20 percent for maintenance projects, but this ballot initiative would involve costs of about 20 percent for extension projects and 80 percent for maintenance projects.

Mr. Skala commented that he was more comfortable now than he had been previously when he had asked for this issue to be tabled. He understood staff was still meeting with the property owners to finalize development agreements. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He noted the agreements were complex, but believed they were close to completion. He explained everyone he had spoken with appeared to be committed and interested in discussing the details. Mr. Skala understood this would trigger an immediate annexation in

terms of the City being able to take advantage of the public/private partnership. Mr. Matthes stated that was what staff was working toward. He pointed out they did not have a document to present to Council tonight, but stated he felt positive reactions had been received from the property owners.

Mr. Trapp asked for clarification regarding the worst case scenario. He understood the City would charge 1.5 times the sewer rate under the pre-annexation agreement if the properties were outside of the City limits. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Trapp understood the worst case scenario would be to collect 1.5 times the amount that would be charged to someone within the City. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He noted annexation would occur when the City limits reached the boundary of the properties, which was unknown in terms of time and the reason for the higher rate.

Ms. Nauser understood the City would immediately collect revenue from the properties once they all annexed into the City since many of those properties generated sales taxes. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend R11-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Tom Ratermann, 1314 N. Seventh Street, explained he was the General Manager of the Boone County Regional Sewer District (BCRSD) and was in support of the sale of these sewerage system revenue bonds. He noted the BCRSD had about 7,000 customers and their service population included 18,000-25,000 people. They had 30 active Missouri Department of Natural Resources (DNR) permitted facilities in unincorporated Boone County, and maintained 80 miles of gravity sewer, 35 miles of force main, and 24 BCRSD-owned pump stations. He pointed out the BCRSD had about 25 connection agreements with the City of Columbia going back to the late 1980s. In the Henderson Branch watershed, the BCRSD owned, operated, and maintained four treatment facilities serving the four marketable lots owned by Midway USA, the Trails West subdivision, the Midway Crossings subdivision, and the Rollingwood subdivision. Additionally, there were some private DNR permitted facilities within the service area that were not BCRSD customers, namely Midway Truck Stop and Midway Heights Elementary School. He explained the memo and service area map in the packet was based upon the concept that existing BCRSD customers would remain BCRSD customers and a certain amount of land would be allocated to the BCRSD service area, and the BCRSD would pay a percentage of the cost for the Henderson Branch sewer extension based upon this allocation to the service area. He believed the Henderson Branch sewer extension would protect the public health and the environment, and would assist the BCRSD in complying with future environmental regulations. He asked the Council to issue these bonds and to work towards a mutually acceptable connection agreement for the service area.

Mr. Skala understood the pending agreement between the City and the BCRSD involved about 31 percent of the costs, which was in the neighborhood of about \$629,000. Mr. Ratermann stated that was correct, and pointed out the BCRSD Board of Trustees wanted to proceed with that concept.

Matt McCormick, 300 S. Providence Road, stated he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and noted the Chamber supported the Council moving

forward with the sale of these revenue bonds. He explained the Chamber had supported Proposition 1 as they had agreed it would enable the City to continue necessary improvements to the sewer system and bring the sewer system into its next phase toward compliance with federal regulations, and they felt that not selling these bonds would send a bad message to the citizens and business community. He asked the Council to keep the promises that were made, sold, and discussed when the City and other community organizations fought to get the bond initiative passed.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, asked if the list of projects discussed would be tied to the rates or if it had been used to gain public support. Mr. Blattel replied the project list provided those that purchased the bonds a list of what would be built with the bond proceeds. It offered bondholders some security for their investment in purchasing the bonds as the bondholders would be able to go against those projects if the City defaulted on the bonds. Mr. Clark understood these projects were promised, and although they might not be legally binding, they were binding in terms of the markets and credit ratings. He commented that he was generally supportive of the sale of these bonds and was glad about the cost sharing. In terms of annexation, he believed a northwest area plan was needed similar to the Northeast Columbia Area Plan and East Columbia Area Plan prior to annexation. He also thought a 10-15 year fiscal analysis and projection was needed for all costs and revenues associated with annexations. He noted he felt any pre-annexation agreement should make it clear that Midway Arms and others needed to bear the full cost of building pre-treatment facilities to handle issues the City's wastewater treatment was unable to address.

Mr. Skala explained he only wanted to delay the Henderson Branch sewer extension project so stakeholder conversations could occur, and it appeared as though that had happened. He noted he would be more comfortable if the agreements were finalized, but understood there were some time constraints in terms of selling these bonds before they were penalized by the volatility of the market. He felt deals had been reached that would save the community as much as one-half to two-thirds of the estimated project cost, and those savings could be used to reinvest in the promises made to people whose sewers were backing up near the central areas of the City. He thought the types of agreements people could come to when everyone was willing to come to the table were amazing. He noted this project was unique because it was beyond the urban service area, and the principle of the urban service area did not limit the City from developing or extending services beyond the City limits, but it did limit the subsidy so those projects were not subsidized as much as the projects within the City limits requiring agreements to be structured so there was a fair public/private partnership. He thought this was where the City was headed with the Henderson Branch sewer extension and was glad to see it. He noted he was happy to support the sale of revenue bonds given the evidence to suggest this was the way to approach extensions, especially those beyond the urban service area.

