

Columbia Vision Commission: RE-Vision Dialogue
March 18, 2015 – City Council Chamber
Columbia, Missouri

G. Arthur Pollard, pre-meeting comment: Concerned about urban planning; new apartment buildings are too tall, shoddy construction; need wider sidewalks, more traffic calming and underground parking; the “gargantuan” parking garage is under-used; sees big trucks making deliveries downtown and pumping out diesel fumes; plastic bags cause problems at trash heaps, kill wildlife.

Commission Chair Maurice Harris welcomed guests to the RE-Visioning dialogue. Other Commissioners attending included Vice-Chair Alvin Cobbins, Jeremy Milarsky and Kevin Reape. Chair Harris summarized the Vision process and the five-year review process, noted the location of future meetings and observed that the Vision should reflect changes that have occurred in the community over the past few years.

Downtown

Chair Harris summarized the vision statement and goals for downtown, as noted in the Community Vision document, and asked for comments from those attending.

Vision: Downtown Columbia is a hip and vibrant district with a diversity of easily accessible businesses, residences, attractions and institutions; it is an exciting gathering place for all types of people

Goals (numbering corresponds to Community Vision document)

- 6.1 Investments - Significant investments in the physical community and business environment...to leverage economic strength will bring vibrancy and diversity...and lead to major attractions and exciting destinations.
- 6.2 Housing - Downtown Columbia will have a variety of safe housing options...for all age groups and income levels with easy access to desirable amenities.
- 6.3 Mobility - People and vehicles will have easy access to downtown businesses and services...

What progress have you seen since the Community Vision was created?

Rachel Bacon, Planner, City of Columbia: There has been a lot of development and investment downtown, but also an increase in tension between “town and gown.” Will be working on relationship issues moving forward.

Katie Essing, Executive Director Downtown Community Improvement District: Since the original Vision process, a Community Improvement District (CID) plan has been put in place. Voluntary District Design Guidelines were released in January. They emphasize the character of new buildings and are free and available through the City and on the District’s website.

What else has happened since then?

William David Steinmeyer: There’s not much we can do but build more parking and close streets. Always has to allow more time to travel across Columbia. Has been here since 1992, when it was a lot easier to get around. Now it’s too complicated. Recalls parking lots replaced by Short Street garage

David Sheely: Parking downtown continues to be a problem. There is a lack of disabled parking spots. Lunch-hour traffic on Broadway is hard to get through, especially with big rigs idling in lanes during deliveries. It has worsened since remodeling and building new motels.

Chair Harris: Feels a tension between town and gown. Housing options are lopsided...more for students to the detriment of others...and there is a lack of affordable housing.

Commissioner Cobbins: With increased student housing, crime has increased. City has tried to address this, and dialogue should begin.

Rachel Bacon: City is reviewing development codes and hopefully will address private space and development. Infrastructure and capacity are issues. We don't have enough alleys to supply student needs.

What should the community do, going forward?

David Sheely: Expand the 8th Street garage "up" and include more and larger accessible parking spots. Put a damper on higher-priced rental housing. Ordinary people need to be able to rent, too.

William David Steinmeyer: Doesn't think there is an easy solution. With the influx of students, parking is always going to be a problem.

Commissioner Cobbins: The most important thing is, we have a process to have your voice heard. You've raised the question and it will be looked at. It's important to address parking for people who are challenged.

Economic Development

Chair Harris summarized the vision statement and goals for economic development, as noted in the Community Vision document, and asked for comments from those attending.

Vision: Columbia will attract, retain and encourage business growth by establishing a business friendly climate, enhancing regional economic partnerships, and fostering a digital infrastructure.