Ms. Nauser stated she had been concerned about the delay, but was now pleased as she felt they had a better project in terms of the Henderson Branch sewer extension, and hoped this process could be utilized in the future for other similar situations. This appeared to be a win-win for the property owners as well as the individuals in need of the sewer extension. It was also good for the environment and showed collaboration between

governmental agencies and the private sector. She noted she had planned to support it regardless of this added bonus because she believed the promotion of a list of projects associated with bonds to the general public was a promise whether legally binding or not, and felt they needed to uphold their promises.

Ms. Hoppe stated she also planned to support this sale of revenue bonds as she was pleased with the process that had occurred since this resolution had been tabled in terms of the agreement that was forthcoming. She noted she was still concerned about project lists associated with ballot initiatives when those projects had not gone through the public process or received Council approval because the Council was then forced to approve the project because it had been promised. She felt that undermined the public process and suggested only items approved by Council be listed or that it be clearly stated that the completion of the projects were contingent upon Council approval after the public approval process.

Mr. Trapp commented that he felt Ms. Hoppe had raised a fair point as she had expressed concerns when the Council had discussed the project list prior to the ballot initiative. He thought it might be good to hash this out at the Council level to ensure consensus for all of the projects prior to moving forward, but felt it would be difficult to make a list of possible projects while maintaining the integrity of the process since people often decided whether to support a ballot based upon specific items. He stated he was curious to know the rate they would receive on the sale of these bonds now compared to what they would have received had it not been delayed. He understood the City had been able to partner with the BCRSD and were in good negotiations with property owners in terms of annexation, but wondered what the net savings would be when comparing the interest rates from a month ago to now. He commented that he believed this extended conversation had been costly in the community in terms of their reputation and integrity, and that those costs were substantial. He believed they had to rebuild relationships to show they were committed to following through on their long-standing plans and commitments. He liked the idea of the urban service area and agreed it needed to be addressed at a policy level, but thought they needed to follow through with items that had already been started. He appreciated many aspects of the results and the hard work of staff to make this happen, but felt it had been an overly divisive and costly process, and possibly more than the end result was worth.

Mayor McDavid stated he did not feel they should look back as the interest rates were higher but could have been lower as well. He noted the Council was committed to repair infrastructure and pointed out the \$140 million worth of sewer projects planned for the next ten years, most of which were within the First and Fourth Wards in the oldest parts of the City. Even though he did not live in that part of the City, he believed it was part of his commitment as a citizen to help pay for those projects. In terms of this \$32 million bond issue, 70 percent of it was for work within the central city area, and he was happy they would be able to fund those projects.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had been a strong supporter of this proposition back in 2013, and liked the fact that 80 percent of it was for existing infrastructure while only 20 percent was for growth, but noted he had been unaware that one of the projects would extend City services beyond the urban service area. He stated the urban service area was an important concept to him as it was needed to manage public infrastructure costs

effectively since it was more expensive to build and manage infrastructure the further out it was located. He noted the Comprehensive Plan had indicated more infrastructure contributions should be charged to entities that would benefit from public infrastructure extensions beyond the urban service area, and that was the reason he supported a delay in the sale of these bonds and for more time to pursue negotiations. He thought the intent of the Comprehensive Plan had been honored through the deal with the BCRSD and potential deals with property owners in the area. The City had also increased the sewer connection fee for new development within the last six months and would continue increases to a level that would cover more of the actual cost of sewer extensions. He stated he was also swayed by the fact the annexation would occur earlier. He commented that although the City received more sales taxes and property taxes when it annexed property, it also had to provide more services to the area, but in this particular instance, the sales tax revenue received would likely be more than the expenditures to service the area due to the predominance of commercial and industrial property with a low likelihood of residential development. He hoped a precedent had been set in that the urban service area was a real boundary and that they had to think differently when extending public infrastructure beyond that area.

Mr. Blattel clarified the bonds would be sold on March 16, and approval would be brought back to the Council at its March 16, 2015 Council Meeting.

The vote on R11-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R40-15 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.**

**R42-15 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Somerset Village located on the north side of St. Charles Road and on the west and east sides of Battle Avenue; granting variances from the Subdivision Regulations.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk and the resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the 75-25 cost share involved the estimated \$7.6 million in traffic infrastructure costs, and the City would contribute \$1.9 million. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He explained the traffic study was used to spread the total cost out over a scenario of development that included but did not consist solely of this development. Mr. Skala understood some of those costs would be recovered by a transportation development district (TDD). Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and noted that if development occurred as projected, the costs could be allocated to the various land uses. The reason 100 percent of the costs were not borne by the developers was because some of the improvements would have area-wide benefits.

Mr. Thomas understood one purpose of the block length rule for streets was to avoid high speeds in neighborhoods, and asked how that would be mitigated if a variance was

granted. Mr. Teddy replied he could not say. He understood street trees, if planted, had a psychological impact. Mr. Thomas wondered if a traffic circle could be installed as they were effective in keeping speeds down. Mr. Teddy explained no one had suggested that type of facility when the plans had been reviewed by staff. He noted there was an interval of intersections and thought that might slow people down once they became aware of the cross traffic.

Rob Wolverton, 2504 St. Regis Court, commented that a tremendous amount of time and effort had been put into this project as it had been a nine year journey. The site for Battle High School was chosen in 2006, and the Northeast Columbia Area Plan, which took approximately a year to complete, was produced afterward. In addition, the High School had been built, there had been a sewer extension project, a traffic study had been completed, road improvements had been made, etc. After the Lake of the Woods Golf Course was annexed, their property became contiguous to the City so they filed their annexation petition paperwork in September, and the Columbia Public School District and the City for a park had also submitted their respective annexation petition paperwork. He pointed out a tremendous amount of planning had been done in this area and a tremendous amount of infrastructure that had been built. He felt more planning and infrastructure improvements had been completed ahead of development and growth in this area than in any other part of the community. The next logical step was to bring the schools into the City as had been anticipated when the site was selected.

Caleb Colbert, 601 E. Broadway, explained he was one of the attorneys for St. Charles Road Development, and noted the result of the traffic study completed in 2012 was a fee schedule. He referred to a slide in his presentation and explained it was the fee schedule applied to their project. He pointed out that schedule was an estimate and an illustration for their purposes this evening. The final fees would be based upon what was actually constructed and developed in the area. In this illustration, they assumed maximum development, and the total fees from the traffic study allocated to this project equaled about \$7.3 million, of which the development would pay for 75 percent through roughly \$2.2 million in road improvements and \$3.3 million from a TDD. He pointed out the traffic study fees did not replace the existing 50 cent fee, and that \$414,000 would be paid on top of the 75 percent of traffic study fees. He noted the developer contribution would be approximately \$5.5 million, and the TDD would be subject to the same rules and regulations as other TDDs except that the revenue from this TDD, after a reduction for administrative costs, would go to the City. It would be up to the City as to how, where, and when the money was used as long as it was used in the traffic study area. He stated the TDD would include the commercial tracts, Tracts 4 and 5, and could be expanded to include other tracts or areas if non-residential uses were proposed.

Mr. Skala understood this TDD would be different than others in that it would include sales taxes and property taxes and three City representatives on the TDD board along with two other stakeholders, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Colbert replied there had been a change to the suggested TDD Board composition, and the City would now have a non-voting advisory member on the Board. He noted they were still working on some of those details. Mr. Skala understood that had changed. Mr. Colbert explained the control of the City would

be that it would receive the revenue, and the Council would determine when, where, and how that money was spent. The owners wanted to have some input, but would really only be passing the money on to the City, so there was really nothing for the Board to control. The assessment would be a combination of a half-cent sales tax and special assessments, and the final amount would be the fees represented by the traffic study. It would not be a never-ending fee generator. Mr. Thomas understood the TDD would expire when the \$3.3 million had been raised. Mr. Colbert stated it could be collapsed at that time. He noted there was flexibility in how it was setup, but it could be collapsed then. If other areas were added to the TDD, it might not end at that time.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, suggested the construction of smaller homes as larger homes had more costs in term of utilities, etc. He also suggested future expenses be considered for placing utilities under sidewalks and with regard to the root system of trees.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, recognized the good effort toward creating a structure that matched the cash flow that would come into a project over time with the cash flow needed to build certain infrastructure over a period of time. He understood the traffic study was for the entire 1,800 acres, but the allocation of cost was for this project only. He wondered how much assurance the City had with the proposed structure in terms of obligating other owners within the 1,800 acres to participate. He was also concerned about the lack of City representation on the TDD Board as he assumed that Board would determine the amount of revenue to come from sales tax and property tax. He felt approving the development agreement was premature due to the innovative nature of this agreement, and encouraged the Council to table this issue until they had assurance from outside legal counsel and because it involved an annexation, which he believed needed to first undergo a 10-15 year fiscal impact analysis.

Sid Sullivan, 2980 Maple Bluff Drive, commented that TDDs involved sales tax revenue, which essentially came from commercial property, and in general, followed residential development. Due to the high school, he understood a few fast food establishments might develop sooner to help pay for improvements, but had concerns. He noted he was concerned with the change in the administration of the TDD since the City would only be represented by one non-voting member. In addition, the money would only go to the City after administrative costs, such as planning and legal costs, were paid so the amount left for roads would be greatly diminished. He stated he did not believe the traffic study incorporated this area as the study had been done for Boone County and did not provide for roadways other than the north-south connection of Battle Avenue and Mexico Gravel Road and the \$10 million bridge across I-70. It did not provide for traffic flow within the City itself to allow for commerce and other activities.