Goals (numbering corresponds to Community Vision document)

- 7.1 Economic Development - Columbia will attract...the growth of new businesses by establishing a business-friendly climate, enhancing regional economic partnerships, and promoting reciprocal business relationships.
- 7.2 Airport – It will be possible to efficiently and cost effectively fly into and out of Columbia to save time and money.
- 7.3 Jobs and Job Training - Columbia will have an employment base that is trained and qualified to work in a variety of industries. Employers will provide "decent" wages with benefits that provide opportunities for professional development, further education, good health, and quality of life.
- 7.4 Science and Technology - By 2020, Columbia and Boone County will be known internationally as a leader of science and technology innovation, having produced more than 25 successful new high-technology business start-ups in Boone County.

What progress have you seen since the Community Vision was created?

Rachel Bacon: Our employment rates were better than other places during recession. Smaller, more "artisan" businesses are emphasized, and they understand the internet market base. Regional retail is our number one economic sector, which can be good or bad, depending on how you look at it

Bernie Andrews, Assistant Director of Economic Development, City of Columbia: Columbia has been fairly successful in attracting biotech businesses. We want relationships with the University of Missouri to keep this sector positive. There is a small business incubator in REDI, Inc. office that provides shared work space for startups. It's a hub for entrepreneurship, serving 35 – 40 people through Million Cups sessions each week. We've started some training programs, such as mechatronics for manufacturing careers in partnership with Moberly Area Community College, and we work with local businesses to design the training they need. These are eligible for A+ treatment, and high school students can earn certificates.

Chair Harris: JobPoint trains 18 - 22 year olds in working trades such as carpentry and plumbing. They build houses using Community Development funds.

Commissioner Milarsky: The University's joining the SEC has had some economic impact.

Chair Harris: Community has been trying to attract those athletic event travelers to downtown, and a new Zaxby's, based in Georgia, has opened.

What else has happened since then?

Bruce Watts – People's Visioning developed Plan B. Ask that this be entered into the RE-Vision record. It is available online.

Chair Harris: We try to develop talent inside the community.

What should the community do, going forward?

David Sheely: Is the City going for free broadband, as they have in Kansas City? This would free up income and benefit Columbia.

Bernie Andrews: There probably have been 25 startups developed in the MU life sciences Incubator. The big issue is retaining them. We don't have next generation lab space, and we lose startups to communities that have space and investment funding to, like St. Louis. Some groups in town are working on it, but haven't reached the goal. Columbia Water & Light has done a broadband study, but there's no progress yet. We still need more middle income jobs between high tech and retail.

William David Steinmeyer: There is a difference between the airport serving passengers and being a location to lease space and serve businesses...not sure what the City intends for that facility. We need to get air industry-related companies to move here from St. Louis or Kansas City.

Chair Harris: Understands there is interest in building a decent size terminal, and a regional hub may be the long range plan. There is debate about how to fund it.

Rachel Bacon: There is a lot of freight business and a plan to expand that.

Community Character

Chair Harris summarized the vision statement and goals for community character, as noted in the Community Vision document, and asked for comments from those attending.

Vision: Columbia protects and encourages the expression of its historic and natural character, uniting the community with sustainable, healthy planning and design, beautifying the streets and lives of its citizens.

Goals (numbering corresponds to Community Vision document)

- 2.1. Appearance - Columbia will preserve its existing character and enhance the city's natural and man-made aesthetics.
- 2.2. Preservation - Historic areas will be identified, valued and preserved through education, enforcement and incentives.
- 2.3. Revitalization - Columbia will utilize...urban planning designs to promote walking and visiting...to preserve and restore historic areas both green and civic... Columbia will provide and advertise incentives for building and retrofitting...for energy efficiency...and restoring neighborhoods with abandoned and substandard structures.

What progress have you seen since the Community Vision was created?

Leigh Britt: City Council recently appointed a Community Tree Task Force. While not mentioned in the Community Vision, the Office of Neighborhood Services provides a central point to work with neighborhoods on code enforcement and housing programs. Has been more aggressive in demolishing dilapidated houses in the last two years, especially in the central city.