Mark Farnen, 103 E. Brandon Road, stated he represented the developer and explained they did not have a way to project into the future everything that might need to be built in the next 30 years. The County created a traffic study that attempted to make some projections while allocating those cost in a fair way, as best as possible, to the properties that were most likely to develop in the 1,800 acre area. He understood the previous speaker had indicated it might take 5-6 years before revenues were generated, and pointed out they had already spent \$1 million on road improvements to serve the school. He commented that this

agreement would not short-change the long-term construction of infrastructure in the 1,800 acre area. It would allow for a head start and the potential to provide safety that could not otherwise be accounted for in terms of improvements to St. Charles Road, Battle Avenue, etc. He hoped the Council would look favorably on this proposal.

Mr. Skala asked Mr. Farnen to speak on pedestrian safety as it related to traffic circles. Mr. Farnen replied that many engineers would say pedestrian crossings at round-a-bouts was safer than trying to cross at a four-way signalized or non-signalized stop because people only had to look for traffic in one direction and only had to cross two lanes of traffic to get to the center to get across. He noted this did not mean there could not be additional crosswalks strategically placed across Battle Avenue, and believed the best way to proceed was to locate the round-a-bouts to take care of vehicular traffic and to then see what occurred in those commercial and office areas as only certain uses might require additional crossings at other points. He understood round-a-bouts were the safer option and the best option for vehicle management, and thought they should wait to do anything further until the ultimate uses were known.

Mr. Skala stated he was troubled by the change in the TDD Board as he thought there would be City representation. Mr. Farnen explained this had been discussed and described at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, but it had not been defined at that time. He commented that the real control of the TDD was with the use of funds, and the pledge of the funds to be controlled by the City Council obviated the need for representation on the Board. Mr. Skala understood Mr. Farnen felt the TDD Board was there for administrative purposes only. Mr. Farnen stated that was correct. He explained TDDs were required to have a board of directors, and in this instance those board of directors could be anyone. Although the board members could vote, the only thing they could vote on was whether they should follow the rules they had agreed to by contract with the City, which they would since that would be governed by the intergovernmental agreement. Ms. Thompson explained there would be a separate cooperative agreement for the pledge of those revenues to TDD projects in the development agreement.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been following this project since 2006 when the site for Battle High School had been selected and agreed with Mr. Wolverton in that a considerable amount of effort had gone into this proposal. He noted he was disappointed that a community heat pump system could not be incorporated into this development, but still believed there were many commendable aspects to the development, to include the 75-25 percent cost share. He felt that type of public/private partnership was groundbreaking, and pointed out this area was within the urban service area, so it was an area in which they wanted to provide City support particularly since it involved other governmental organizations like the Columbia Public School District. He thought the TDD was innovative, and felt City representation would have been even more innovative. He noted he was assured by the City Counselor that controlling the dollar amount was what was important and a separate agreement would be entered into at a later time. He stated he was reassured of the pedestrian safety issues and understood there might be a need for a dual lane round-a-bout if there was a lot of traffic. He noted he planned to support this proposal.

Mr. Trapp stated he agreed with the comments of Mr. Skala, and liked the public/private partnership, the thoughtfulness and attention to the plans, the fact it would be built in stages as development occurred as that made sense, and the fact some items would be withheld until they saw how the area developed. He noted he appreciated the attempt of staff to reduce the number of cul-de-sacs to only one as it would help with snow removal and provide great inter-neighborhood connectivity. He understood the reason for the long blocks and some of the sidewalk variances as there were trade-offs in the development. He commented that he liked the street trees and the enhanced right-of-way, and pointed out the City arborist would make recommendations so the root systems of the trees selected would not tear up the streets and sidewalks. He appreciated the collaborative nature between the Columbia Public School District, Boone County, the City, and the developers, and thought it looked like it would be a nice place to live.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with the comments of Mr. Skala and Mr. Trapp. She believed it was a natural area for annexation and liked the cost share in terms of the streets and the traffic plans. The lack of cul-de-sacs would provide a successful 50's urban feel and would allow for more walkability and better snow removal. She liked the fact consideration had been given to the Northeast Area Plan and the street trees as it would add to aesthetics and property values. She believed the neighborhood would be successful for a long time and would add to the attractiveness of the Third Ward.

Mr. Thomas commented that this long planning process with a lot of public input and the collaboration of multiple jurisdictions in a visionary way had helped develop a project that adhered to the Comprehensive Plan in a number of ways. He thought the development included a fair way to pay for transportation infrastructure in terms of the \$5 million or 75 percent and the 50 cents per square foot for every home built along with the construction of the on-site streets. He stated he liked the detail in the document delivered by the applicant last week as it included a lot of philosophical thoughts. He understood they would target some lower than median type housing, which he felt was needed, and noted he hoped they could develop a good bus service, so not everyone that lived there needed to own a car. He liked the walkability and pedestrian access of the neighborhood, and pointed out he was glad to see a pedestrian easement as those were not always built into the plat for a path or trail. He suggested those easements be included in other developments as it allowed kids and others to get around without vehicles. He agreed round-a-bouts were safer for pedestrians than four-way stops, and helped to keep vehicle speeds down, which dramatically reduced the incidents of pedestrian collisions and severity if collisions occurred. He thought it was a great project and was happy to support it.

Ms. Nauser stated the innovation and cooperation with this project along with the sewer project they discussed previously had set the bar higher, and noted she would look for more of this type of innovation in future projects. She thanked everyone for thinking outside of the box, and explained she would happily support this subdivision.

B40-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on R42-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**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.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to table B41-15 to the March 16, 2015 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, stated she was the neighborhood representative for the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) and a member of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), and she along with the DCLC and the HPC had previously had concerns about the architectural integrity of the area surrounding this development. While she appreciated they had fast-tracked some of the sewer easement issues, the language of the agreement the Council had been presented had been carefully crafted to include an inference that the City had agreed to the architectural design of the proposed building. She thought it was important and timely for the HPC and DCLC to comment on this as they had been involved previously, and asked the Council to refer the agreement and design guidelines to those two commissions. She noted she owned property along Flat Branch Creek, and over time, development had pushed that creek under her front walkway so it caused water to rise into her basement when it rained. As a result, she was concerned about any effects of this development to the Flat Branch Creek, and wanted the opportunity to have her questions answered. She asked for this matter to be referred to the HPC and DCLC before entering into the agreement.

Ms. Hoppe asked whether the HPC and DCLC would meet before the next City Council meeting.

Ms. Fowler replied the HPC would meet tomorrow evening, but she did not know whether that was a sufficient amount of time to discuss this issue, and the DCLC met on the fourth Tuesday of every month. She asked that this be slowed down just enough so they had the opportunity to look at the drawings and answer citizen questions regarding Flat Branch Creek.

Ms. Thompson noted Ms. Fowler was correct in that the easement release agreement approved architectural components of the building in terms of the depiction attached to the agreement.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to reconsider the prior tabling of B41-15 to the March 16, 2015 Council Meeting, and to table B41-15 to the April 6, 2015 Council Meeting and to refer this issue to the Historic Preservation Commission and the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council for input. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**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.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

B50-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B51-15 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code to add a new Article XII pertaining to the regulation of single-use plastic bags.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Christian provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood this could not be tabled longer than 120 days. Ms. Thompson stated best practice was not to table anything longer than 60 days, and another short tabling could be done then if needed. If the Council wanted to continue something for any significant time frame, she suggested it be withdrawn and reintroduced.

Mr. Matthes commented that staff wanted to take a good amount of time to determine if there was any way to move the two positions on this issue closer together, and did not believe any meaningful progress could be made in a short amount of time. He thought progress might be made if this bill was withdrawn and introduced later after that progress had been made.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was concerned that the only documents attached to this agenda item were from the plastic bag industry and the people in opposition to this proposal, and noted the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) recommendation had not been a part of the supporting documentation. She asked if she could request the EEC recommendation along with the presentation of the EEC and Sierra Club that was posted on YouTube and the petition signatures that were recently submitted to be made a part of this agenda item, if it was withdrawn, as she felt that would be fair. Ms. Thompson explained the agenda item could not be amended at this point, but staff might be able to create a webpage linking all of the pertinent documents.

Mr. Skala suggested they make a motion for all of this information to be included as a report on a future agenda. Ms. Hoppe stated she was agreeable, and would plan to make that motion at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to withdraw B51-15.

Mr. Thomas noted he had received a lot of negative comments with regard to this proposal.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas to withdraw B51-15 was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Ms. Hoppe stated she supported a reduction in the use of single-use or light-weight plastic bags. She noted she had used cloth bags for over 10 years, and showed the audience one of the bags she tended to use. She explained the cloth bags came in different sizes, did not break, were washable, could be used for other purposes, and could hold a lot of items. She pointed out the average American used 500 single-use plastic bags annually, and she and her husband had likely saved 15,000 plastic bags in the last 10-15 years. She

explained she had been concerned with the fact the supporting documentation for this agenda item had been one-sided and misleading or deceptive. She noted it had indicated that 92 percent of Americans recycled these plastic bags, but when looking at the fine print the question asked had been whether the person had ever reused a plastic bag. The report also indicated the bags were not toxic, and although they were not in and of themselves toxic, they were highly photodegradable and not biodegradable so they had the ability to absorb toxic materials. She encouraged the public to not take these statements at face value and to look into the issues. She commented that plastic bags in Columbia were primarily a litter problem, and believed it was the third highest item found in terms of litter in the streams. They were urban tumbleweeds and a problem even when recycled or disposed of properly. She understood some had indicated plastic bags comprised of less than one percent of waste, but that calculation was based upon weight. She hoped City staff, the EEC, and other proponents would educate the community. She pointed out that 30 years ago, she and others had signed a petition for the City to collect recyclables once a month if the citizens set them out, and that was the beginning of the recycling program in Columbia. The City eventually went to the bins and picking up recycling on a weekly basis. She believed the plastic bag issue was similar in that it would take education and time to eventually eliminate the use of single-use plastic bags. She stated she agreed the citizens wanted government to do things for them and not to them so they needed to work with the community to the point people believed the reduction or elimination of plastic bags was good. She noted she was supportive of withdrawing this item as long as it would continue to be pursued.