Chair Harris: Columbia Water and Light offers low-interest loans for energy efficiency.

Rachel Bacon: The City Sustainability Office is new. The new comprehensive plan grew directly out of the Community Vision, with neighborhood planning for the first time in 20 years. Updates to the zoning code tie into neighborhood planning. The Historic Preservation Commission is working to improve the technical capacity of contractors and promotes community character through neighborhood tours.

Katie Essing: The District's voluntary design guidelines encourage historic preservation and retention of a sense of the area's special character. CID recently presented gateway designs to the City Council and is looking for grants to fund the improvements.

Bernie Andrews: Business Loop property owners are hoping to create their own CID, with improvements funded by property and sales taxes.

David Sheely: You get on I-70, the Loop is your first impression of Columbia. With the power plant, it doesn't look so good

What else has happened since then?

David Sheely: Kudos who to whoever saved the Heibel Building.

What should the community do, going forward?

Leigh Britt: Concerns about effects of more student housing on other housing throughout the city. As we think about appearance and character, will that affect other neighborhoods or older housing stock, or will it harm neighborhoods?

Katie Essing: Although the negatives have been highlighted, new student housing produces more revenue for businesses and for the CID. It helps maintain a sense of vibrancy and safety with more people living there. There are some creative businesses, such as the curated collection of galleries and businesses in North Village arts district, and Alley A flipped alley inside out.

Commissioner Reape: Will Discovery Parkway be a place that people go? There could be opportunities there.

Commissioner Cobbins: Public housing is clearly identifiable in Columbia but is well-maintained and better than what you see in other cities.

Rachel Bacon: The model for moving forward is more positive...more dispersed in community, smaller and less industrial, not identical, bungalow colors. Columbia Square Apartments have great landscaping and show creative thinking.

Bernie Andrews: Columbia Housing Authority is reaching out to more minority contractors, with a goal to use more and to identify more of them as businesses.

Leigh Britt: We need more applicants for City programs to help homeowners; it's hard to find people who meet income guidelines and are qualified. Columbia needs a not-for-profit organization to help homeowners maintain and repair their homes, especially those who are *not* senior or disabled.

Open Period

Chair Harris: Invited comments on all topics. Thanked participants and announced next meeting on Wednesday, April 22, 2015 at Missouri Employers Mutual, 101 N. Keene Street. Topics will include education, community facilities, parks and transportation.

Commissioner Cobbins: Invited applicants to fill Commission member vacancies.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Toni Messina, Civic Relations Officer and staff liaison

**PEOPLES' VISIONING 'PLAN B'
(*INSTEAD OF TIF*) SUMMARY POINTS:**

- 1) Zoning codes ahead of new development—until then, a development moratorium
- 2) Always carefully consider and use full definition of Smart Growth included herein
- 3) Green Buildings, Building Codes and Renewables: 100% Renewable as Goal
- 4) Hard and Soft Infrastructure to be assessed to new and redevelopment, as if new, at significantly higher costs or Impact Fees, User-Based Rate Structure, and/or Trip Generation models
- 5) Consider Bill Weitkemper's suggestions on billing, available funds from rate and billing changes, sewer concerns, potential rearrangement of certain projects and work timeframes
- 6) Look at City Department Finances, Bonds, Tax or Rate Increases or Refunds As Appropriate
- 7) Full investigation and audit of all our financial balances and present funding situation and 18 month running financial report at every 3rd Monday of the month City Council meeting.

PEOPLES' VISIONING PLAN B

From PV's Visioning, which often meshes with Columbia's Vision process results in the original Columbia Vision, as well as large parts of the Comprehensive Plan, out of that earlier document, we request the following Seven Steps:

Step One: Get thoughtful, public-supported, proper and updated zoning codes in place ahead of ANY NEW development or redevelopment that considers these documents and the voice of the public especially the downtown neighborhoods bordering the District and surrounding area. Consider a zoning overlay that would account for historic preservation and appropriate density, other principles of smart growth, as well as form based building codes, mom and pop stores, and net-zero energy building requirements for all of Columbia, but especially this portion of our city as we struggle with infill and density. **Until then, maintain a moratorium** as the public and Downtown Leadership Council asked for over a year ago, strongly supported by many in the community, and asked for again with the Niedermeyer 'uproar'.