Ms. Nauser stated she was glad this item would be withdrawn. While she agreed they needed to recycle and reuse more products and get away from the throw-away mentality, she did not agree with banning legal and useful products, so she did not plan to support the banning of plastic bags if the issue returned to them for consideration. She noted she would support education in terms of the importance of recycling, encourage retailers to provide more recycling facilities at their locations, and support the City's efforts to increase recycling through the trash service provided. She was happy the City allowed the recycling of more items as she was able to recycle many food service containers. She commented that while she was opposed to the banning of legal and useful products, she was even more opposed to State representatives becoming involved in local issues. She did not believe State representatives should become involved in restricting people from making decisions for their own communities through elected city representatives. She noted State representatives were trying to limit Columbia's ability to utilize the tax increment financing (TIF) tool for infrastructure even when the State of Missouri had failing roads and bridges. Those representatives were also attempting to make laws to support big corporate donors, such as Uber and broadband companies, to the exclusion of local needs and local companies. She noted elections had consequences, and asked those supportive of State involvement to remember the State could take away the right to make a decision on an issue they were supportive of tomorrow. She stated local government was the closest to the people, and she did not believe the state and federal government should get involved in what had historically been local issues.

Mr. Skala commented that he believed reducing the number of single-use plastic bags in favor of reusable bags was a good idea environmentally. He also did not necessary believe bans were a good idea unless there were really serious public health issues like the Tobacco 21 issue. He agreed this was a controversial issue and felt the best way to approach this was to devise incentives and disincentives to the get to the goal without banning the bags altogether. He understood the EEC report had mentioned a fee on plastic bags and thought that along with a fee on paper bags might be appropriate, and for retailers to use those revenues to subsidize reusable bags. He was glad this issue would continue to be discussed.

Mr. Trapp agreed with Ms. Nauser with regard to state interference as cities could be a great laboratory of experimentation. He believed the state should set a baseline of minimum standards and cities should be allowed to exceed those standards based upon local conditions and the values of their citizens. He commented that he felt withdrawing this issue was the right thing to do. In addition to the timing issues, he did not believe two of the “whereas” statements in the ordinance were not factually true. He explained he had learned plastic bags were made from the waste products of natural gas, and not petroleum. He thought a more robust conversation was needed to determine if polyethylene plastic bags were a vector for toxicity because that could raise the public health specter. He noted the 50 million bags generated as a community on an annual basis was troubling, especially since they did not know how long they would remain on earth since they did not degrade easily. He explained he had also learned that most people disposed of the bags properly, but they tended to catch the wind and rise out of trash cans because they were so lightweight. He commented that he had some misgivings about the nature of the technology and the risks the bags posed, but was glad there would be a pause as they needed to examine the issue further. He thought they also needed to consider the result of a ban if they moved in that direction in terms of a referendum or state government involvement.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Trapp to withdraw B51-15 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

## CONSENT AGENDA

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

- 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.**
- 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.**
- R33-15 **Setting a public hearing: construction of a sidewalk along the east side of Garth Avenue between Worley Street and Sexton Road, a crosswalk across the east leg of the Garth Avenue and Worley Street intersection and reconstruction of six driveways to meet ADA requirements.**
- R34-15 **Setting a public hearing: construction of a recycling drop-off area located north of the northwest intersection of Providence Road Outer Roadway and State Route AC/Nifong Boulevard (former site of Fire Station No. 7) and improvements to the State Farm Parkway recycling drop-off site.**
- R35-15 **Setting a public hearing: replacement and upgrade of a water main along Texas Avenue, between Garth Avenue and Creasy Springs Road.**
- R36-15 **Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of Battle Avenue and north side of St. Charles Road.**
- R37-15 **Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of City-owned property located on the east side of Battle Avenue, north of St. Charles Road.**
- R38-15 **Setting a public hearing: consider an amendment to the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and FY 2015 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.**
- R39-15 **Transferring funds to close out the outdoor warning sirens project.**
- R40-15 **Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Engineering Surveys and Services for preliminary and final design of the Discovery Drive Roadway and Sanitary Sewer Extension Project.**
- R41-15 **Authorizing a license agreement with Burton & Associates, Inc. for use of the FAMS-XL<sup>®</sup> financial forecasting model for the Sanitary Sewer Utility and Stormwater Utility cost of service and rate recommendations study.**

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE. 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.

- B52-15 **Rezoning property located east of the intersection of Scott Boulevard and Southview Drive from District PUD-7 to District PUD-7.2; approving a**

revised statement of intent; approving a revision to the planned unit development plan for Kochtanek PUD.

- B53-15 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on a portion of both sides of Worley Street near Park De Ville Drive.
- B54-15 Authorizing the replacement and upgrade of a water main along Texas Avenue, between Garth Avenue and Creasy Springs Road; determining that the work shall be done by City employees.
- B55-15 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B56-15 Authorizing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for STD testing and treatment services.
- B57-15 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for public health services.
- B58-15 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for animal control services.
- B59-15 Authorizing an agreement with the National Association of County and City Health Officials for the Medical Reserve Corps program; appropriating funds.
- B60-15 Accepting the 2015 Public Health Volunteer Program Award from the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services – Office of Emergency Coordination for the Medical Reserve Corps program; appropriating funds.

#### REPORTS AND PETITIONS

**REP32-15 Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission Report: Request for Mayors' Challenge Participation.**

Mayor McDavid stated the City was participating in the Mayor's Challenge, but noted he would be unable to attend and understood representatives of the PedNet Coalition had planned to attend. He thanked Mr. Thomas for his influence on this and explained the City had issued a public statement about the importance of bicycle and pedestrian safety. He thought the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission should be the local action team, and listed the challenge activities. He believed the community valued pedestrian and bicycle safety and the City could concentrate its efforts towards those activities.

**REP33-15 Request from the Building Construction Codes Commission to Review the 2015 International Codes.**

Mayor McDavid stated he thought it made sense for the Building Construction Codes Commission to begin reviewing the 2015 International Codes.

Mayor McDavid made a motion authorizing the Building Construction Codes Commission to review the 2015 International Codes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Mr. Skala noted the report also mentioned referring this issue to the Energy and Environment Commission concurrently.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend the motion made by Mayor McDavid to include referral to the Environment and Energy Commission. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid, seconded by Ms. Hoppe, and amended by Mr. Skala authorizing the Building Construction Codes Commission and the Environment and Energy Commission to review the 2015 International Codes was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP34-15 Business Loop Community Improvement District Petition Verification and Update.**

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

**REP35-15 Vision Commission Implementation Status and Media Mention Reports.**

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

**REP36-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

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

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that he only had a small amount of trash in his garbage bags and noted there was money in recycling. He thought more education was needed in terms of recycling as all plastics could now be recycled, which should decrease the amount of trash for everyone.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he believed B51-15 was a political issue and had been disturbed by the involvement of staff as it was not their job to negotiate solutions across the City. He felt that was the role of citizens, boards and commissions, and the Council. He noted he had also been offended by the supporting documentation included with that agenda item as it was not fair, impartial, or complete information. He understood these bags created major mechanical problems at the recycling facility. He suggested the staff only support the boards and commissions in talking to the stakeholders as they might eventually come up with a mechanism other than a ban for the problem. He thought the Environment and Energy Commission should continue to take the lead on this issue by seeking out stakeholder groups.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mayor McDavid for his leadership in participating in the Mayors' Challenge for Safer People and Safer Streets and for appointing representatives to participate in the Summit. He hoped the Council would receive a report with recommendations when they returned in terms of how the City should proceed in working with the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission. He noted there had been three pedestrian deaths since October, and one pedestrian was killed and two others had been injured by vehicles on one day alone in January.

Mr. Thomas asked City staff to review the use of GetAbout funds and to provide the number of miles of sidewalks constructed with those funds. He agreed with Ms. Owens, who

spoke earlier, in that there was a shortage of sidewalks in many areas, and people were walking on the sides of streets, which was very dangerous. He hoped the City would put a plan in place to address the need for sidewalks on arterial and collector streets.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with a lot of the goals of It's Our Wild Nature Community Association, and believed the property on the east side of Hinkson Creek was ideal in terms of preservation as a natural public park with educational opportunities in terms of native species and natural ecosystems, walking paths, and a transportation connection as it would only impact a small area. He noted Options 1 and 3 made the greatest sense in terms of trail connectivity and shifting the most vehicle journeys to walking and bicycling journeys. He thought Option 4, which would improve the pedestrian facilities on the bridge near Stadium Boulevard over the Hinkson Creek, was an important project, but a lower priority than Options 1 and 3.

Mr. Skala explained he wanted to reinforce the comments of Ms. Nauser with regard to State legislators. He understood Senator Schaefer and Representative Rowden had teamed up to deal with issues that he believed were local control issues, such as fiber broadband, Ban the Box, Uber, plastic bags, etc. He did not know whether it was appropriate for the Council to take a position to encourage its lobbyists to fight the good fight or draft a letter about the issues of local control.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed the point had been made and that there was no need to write a letter. Mr. Skala thought he might write a letter. Mayor McDavid thought it would be okay for them to individually call or write a letter to their representatives.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the City's lobbyist was advocating on the City's behalf. Mr. Matthes replied the City's lobbyist was, but noted it was more powerful when the Council contacted the representatives individually since they were the elected officials. He noted lobbyists were very good at knowing the best way and time to communicate with representatives, but it was a more powerful message when it came from the Council.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed the message was unified and strong, and had been made clear tonight.