Step Two: Always use the full definition of Smart Growth:

Smart growth values long-range, regional considerations of sustainability over a short-term focus. Its goals are to achieve a unique sense of community and place; expand the range of transportation, employment, and housing choices; equitably distribute the costs and benefits of development; preserve and enhance natural and cultural resources; and promote public health.

Consider our own Columbia, citizen-created documents. Then consider additional information such as Eban Fodor's Better Not Bigger: How to Take Control of Urban Growth and Improve Your Community, which notes: 'Contrary to accepted wisdom, rapid urban growth can leave communities permanently scarred, deeply in debt, with unaffordable housing, a lost sense of community and sacrificed environmental quality.', along with other works, some cited herein, for a much better understanding of a more thoughtful, just, fair and sustainable development that most Columbian's are calling for.

About 15 years ago, a Carnegie Mellon professor named Richard Florida quantified something many of us had long suspected, that throughout the last half of the 20th century, well-educated young adults were

leaving industrial cities such as Buffalo and Cleveland, and moving to high-tech cities such as Seattle, Minneapolis and Austin. He coined the term "the creative class," to describe these affluent, well-educated young adults, and praised cities that attracted them by prioritizing cultural districts, thriving downtowns, LGBT acceptance, farmers' markets and greenways and green space. Not surprisingly, Richard Florida had a fair amount of praise for Columbia, and other small Midwestern college cities such as Madison, Bloomington and Ann Arbor.

Dr. Richard Florida, PhD from New York's Columbia University and Director of the Prosperity Institute and Professor of Business and Creativity at the University of Toronto, in early 2012, made a rather startling statement about the cities that had been so successful in pulling in members of the creative class, a term he coined. Or at least it was startling to him, and to others that it came from him. For most of us, it was something that we had been experiencing or long suspected. He said new data showed that the people who had already been living in those creative class cities often wound up being no better off than they were before the influx of new people and in some cases were worse off. Sure, perhaps there were some more job opportunities for some of them in retail or construction, for example. But the cost of living had skyrocketed. Commute times had also risen tremendously. Small gains folks may have made in hourly wage or hours worked were more than offset by all the new costs of this 'creative class driven' growth. This sounds like the case for Columbia, as we've added nearly 2,000 new residents per year for the last 15 years, and have grown by nearly a third in that time period.

Some Columbians and many others in America have long accepted that we must fear the absence of growth. In the Midwest, that is a strong fear because we're occasionally surrounded by places that have done the opposite of grow, and we have seen their consequences. The real concern is: 'Why did this happen there and what can be done about it?' Some of this is driven by what has been explained in 2 books referred to time and again in our local debate over EEZ: 'The Great American Jobs Scam, Corporate Tax Dodging and the Myth of Job Creation' by Greg Leroy, free to read online at www.GreatAmericanJobsScam.com, available for check-out at our library; and, the other is Colin Gordon's story of negative consequences in St. Louis with these types of funding mechanisms associated with negative growth in 'Mapping Decline'. As the saying goes, be careful what you wish for, because you might get it. What Columbia has gotten is an unprecedented strain on roads, all infrastructure including public schools, public health and safety and more.

So it is time to quickly and completely reconsider our viewpoint of growth, put much more of a focus on what type it is, how fast its occurring, what it looks like and its real costs, rather than accounting only for touted or certain perceptions of the benefits of some types of growth. Data less than a year old shows, those benefits of certain types of growth have been overstated.

Step Three: It is Peoples' Visioning's recommendation, as part of our Vision and community guiding documents, that green building codes and 'stretch green building' codes, providing new opportunities in both materials and design, be quickly adopted, to include all buildings, commercial as well as homes, and that these improved building codes be immediately and strictly applied. This step regarding 'green buildings' and building codes was also part of the Burns and McDonnell November 2013 Report on Columbia's utility and energy supply, backing our PV recommendations as of December 2012, as a quick way to greatly reduce energy demand while significantly improving sustainability as it eases utility and resource demands that are provided by infrastructure for electric, sewer, water, and solid waste. We must also vigorously continue to educate and 'train' ourselves, our residents, both old and new, and our business persons to REDUCE, REUSE, and RECYCLE, in that order, while expanding opportunities for them to do this easily. Taking both of these important additional steps will reduce amounts of use, need and demand, reducing costs for less infrastructure and utility services demand, contributing greatly to our long term sustainability and to Columbia becoming more and more powered, in future, by 100% renewable energy, called for by Peoples' Visioning in City Council, Public Comments, December 2012, when PV called for 80% renewable energy by 2015. We also offered renewable energy plans to get Columbia all or most of the way to that goal, which we still offer. We brought Council information on other

cities with renewable energy already, in 2012, supplied at 86%, 95%, and 100%, as existing models and examples that this is not a 'pie in the sky' suggestion, but a 'doable' reality.

Peoples' Visioning has made recommendations through the Boards and Commissions, as was suggested then that we do, regarding raising our request to raise our Renewable Energy Standard, and to raise ALL building code standards for both home and commercial buildings, which will improve building efficiency, greatly reduce demand, offer additional conservation measures, as well as distributed renewable generation, for a variety of utility models and types. We hope PV ideas will move quickly forward not only from the dais, but from staff and from advisory boards and commissions, as with the recent increase in Columbia's RES and presently as with these very specific steps and specific suggestions that will help the current and present situation we find ourselves in, along with much more, very soon. As the Mayor and many Council Persons noted when passing 2013 improved home building codes; and, as the latest Burns and McDonnell recommendations note, building green is a very fiscally responsible step, easy to take, that the city will reap the benefits of, along with all Columbia residents and construction business owners; other businesses, realtors, staff and policy makers; and, ultimately, 'green building' owners themselves—please implement immediately before other commercial or home buildings are approved. This is a Peoples' Visioning step strongly supported by the community as the excitement for the Net-Zero Energy project demonstrates.

Step Four: Once these other steps are in place, Peoples' Visioning proposes addressing what others and other Visioning documents also propose in asking development to be fairly charged for the actual and real costs of the Impact of their development that, 'but for' it, we would not have the added burden of cost to all of the following infrastructure needs, as follows:

- * roads and lower-impact forms of city bus or similar forms of urban mass-transportation modes, walking and bicycling paths, as well as regional high-speed rail and bus services, as these all are aspects of infrastructure costs, are more sustainable and need to be part of assessing impact fees and/or user-based, trip generation assessment models in the transit category and link or extrapolate burden on other needs including
- * water, in critical supply in a warming world;
- * sewer, with abundant 'green' solutions;
- * electricity, also with 100% renewable already being achieved or within easy reach in several American cities;
- * fire and police protection;
- * public schools and libraries;
- * as well as many, increased green spaces, crucial to public health and quality of place and life, including all types of publically owned parks, with edible landscaping, urban farming and additional 'food forests' in public parks and spaces, along with additionally designated 'wild, untouched, urban 'green spaces'', urban forest or wildlife preserves and greenbelt areas, along with any remaining and/or valuable historic scenic roads and routes as well as potential scenic new routes.

Assess impacts on these hard and soft infrastructure needs and associated costs and link these costs to impacts and user-based models, as recommended by Peoples' Visioning, as well as to some degree mentioned in the minority report of the Infrastructure Task Force, focused solely on roads in that report, but now recommended by some of those members and others to include **all forms** of necessary infrastructure, as noted above. Peoples' Visioning, has also more recently led the community in calling for this, along with our allies and PV co-sponsors as well as many in the broader Columbia public voice, in several, but often ignored, guiding documents and processes supported by the public, as well as a few

Council Persons, as the public's voice on City Council. This also includes results of 2007 studies by Dr. Ben Londree and very apparent, dire need to upgrade our ranking in his list of comparable communities and his note of the national average at that time for development impact fees.

Cost assessments and impact fees must include long-range maintenance, upkeep and general maintenance as a fair and realistic cost of developers fair cost of maintenance 'but for' their developments—just as a homeowner plans for repair and maintenance. These development related maintenance and repair fees should be charged at an appropriate rate in any number of creative ways to assist developers, if necessary, to pay them as long as it does not ever come out of public's pocket through taxation models like TIF, EEZ and others or rates. Some portion of this maintenance fee must be up-front in an escrow-type fund for such services and needs and be a part of any later real estate sales contracts for properties that may change hands. Local business must be given priority and some considerations for sliding scale costs and creative pay arrangements for smaller, mid and large size local companies so as not to discourage or inadvertently prevent local businesses of all sizes from being able to develop in the face of bigger companies coming here to invest, develop and siphon all their profit off the community. We should favor local developers, but within constraints of paying for their 'true development costs'.

Peoples' Visioning supports a 'flip-flop' or close to a reversal of our present development model with regards to costs assessed to accommodate the above areas, necessary for sustainability and a high quality of life, infrastructure needs and services. We also recommend something like what is also being confirmed and supported by public input, over and over again, and in an 'unofficial' but significant poll non-the-less, Councilman Thomas' poll on development fees and models. Our Peoples' Visioning suggestion is 70% to 80% is fair to assess all or most developers for development fees and costs to pay their fair share for infrastructure for developments (and development profits) which must be there to support their impact on the community. Most development, except some local development corporations and small business companies, take their profit way out of the community. We need an impact development fee and policy that rewards developers who do not do not take profits way out of the community and that doesn't harm smaller business persons and/or local developers, putting them at risk in competing with the much deeper-pocketed and usually out-of-state or region big corporations, there should be a part of this new impact fee policy that levels the playing field and helps reward smaller and more local developers who keep and spread profit in Columbia, our the local economy and the community. This model would help serve other communities.

Step Five: Adopt all of Mr. Bill Weitkemper's suggestions, coming from nearly 40 years of experience in our Public works department, to improve funds in his area of expertise, not only to improve funds collected, while fairly assessing use and corresponding rates to encourage more customer conservation at all levels, but also essentially adopting a 'conservation rate structure' across the entire utility spectrum to reduce costs of related infrastructure to all parties and be distributed more equitably and fairly with a user-based system and/or conservation rate pricing structure. Also assess results of efforts to improve sewer and other infrastructure for effectiveness in both cost and results delivered. Consider Mr. Weitkemper's, and other's ideas, of which PV also approves, to shuffle and/or re-prioritize a few carefully assessed and considered, pre-approved monies and projects to lessen the system's downtown bottleneck and upgrade infrastructure, enhancing the whole system while addressing repairs, public health consequences and our current and ongoing relationship to the EPA regarding pollution levels and our storm water run-off, which always needs to be kept on the front burner from here on out. To this Peoples' Visioning adds that we must set an example for diligent and continuing strong reduction and use of strong, toxic chemicals across public lands, public and private lawn and garden care, disposal of cleaning, building, paint, auto, batteries electronics and all toxic chemicals and their application across all our systems to aid in water quality and EPA compliance. A strong public educational effort of this problem is necessary and required. These ideas and ideals are held by many in our community and have strong support from many allies, Peoples' Visioning, our co-sponsors, and many others.

Step Six: Finally, after the preceding steps and methods are in place, being utilized, and 'development costs reassessment' policies are in place, we then, and only then, look at city finances and department balances or fund balances, or consider bonds or tax increases to pay for what is a true and fair cost of development, new and/or redevelopment, as well. It is high-time to upgrade these old policies, asked for many years ago, with these guiding principles, city documents, other available models and processes directed above and herein. We are just now learning that we **must listen** to the people, follow their written voices in our guiding documents, and further public voice, confirming and requesting this and adding, many times by some of us, 'just how it is that we can get there'.

As we revamp zoning, to include historical overlays and form-based zoning, etc... it is the right and appropriate time to also upgrade this and other policies and codes, listen to the people, and implement a 'new cost to develop' in Columbia to reflect the real costs, and need for costs to be fairly shared. Just because developers have been able to pay less in 'the forever past', does not make it 'unfair' to finally change to a more fair policy and, that somehow doing so is unfair to them. For far too long, inequitably, and clearly unsustainably, it has unfairly fallen to the poor and the public to do without, as we have, or pay more in taxes, as we have! It is unsustainable and fiscally irresponsible to the 'peoples' money' to say we, the people, must continue to shoulder the cost burden of unbridled development or it will 'sprawl' and just develop elsewhere. We must also work on this with our neighbors, our County and surrounding areas to help them not be similarly burdening their public and taxpayers. And, homeowners, other consumers, will pay their 'fair share', as a 'market will bear' developer cost, passed on to that market limit to those specific consumers of development products. *This sixth step is unlikely to be necessary if the important prior Five Steps above are taken.*

Thank you for remedying this long time inequitable, fiscally irresponsible, and unsustainable imbalance with the present and immediate circumstance we face.

Step Seven: Once these six steps have been accomplished, or going on simultaneously with the assessments and calculations required for correction of this situation, an internal investigation and audit of all our financial balances and present funding situation is called for. It must be done in a responsible, transparent fashion, with the public able to easily follow, online or in some other way, to fully ascertain the accurate state of our shared public funds, then determining appropriate balances, uses and adherence to our City Charter, laws and ordinances regarding those funds and balances, or lack thereof, with appropriate explanations for the circumstances we would find. If it is finally determined there is some excess cash, after this full audit and investigation, then those appropriate monies will need to be fairly refunded to utility customers, according to the charges and rate structures during which those excess monies were acquired, rather than be used, yet again, to subsidize more development that falls outside the call of the City Charter and may put Columbians at serious legal risk if expensive services are not supplied.

For these and other many reasons displaying fairness: that the public has been paying more than its fair share for far too long, we suggest these appropriate, more fair payment options for handling our present and future development infrastructure problems, that 'but for' new development, we would need 'some' upgrades, but how some look at it now is as if development has just arrived on an empty plot of land and that these repairs and upgrades will cost not more in that scenario, and could possibly cost less, than any development in that 'just arrived on an empty plot of land' scenario would cost developers if they had to pay themselves rather than receive subsidization from the taxpayers. Some complain that their rate or tax money might go to help an individual lower their rates or utilities with modest policies to meet our ordinances and operational goals of our utilities, yet when business persons with far more demands are supported by those monies its just fine, or great. This is a philosophical 'double-standard' of who we might consider 'worth' our rate or taxpayer assistance. Automatically provide a full report, monthly update, in a full 18 month financial running 'full audit' statement or accurate statement of financials in a report each month at each 2nd regularly scheduled monthly Council meeting on the 3rd Monday of each month for the public and Council to base input and important decisions on, easily accessible to all.

Thank you very much for your time to listen to us. We hope you will quickly implement all or a large part of these carefully vetted, important policy recommendations, important improvements and important changes to preserve and protect our loved and shared community, our home!

Monta Welch, Director: Columbia Peoples' Visioning

Founder/President: Columbia Climate Change Coalition

Interfaith Care for Creation