Mr. Skala thought it was important for each Council Member to individually contact its state representatives with regard to these issues, and encouraged everyone to do so.

Mr. Skala thanked the staff involved in snow removal for their work as he believed the last two storms had been handled well. He noted he had received very few complaints. He stated his appreciation for the interactive CoMoSnow website in terms of updates, where the trucks had been, and which roads had been cleared.

Ms. Hoppe asked for a report on plastic bags, which would include the documentation that had been with B51-15, the report of the Environment and Energy Commission, the YouTube video of the educational meeting held in February, and the petition signatures that were submitted so the public had all of the information in one location.

Ms. Hoppe asked for a report on snow removal on private sidewalks, and noted she wanted to know whether the City was doing anything to encourage or monitor that type of

snow removal and if fines were being issued when it was not done. She noted her husband could not walk to work because the sidewalk on Old 63 was impassable, and pointed out she did not like driving on streets where pedestrians were walking. She pointed out the Boone Hospital Center, Columbia College, and Boone County Lumber were very good in terms of snow removal on the sidewalks, but there were other stretches along really busy streets that were not cleared. She reiterated she wanted to know what the City was doing in this effort.

Ms. Hoppe noted one of the scheduled public comment speakers had requested a public forum to be held to allow the public and the Council to ask questions regarding the Prairie State Energy Campus contract. Mayor McDavid thought it would be best to refer the issue to the Water and Light Advisory Board and to ask them to hold a public hearing or forum on the issue and to provide a report to Council. Ms. Hoppe stated she was agreeable with that suggestion.

Mr. Matthes pointed out there was likely no way to compel Peabody Energy to show up, but they would be invited. Ms. Hoppe stated she understood.

Ms. Hoppe explained she had expressed concern regarding projects being associated with ballot initiatives without going through an approval process when discussing the sewer bond issue earlier in the evening, and suggested the project list only include items that had been generally approved by the Council or at least language that informed the public that the projects still had to go through the public improvement process and needed approval by the Council so the public process was not undermined. She asked staff to consider her concerns and make a recommendation for improvement.

Ms. Hoppe clarified her concern was with projects being promoted to be funded by a ballot initiative without the Council understanding the details of the project and then being forced to move forward with the project because the ballot initiative had passed and been promoted to include that project.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not believe the intention was to never accomplish a project on the list. He thought they only wanted to defer projects due to certain contingencies.

Ms. Nauser stated she believed the public was given the opportunity to provide input, and provided the electric ballot initiative for April as an example. She noted there had been work sessions that people could attend for informational purposes. In addition, public input had been allowed when the Council was considering whether to place the funding of these various projects on the ballot. It would be discussed again when the bonds were issued as well. She believed the public had the obligation to follow city government, and although they needed to provide opportunities for the public to comment and to be informed, they could not force the public to be informed.

Ms. Hoppe stated she believed the current process deprived the public and the Council of decision-making when something that had not been previously discussed was tied to a ballot issue because they were then told they could not vote no since the public voted on the ballot issue with the understanding that project would be completed.

Mr. Matthes commented that staff could prepare a review of how they approached different ballots over the last few years. Ms. Hoppe thought they needed to ensure projects

were not listed that had not been thought out or were controversial. She also did not feel projects should be added at the last minute.

Mr. Skala explained he thought they wanted to do what was promised, but believed there needed to be flexibility for unforeseen contingencies.

Ms. Hoppe noted she had received an e-mail regarding a row of mailboxes on Rice Road and Ballenger Lane and asked Mr. Skala if he had looked into the issue. Mr. Skala replied he had been in contact with the person who was concerned about people parking in front of the mailboxes, and it had been referred to staff.

Mr. Trapp stated the residents in the Valley View subdivision were upset they did not get the fire station that had been promised to them. He understood the City had not received the necessary sales tax revenue due to the recession to complete that project, and did not have enough firefighters to staff the fire station. He agreed the City needed to be careful in creating project lists associated with ballot issues.

Mr. Trapp noted there was a lot of brush growing near the culvert next to Parkview Park and a couple of citizens were concerned about the activities taking place in the culvert as there was some graffiti there. He thought clearer site lines would help the situation and asked staff to look into it.

Mr. Trapp explained there was a dim streetlight on Whirlaway Court and asked for that to be looked into as there were property crime issues in the Derby Ridge area.

Mr. Trapp commented that some people in his ward had recycle bins instead of the blue bags due to being part of a study, and a constituent had informed him that the bins were made in Canada. The constituent wanted to ensure the purchase American-made roll carts if a roll cart system was implemented. He understood the City was obligated to contract for certain projects and services in a certain manner, but thought a buy-American policy might be reasonable. Mr. Matthes stated staff would look into that possibility.

Mr. Trapp stated his appreciation for the hard work of Ms. Christian.

The meeting adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk