

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
APRIL 6, 2015**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 6, 2015, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID and TRAPP were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting of March 16, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

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

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to add B85-15 to the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda.

Ms. Hoppe explained the Council had received a copy of B85-15 earlier today, and noted it would establish an administrative delay on the processing of applications for the demolition of structures located in areas included on the National Register of Historic Places and would provide for a process for some applications to be considered by the Council.

Mayor McDavid understood the target of this legislation was the Shakespeare's Pizza building as a demolition permit application had been submitted last week. Ms. Hoppe stated this was not targeted toward any particular building. Mayor McDavid understood that building would be included in the area covered by this legislation, and asked if this ordinance would prevent City staff from issuing a demolition permit for that building. Ms. Thompson replied it would prevent staff from issuing the permit, but it would not prevent the Council from approving the permit as it was currently drafted. Mayor McDavid asked if it would prevent staff from issuing the permit before the Council voted on this legislation. Ms. Thompson replied it would not become a requirement upon staff until it was enacted as an ordinance by the Council.

Mayor McDavid noted the map of the downtown historic district on the [www.gocolumbiamo.com](http://www.gocolumbiamo.com) website appeared to indicate that district encompassed a small part of the downtown to include some areas on Ninth Street, Eighth Street, and Broadway, but it was not clear. In addition, the ordinance did not really clarify the areas this prohibition would impact. He understood the Shakespeare's Pizza location was included. Ms. Hoppe explained it was one of the designated contributing structures to the National Register of Historic Places, and there was a document that individually listed those structures. She believed it was clear which structures would be impacted. Mayor McDavid understood it involved the downtown historic district, but it was not on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Hoppe clarified it was an underlying contributing historic property for the

National Register of Historic Places designation. Mayor McDavid asked if this building was a contributing property. Ms. Hoppe replied it was. Mayor McDavid stated he was not sure it was listed on the map on the [www.gocolumbiamo.com](http://www.gocolumbiamo.com) website. Ms. Hoppe pointed out the demotion notice included paperwork showing it was a contributing property. Mayor McDavid understood it was not on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Thompson explained the United States Department of the Interior - National Register of Historic Places had designated the Downtown Columbia Historic District, which included a map of the district, but noted she had not completed a survey of that map so she was not sure which buildings were included. The ordinance covered that particular district. Mayor McDavid understood this building was in the district, but was not itself a historic property. Ms. Thompson explained the National Register of Historic Places and the Downtown Columbia Historic District were two different items, and both were included in this proposed ordinance.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe to add B85-15 to the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mayor McDavid stated he was fan of Shakespeare's Pizza, but did not believe the building was historic. He was uncertain as to all of the owners of the building, but had spoken with two part owners today that had indicated money had been spent and leases had been let. This ordinance would interrupt the process already established, which made him uncomfortable. He explained he would prefer this go through the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and the Planning and Zoning Commission for their recommendations instead of voting on this ordinance in two weeks when Ms. Hoppe, who had proposed the ordinance, would not be on the Council as he believed this legislation would expose the City to a substantial risk of litigation.

Mr. Skala commented that he planned to take an agnostic approach to this since they were not voting on it tonight and because they did not have any background material to consider, but felt there was a precedent for this as the Planning and Zoning Commission had provided a recommendation to the Council with regard to demolition permits in the past and the Council had established interim C-2 zoning rules. He did not believe it would create the risk of a lawsuit if it was constructed correctly and with due diligence. He stated he would support the introduction of this proposed legislation as they could discuss and decide whether to approve it later with more information.

Ms. Hoppe explained she had introduced a similar measure when the Niedermeyer property was in danger of being demolished. She commented that although there were many historic structures in the downtown to include structures on the National Register of Historic Places, the City could not stop them from being demolished. As a result, any historic property, except those that had been secured by historic tax credits, could be torn down. The Shakespeare's Pizza building would only be the first. She explained this was not intended specifically for that building even though it would be impacted by the ordinance, and pointed out there was a safety valve included in the ordinance that would allow the Council to authorize the granting of the demolition permit under certain circumstances. She believed some sort of protection needed to be in place because they would otherwise risk losing all historic structures within Columbia. She stated she would not be able to vote on the issue,

but thought it was important to discuss best practices and obtain community input with regard to historic preservation.

Mayor McDavid asked how long this moratorium would last. Mr. Matthes replied until October 6, 2015.

Mayor McDavid asked if a map that could be understood would be provided. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Ms. Nauser stated she had not liked this conversation when it was discussed previously due to the Niedermeyer property, and felt this proposed legislation was targeted toward the demolition process already underway. She noted she would not support this proposed ordinance being brought forward for discussion at this time due to the implication of stopping something that was already in process. She thought discussion on this topic should occur at a later date when it did not impact specific properties that were already moving through the process.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Skala to add B85-15 to the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda was approved by voice vote with only Mayor McDavid and Ms. Nauser voting against it.

The agenda, including the consent agenda, as amended to add B85-15 to Introduction and First Reading, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

## **SPECIAL ITEMS**

### **Recognition of Barbara Hoppe for her service as the Ward 6 Council Member.**

Ms. Hoppe joined Mayor McDavid and Mr. Matthes at the podium.

Mayor McDavid presented Ms. Hoppe with a Resolution of Appreciation, a plaque recognizing her years of service on the Council, a silver tray recognizing her years of service as Mayor Pro Tem, and a certificate for a heritage tree to be planted in her honor in the park of her choice.

Mr. Matthes presented Ms. Hoppe with a glass tile with the City logo and a gift from City staff.

Ms. Hoppe thanked those in the audience for attending the earlier reception and this portion of the meeting as it meant a lot to her. She stated she had appreciated and enjoyed working with the residents of the Sixth Ward and the rest of the City with regard to many projects over the last nine years. She agreed they might not always be able to attain a successful resolution, but believed they would have never been able to attain any successful resolution without trying. She stated Columbia was a great community with passionate citizens that were willing to invest their time and talents to make it better for everyone.

Ms. Hoppe noted she had been a passionate citizen in 1999 when there was threat of development at Stephens Lake Park. She, like others in the community, believed a centrally located park would be an asset to Columbia, and as a result, she dedicated 1 ½ years of her life toward that goal. She thanked her husband, Michael Sleadd, for being understanding and supportive then and during the nine years she served on the Council. She explained her approach as a Council Member had been holistic. She believed the City needed to take care of the basics while also paying attention to the many other important aspects and issues that

made Columbia exceptional and a place where they and others wanted to live and visit. She listed some of the items she had been involved with since being elected to the Council, which included planning in terms of the community-wide vision plan in 2006, the East Area Plan, the Bonne Femme Watershed Study, the Comprehensive Plan, and the modernization of the zoning codes. She was happy they had C-2 interim zoning and thought more was needed. She stated she had been a champion of the stormwater ordinance currently in place and of the establishment of the Citizens Police Review Board, which people now acknowledged was good. A new police training center had been built and police officers had been added as funding allowed. She supported upgrades to the wastewater treatment plant and the addition to City Hall, which was good in terms of the environment as it was a LEED building and in terms of saving money by not having to rent other buildings. She noted progress had been made in terms of Columbia being a pedestrian-friendly community with ADA accessibility and a reduction in the speed limit in residential areas to 25 mph as this was important in terms of quality of life. She explained she had been involved in the inclusion of restaurants in the no-smoking in public places ordinance, which had not hurt the economy as some people feared. She stated she had worked tirelessly for better funding for infrastructure since before she was elected to the Council, and some improvements had been made although more improvements were needed. Since Columbia was growing, new infrastructure was needed in addition to the maintenance of existing infrastructure, and a hindrance to this was the loss of sales tax. She commented that she believed the role of a Council Member was to be critical and to challenge things that did not fit well within the community, and that was the reason she had not supported the bio-defense level-4 lab that was to be located on New Haven Road near a school and retirement community. She felt IBM would not have located to Columbia if that lab had come to Columbia. She noted the Enhanced Enterprise Zone (EEZ) and associated blight designation was another issue that had caused community concern, and the City ultimately did not move forward with it either.

Ms. Hoppe stated she believed a holistic and balanced approach was the best in terms of serving the community well, and noted the rest of the nation acknowledge Columbia had made great achievements over the years. She listed some the best cities rankings through which Columbia had been recognized, such as best small places for businesses and careers, best college town, best college destinations, best cities of young entrepreneurs, hardest working town, best small cities for job growth, etc. She commented that as a result, Columbia was a growing community as it was attractive to other people, and this brought the City its greatest challenge. She noted Columbia was the 15th fastest growing city in the United States and the 7th fastest growing mid-size city in the United States. The challenge to the City was to find a way to pay for everything, and to examine whether new growth was paying for new infrastructure and whether the City had enough money to maintain existing infrastructure. She thought a balance was needed so the City would continue to be a great community. She believed they wanted to keep what they loved about Columbia while ensuring anything new would enhance and not detract from the community, and determine a fair way to pay for everything. She stated she planned to stay engaged, thanked everyone for their support and passion, and asked them all to remain passionate.

## APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

## SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

### Kelly Johnson – Report matters needing attention.

Ms. Johnson was not in attendance.

### Glenn Cobbins, Sr. and Judy Hubbard - Announcement of the "WE ARE FAMILY" march for April 11, 2015 from 2-4pm for the purpose of black on black crime awareness and prevention in Columbia and the nation.

Mr. Cobbins commented that as Columbia grew it would attract people from larger cities and states that were in the drug business or had past gang experience in addition to those that just wanted to raise a family, and this created friction, fear, and distrust. He explained he wanted to address black on black crime. He noted there were marches when a white man killed a black man, but those marches did not tend to occur when a black man killed another black man. He provided a handout with information related to the march dedicated to the awareness and prevention of black on black crime, and asked the Council to help get the word out. He believed black on black crime made the crime rate in Columbia higher, and that issue needed to be addressed. He stated he wanted to be a part of the solution after being part of the problem for 23 years.

Ms. Hubbard understood the crime rate in Columbia had decreased over the last three years, but the black on black violent crimes had increased significantly. Statistics based on 100,000 people ages 15-24 in Boone County from 2008-2012 indicated 14.7 white people and 234 black people had fire arms related injuries, so black youth were 16 times more likely to be injured by firearms in Boone County during that time than white youth. She noted they wanted to raise awareness that it was not okay to have black on black violent crime as part of the march on Saturday, and invited the Council to participate. She pointed out she had worked with the black community for 26 years and had started with 90 children, and most were now either dead, in prison, drug-addicted, or single moms having trouble raising multiple children. She asked everyone to come together for this issue on Saturday.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### (A) 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.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated this appeared to be a worthy project and a good use of federal funds.

Mr. Thomas noted this was exactly the type of street where sidewalks were needed as it was a major street with high volumes and speeds of traffic without pedestrian

accommodations on the one side. In addition, there was a lot of pedestrian activity in the area.

Mayor McDavid stated it was hard to find funding for projects such as this, and appreciated staff finding Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for it.

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for this project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(B) 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.**

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood lighting was a concern for many in the area that had participated in the interested parties meeting, and asked if that had been addressed as an apartment complex was nearby. Mr. Nichols replied staff would look at the lighting footprint, but had not done so yet. Ms. Nauser understood there were competing concerns with lighting in terms of safety and spillover. Mr. Nichols stated staff would look into the issue further.

Ms. Nauser asked if sidewalks would be included as part of this project. She believed if citizens were required to build sidewalk, the City needed to construct them as well. Mr. Nichols replied funding for this project was through the solid waste utility and staff had not completed any engineering work for a sidewalk to date. He thought that would come forward as a separate project in the future.

Mr. Thomas asked if this involved City-owned property. Mr. Nichols replied yes. Mr. Thomas asked if this was considered development from a legal perspective as he understood that would require a sidewalk to be installed. He understood the construction of a building or building expansion would require the installation of a sidewalk for private property owners. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He explained they viewed this as temporary structure for a temporary basis. He noted sidewalks would be installed, but he was uncertain as to whether it would be a part of this project.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the sidewalk connectivity in the area. Mr. Glascock replied he thought there were sidewalks on State Farm Parkway. He did not believe the outer roadway by the former Fire Station No. 7 had sidewalks, but noted there was a pedway between Providence Road and the outer roadway. He stated staff would bring something back to Council on the issue. Ms. Nauser asked that cost estimates be provided when it was brought back, and noted she did not believe they should wait an extended period of time. She believed sidewalks were important there as the area included a couple of adopt-a-spots and was adjacent to Gerbes and near an apartment complex. Mr. Glascock suggested the motion include the construction of sidewalks if that was what Council wanted.

Mr. Skala commented that he understood too much lighting could hinder witness identification and create a spillover-effect to neighborhoods. He thought they needed to be sensitive to the aspect of providing enough lighting for safety purposes without bothering the

neighbors. Mr. Nichols explained this would likely be vetted through the lighting committee for a recommendation to Council.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for this project, and to include the potential cost and construction of sidewalks in the plans. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(C) Consider the establishment of the Business Loop Community Improvement District.**

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Robert Hollis, an attorney with offices at 1103 E. Broadway, provided a handout and explained his clients had hosted several interested parties meetings, fielded many questions, and provided information to property owners since 2012, when this process had been initiated. More recently, they had prepared, circulated, responded to, and filed a CID petition in December. He commented that he believed this was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in that it was a public/private partnership and its goals involved infrastructure, economic development, land use, and livability. He noted the petition listed the potential projects that could be done depending on funding and the decisions of the Board of Directors. He explained it was similar to the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) with regard to funding mechanisms. A proposed assessment of 0.4778 cents per hundred was authorized by the petition and it would be up to the Board of Directors to impose the assessment.

Mayor McDavid asked if the ½ cent sales tax covered automobile sales. Mr. Hollis replied no.

Mayor McDavid asked if he knew how much revenue might be generated by this CID. Mr. Hollis replied he thought it would be about \$50,000 per year in special assessments and an additional \$230,000 to \$240,000 in sales tax, if imposed.

Mr. Skala asked if the sales tax that could be imposed was statutorily limited to a ½ cent. Mr. Hollis replied it was limited to one cent statutorily, but the petition limited it to a ½ cent.

Ms. Nauser commented that the Downtown CID had indicated it would support downtown safety, but she did not believe much funding had gone toward public safety as the funding had generally been used for marketing and other items. She asked how much of the funds generated by the Business Loop CID would go toward public safety as it was very broad and vague in the petition. Mr. Hollis replied the petition included a long list of potential projects and there was likely no way everything could be done, so they could not guarantee safety would be the focus of a substantial portion of the funds. Ms. Nauser explained she did not necessarily want a substantial portion going toward safety, but felt money needed to be contributed to public safety on an on-going basis. She wanted it known that was a concern of her, and pointed out she was generally supportive of the CID.

Mr. Thomas asked why automobile sales were exempted and whether there were any other products or services that would be exempted. Mr. Hollis replied he did not know the reason as the state legislature had included that exemption in the CID Act, and noted he understood other items were exempted, but did not have that information at this time.

Mary Hussmann, 210 Ridgeway Avenue, commented that Columbia's already high sales tax would be even higher within the CID due to this proposal, and noted sales taxes were regressive taxes that affected low income families much more than other families. The Business Loop CID would be located where many low income families shopped and obtained services. She stated she did not object to the property tax increase, but did object to the sales tax increase. She asked the Council to exclude a sales tax increase or to exempt an increase in sales tax on food at the very least as everyone needed food and an increase of sales tax on food was disproportionately unfair to the poor.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyons Street, stated he was the President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association (NCCNA) and explained they were well aware of the issues this CID proposal hoped to address as the entire north boundary of NCCNA would be included in the CID. He noted they were very much supportive of efforts to improve the design, safety, and attractiveness of the corridor, but pointed out they had some concerns as well. He explained their first official notice of this was through the newspaper in March. It was troubling to him that bordering neighborhood associations were not informed or invited to participate in any of the interested parties meetings. He stated he did not feel they knew enough to be supportive of this CID, and pointed out another neighborhood association he had spoken with had expressed a similar interest and concern. He asked that something be done to include his neighborhood and other neighborhoods before any action was taken on the establishment of the CID.

Jack Miller, 2201 Country Lane, explained he was the owner and president of True Media, which resided on the Business Loop, and as Mr. Hollis had indicated, this had been a long process for many of them. He stated he believed this was the first real shot the Business Loop had in terms of organizing property owners to proactively look at the existing neighborhood, which was a gateway into the community and one of the most traveled and least attractive streets in Columbia. He noted this had been a collaborative effort over the past couple of years, and unlike the downtown, they did not have an established organization with infrastructure, revenues, bank accounts, etc. The funding for the work they had done had come out of the pocket of the property owners and was estimated to cost about \$50,000 in legal fees, survey fees, and petition validation fees. The creation of the CID would allow them to have funds in place to be able to hire experts for long-term strategic planning to determine best uses, the kinds of businesses to attract, etc. He pointed out no one liked to pay sales taxes, but they would not be able to get anything accomplished without revenue. The proposed ½ cent sales tax increase would not put them at a disadvantage in Columbia, and would be equal to the sales tax rate in the downtown while still being substantially lower than the sales tax rate in many of the other areas and districts within the community. He stated he believed positive CIDs had a rollover effect on the surrounding neighborhoods, and noted they had not worked with the neighborhood associations due to the lack of infrastructure on their part, which he hoped would be resolved after the CID was established.



Ms. Hoppe asked if they were open to meeting with the neighborhood association representatives to discuss the CID before the Council voted on the issue. Mr. Miller replied they would be happy to meet with them.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he had attended one of the interested parties meetings and noted he would be supportive of the CID pending other actions. He thought the property owners needed to work with the City on a corridor plan that would be legally enforceable and was completed before the formation of the CID so it was a part of the contract. He also felt many other stakeholders were involved and that they should plan for a few blocks beyond the Business Loop as part of the plan. He did not believe the CID should be established until a formal corridor plan was in place and agreed to by the City with a broader stakeholder involvement. He thought the proposed Board of Directors should be adjusted to include other voting or ex-officio members.

Mark Stevenson, 1122 Old Highway 63 South, noted he owned property on the Business Loop, which had been impacted by a fire a couple of years ago by a fire, and wished there was more interest in developing the property. He thought it was outstanding that the property owners were willing to increase their property taxes to help pay for this continued regeneration of the Business Loop, and asked the Council to vote in favor of it.

Ron Calvin, 403 Business Loop 70 West, stated he had opposed this when he had attended the original meeting, and had not been invited to any other meeting afterward. He did not feel it was fair to raise taxes here without the approval of all of the impacted people. He noted his son had small business and this would make it even more difficult for him to pay his taxes. He asked the Council to oppose the establishment of the CID.

Dave Griggs, 6420 Highway VV, stated he had owned multiple properties on the Business Loop since 1975 and believed there had been ample time for the City to conduct a corridor study over those 40 years. He noted the formation of the CID would help fund a corridor plan that was sorely needed, and pointed out this was not the first time they had tried to form a CID, but it was the first time they had been able to get the property owners to help push the project forward. He stated there was a great deal of interest amongst the property owner and businesses along the Business Loop at this time, and urged the Council to support it. He noted they would work with the City in the development of the plan.

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

Mr. Skala asked about the process in terms of not meeting with the neighborhoods and the responsibility of the City in terms of notification for a CID. Ms. Thompson replied the City had followed the statutory requirements. It was a private process as the applicant had filed a petition with the City. She noted City staff had made Council aware the petition had been filed, and had tried to be as open and transparent about the verification process as possible. She pointed out the City had received a request by the applicant early in the verification process for a deferral of a deposit for associated expenses, and that issue had been discussed at either the second meeting in December or the first meeting in January. The process required the actually property owners to receive notice by mail and for the public hearing notice to be published twice in the newspaper for public notification and consumption. There was not any requirement for an interested parties meeting. Mr. Skala understood it

was not like a zoning proposal in which people within a certain distance had to be notified. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood the revenue would come solely from the ½ cent sales tax increase. Ms. Thompson noted they were also proposing a property tax assessment of 0.4775. Mr. Thomas understood it was both a property tax and sales tax similar to the Downtown CID. Ms. Thompson stated both would be authorized, and noted they would be authorized up to 60 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation, but only intended to impose the 0.4775.

Ms. Nauser commented that the Downtown CID had contracted for The District Gateway Master Plan after the CID was formed, and believed plans from the private sector were better or just as good as a plan developed by the government. She stated she was confident the property owners in the Business Loop CID would develop a good master plan for that corridor, and noted she intended to support the establishment of the CID. Her only concern involved public safety as she wanted to feel confident that money would be spent on public safety as it was important.

Ms. Hoppe stated Business Loop 70 had been deteriorating for a long time, and really needed help to become a more attractive and thriving place for the community in terms of sidewalks, the types of businesses, etc. She thought the CID was good step, but felt it was crucial for the CID to involve the community and neighbors, especially during the planning process, as she believed the customers of the Business Loop 70 businesses would be the adjacent community. She also felt they would be able to provide helpful suggestions. She agreed sales taxes tended to impact poor people the hardest, and asked them to consider exempting sales tax from this CID.

**(D) Consider the Water and Light 2015 Renewable Energy Report.**

Item D was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Marilyn McLeod, 2307 Ridgefield Road, explained she was the Co-President of the League of Women Voters of Columbia/Boone County, and noted the League took positions on different public policies to include energy. She stated the League was pleased Columbia was increasing the quantity of renewable energy in the portfolio and had achieved over 7 percent in renewable energy. The League at the national level had been advocating for renewable energy since the 1990's as part of the effort to control global warming caused primarily by growth in carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels. Although Columbia was making progress, over 90 percent of its electricity was produced by burning coal, and the goal of 30 percent renewable energy by 2028 did not achieve predominant reliance on renewables. She encouraged the utility to move much more rapidly to increase the proportion of renewable energy in the portfolio to meet the obligation for a solution to the global warming problem. She suggested encouraging citizens to invest in solar energy by publicizing the fact there was a 30 percent federal tax credit for solar installations until December 2016 and to implement the plan for a large community solar program to make solar energy accessible to more Columbians.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, understood the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) and the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) did not agree with the methodology and felt it caused some items to be radically misstated in terms of impact, and as a result, he believed more work needed to be done as it impacted the ability to plan, etc.

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

Mr. Trapp made a motion to approve the 2015 Renewable Energy Report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Skala stated he was struck by the similarities of the reports of the EEC and the WLAB with respect to the philosophies of whether or not they wanted renewables as a resource for selling shares or a more distributed kind of system. He noted his inclination was for both as it would be best in the long term interest of the community and utility.

Ms. Hoppe suggested staff compute renewable energy using both methods so everyone could see the differences.

Mayor McDavid stated he disagreed with the analyses of the EEC and the WLAB, and believed there were some costs that were not being considered as well. As they moved forward with solar power and as its scale increased, he felt the changes needed would become more obvious. He thought this was a good start and noted he would not argue over a few hundred dollars at this time.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Ms. Nauser to approve the 2015 Renewable Energy Report was approved unanimously by voice vote.

## OLD BUSINESS

### **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 third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if there was a time limit before this could come back if it were denied by Council at this time. Ms. Thompson replied the same subject could not be reconsidered for 90 days without the consent of Council to bring the matter back.

Joan Rowson, 1705 Blue Ridge Road, stated CVS was a wonderful company that was concerned with health-related issues as they refused to sell cigarettes. It would not be located in a pedestrian area, and there were many other one-story buildings in the area. She understood the sewer was presently under the building and CVS had agreed to move it to the east of the building. She also understood there were about 40 water outlets and toilets at this site currently, and that would be reduced to six, creating less of a strain on the sewer system. She thought they would welcome the jobs and tax revenue associated with a company like CVS, which had a stellar reputation.

Mayor McDavid asked staff to clarify why the sewer location was unacceptable as presented. Mr. Glascock displayed a map of the existing sewer, the CVS proposal, and the staff recommendation. He explained the route proposed by CVS was too close to the building and would impact the drive-through if work needed to be done on it. In addition, the manhole would be located under the trash compactor, which was not a good situation either.

He described the route suggested by staff and explained it would provide for a better flow and be in a better location if work needed to be done. It also fit into the future plans of going down Fourth Street to Elm Street.

Ms. Nauser asked why CVS had refused to accommodate the staff proposal. Mr. Glascock replied he understood the applicant believed the cost was too high.

Mr. Skala understood there were not any real protections for waterways in the downtown, and asked how pollutants, such as salt and oils from vehicles, would be addressed. Mr. Matthes understood the proposal would comply with the rules for the downtown, and believed their proposal included stormwater detention so it would create a satisfactory flow for the creek. He agreed it was not any better than any other parking lot in the downtown in terms of salt and oil. Mr. Glascock pointed out the stream went all of the way to the Business Loop as it was in a box all of the way there, and noted they did not like for streams to be boxed. Ms. Nauser understood it was currently boxed. Mr. Glascock stated it was boxed now all of the way to the north. Mr. Matthes commented that his thought was that they would not be any worse off with this than they were now. Mr. Skala did not feel they were well off in terms of the protection of waterways in the downtown area.

Nick Peckham, 15 S. Tenth Street, stated he was representing the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) and noted they had recommended denial of this project. The building would be constructed on land owned by others so the long-term impact on downtown Columbia was uncertain. They felt the problems outweighed the benefits. The architecture was mediocre at best and staff confirmed the mezzanine did not qualify as a second floor. He noted Mr. Matthes had explained the situation of the front door leading to a back door and other design issues. The one-way in and one-way out parking lot would impact traffic on Providence Road, and Flat Branch Creek would be covered, which was not good for the community. In addition, he did not believe dumpsters on Broadway made any sense. He stated the sewer issues had already been discussed and wondered if building the parking lot over the creek would require approval from the Corps of Engineers or the Department of Natural Resources. He was also concerned about the retaining wall on the south side of the parking lot as it would be 16 feet in height. He reiterated the DCLC had recommended denial of this proposal.

Robert Tucker explained he was the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and stated he would not repeat the comments of Mr. Peckham. He noted they were working with representatives of CVS with regard to their plan as they wanted CVS to locate to Columbia, but believed some issues needed to be addressed architecturally. The HPC had recommended denial at this time as well.

Ms. Nauser understood the HPC would meet with CVS tomorrow. Mr. Tucker stated that was correct. He explained he did not believe the issues would be resolved by tomorrow, but the dialogue would begin. He noted CVS was a 7,000-store company that had the means and ability to make adjustments as had been done in other cities. This was a suburban store placed in an urban downtown and did not fit in its current form.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, provided a handout, and explained she was a member of both the HPC and the DCLC and lived along the Flat Brach Creek as it was under the ground in front of her house and under the front corner of her house. She displayed a design

the Council had turned down on October 2 and a design that had been the subject of a press conference in November at the Regional Economic Development Incorporated (REDI) offices. It was not the same design as shown today, and most notably the brick had changed and it did not include limestone accents. She noted the stormwater development fee would require CVS to pay \$2,874, and the Army Corps of Engineers permit that had been granted in August would require CVS to buy 161 stream credits at a cost of \$4,025. The exterior finish schedule called for 16 inch by 12 inch by 4 inch blocks, which was different than brick, and the depiction only showed one CVS Pharmacy sign, but every CVS she had visited had far more signage, so she was concerned with the depiction. She encouraged the Council to hold firm on the front door on Broadway and showed the Council other masonry in the area and a more appropriate retaining wall in another community.

Mr. Skala asked Ms. Fowler for her thoughts on the boxing in of Flat Branch Creek. Mr. Fowler replied she had concerns, which she would like Council to ask staff to investigate. She commented that when a box culvert rejoined an open creek, there needed to be a safe transition that protected against erosion. She did not like the idea of closing 157 feet of the creek as it was much wider now that it would be in the future, but understood the stormwater engineers had evaluated it and determined the effect would be minimal. She believed there were other impacts to the creek that were not being protected by the current regulatory structure, such as stormwater flow, and hoped staff had investigated good standards for riprap. She was also concerned about the water quality issues that would not be addressed. She understood there would be a filtering device that would catch gravel, silt, and soil, but it would not catch salt or other water-soluble or carriable items. This project was higher on the Providence Road side than the Fourth Street side so all of the water, to include water with pollutants, would roll into the box culvert at the corner of the parcel and directly to the creek.

Marilyn McLeod, 2307 Ridgefield Road, commented that a historic building would be torn down for this development, and there would be two very ordinary pharmacies directly across the street from each other and a payday loan at the entrance to the downtown, which she questioned.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, asked the Council to deny this proposal as recommended by staff as he did not believe CVS would take the time to re-evaluate their design without this denial. He noted the applicant could come back in 90 days so this would not be an absolute decision.

Ann Peters, 3150 N. Route Z, explained she had taken a tour in Kansas City as part of a Smart Growth Conference when she had been on the Planning and Zoning Commission showing how neighborhoods had been modernized and redeveloped while leaving the integrity and architecture of the original community. One of the sites they had visited was a CVS site. The Council there had to tell CVS no three times before CVS got the message. She believed CVS could develop a better plan as they had done that throughout the country, and asked the Council to get what was best for the community.

Robert Hollis, 1103 E. Broadway, stated he was representing CVS and explained he had been asked to meet with the DCLC and the HPC, and due to miscommunication, he had failed to meet with HPC. That meeting would occur tomorrow. He noted CVS was working on substantive changes based on the letters of the DCLC and the HPC. He did not believe

defeating this bill and imposing a 90 day penalty would accomplish anything, and could potentially damage the existing relationship between the City and CVS.

Ms. Hoppe stated she had attended the DCLC meeting and it had been clear to her that it was a DCLC meeting and that the HPC meeting would occur later. Mr. Hollis explained he understood the HPC would meet later, but believed his presentation was for both the DCLC and the HPC. He noted he had been asked to leave. Ms. Hoppe stated he had been asked to leave while the DCLC discussed the issue further.

Mr. Trapp asked what CVS was doing to address the concern of staff with regard to the routing of the sewer. Mr. Hollis replied he did not know specifically, but understood they were still discussing that issue along with other issues.

Mayor McDavid stated he would love to see CVS at this intersection because he worried about this intersection as the buildings were not occupied and were falling into progressive disrepair, but noted the community had made its expectations clear. If the community's expectations were met, he would enthusiastically support it. He believed three months would provide time to completely rework the design so it met their expectations. He noted he would vote no on this proposal.

Ms. Nauser explained she would prefer to table this for 90 days. She noted she had continually supported CVS, but pointed out she would not overlook the sewer issue. She preferred that everyone work together as she believed this project could be salvaged with the appropriate changes. She stated this proposal would not get her vote until City staff was satisfied with the routing of the sewer.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to table B41-15 to the July 6, 2015 Council Meeting. The motion died due to the lack of a second.

Mr. Skala commented that he had traveled throughout the country and believed CVS could make the suggested changes to fit within the neighborhood. He did not understand why this was so difficult. He noted staff had made an unequivocal recommendation for denial based on some very substantive issues, and Mr. Hollis had indicated there were many moving pieces which would take time to address. He stated he would love to see CVS, but the community expectations needed to be considered. He noted he intended to deny this proposal.

Mr. Trapp stated he was supportive of bringing CVS to Columbia, but the sewer situation needed to be addressed first.

Mr. Thomas commented that a suburban style building designed exclusively for automobile customers made it difficult for pedestrians and cyclists, which would end up looking like the Business Loop, which they were now trying to improve. The downtown had always fought to maintain pedestrian attractiveness and vibrancy, which he believed would benefit all business areas. The community wanted this type of attractiveness from Providence Road to the east as it was a gateway, and a suburban style building did not fit within that vision. He noted he would vote against this proposal.

Ms. Hoppe stated she would also vote against this proposal. She noted she had attended the DCLC meeting and was disappointed the design did not comply with the basic C-2 zoning requirements. She thought the issue with the second floor and the fake front door was an insult to the community. She also thought the sewer recommendations of staff

needed to be addressed appropriately. She noted the trash bin at Broadway could create traffic concerns as well as the trucks would have to wait to get through the drive-through or would block the drive-through. It also did not honor the downtown Broadway area. She thought it should be rejected as it would likely take 90 days or longer to create a better plan.

The vote on B41-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. Bill declared defeated.

**B61-15 Voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of Battle Avenue and on the north side of St. Charles Road; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that this would complete a forgone conclusion based upon a previous decision of Council, and believed it was straight forward.

Ms. Hoppe stated she believed this was a natural annexation.

B61-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B62-15 Voluntary annexation of City-owned property located on the east side of Battle Avenue and north of St. Charles Road; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

B62-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

**B63-15 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Philip D. Gresham for property located at 208 Ridgeway Avenue.**

**B64-15 Authorizing an STP-Urban Program supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Broadway pavement improvement project from Providence Road to Hitt Street.**

**B65-15 Authorizing a right of use permit with Elke Boyd for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of an inlet modification within a portion of the North Parklawn Court right-of-way (2004 North Parklawn Court).**

**B66-15 Accepting a conveyance for utility purposes.**

**B67-15 Authorizing an agreement for donation of property interests with MDS Real Estate Association, LLC as it relates to Phase I construction of the Grindstone Creek Trail.**

**B68-15 Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Public School District for FY 2015 playground improvement projects at New Haven Elementary School and Russell Boulevard Elementary School.**

- B69-15 Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget to add and delete a position in the Fire Department.
- B70-15 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families America program; appropriating funds.
- B71-15 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with Columbia Public Schools to develop standards to be recognized as a Missouri Breastfeeding Friendly Worksite.
- B72-15 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Corrections to provide tuberculosis screening and testing services.
- B73-15 Appropriating funds for Share the Light Program.
- R52-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements at the intersection of Worley Street and Clinkscales Road.
- R53-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements at the intersection of Stadium Boulevard and Old Route 63.
- R54-15 Setting a public hearing: reconstruction of Runway 13-31 (Phase I) and Taxiway B at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R55-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of sidewalk improvements along the south side of Elleta Boulevard from Rangeline Street eastward to the existing sidewalk.
- R56-15 Authorizing various Adopt a Spot agreements.
- R57-15 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture relating to the Healthy Eating and Active Living (HEAL) program.
- R58-15 Authorizing an agreement with North Village Arts District Farmers and Artisan Market for the use of the City-owned Wabash Station parking lot for the operation of a downtown farmers' market.
- R59-15 Accepting a gift of four (4) sculptures created and donated by Don Asbee installed around the perimeter of the East Campus Historic Neighborhood.
- R60-15 Authorizing an artist's commission agreement with Lisa Bartlett relating to the Traffic Box Art Program.
- R61-15 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to an agreement with TranSystems Corporation for professional engineering services for an alignment/conceptual study of the Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street East-West Trail Connection GetAbout Columbia Project.
- R62-15 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Access Television (CAT) for operation of the public access channel.
- R63-15 Expressing support for The District Gateway Master Plan.

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

- B74-15**     Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to the definition and standards associated with accessory dwelling units.
- B75-15**     Approving the Final Plat of James Estate Subdivision located on the north side of Barberry Avenue and west of Hibiscus Drive; authorizing a performance contract; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction.
- B76-15**     Amending Chapter 3 of the City Code as it relates to attendance requirements for the Airport Advisory Board.
- B77-15**     Authorizing a financial assistance agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for the purchase of a roll-off recycling trailer to be used at special events; appropriating funds.
- B78-15**     Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for air service marketing and promotion services; appropriating funds.
- B79-15**     Authorizing construction of renovations to the exterior of the Thomas G. Walton Building.
- B80-15**     Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B81-15**     Authorizing a facilities and services agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of Peace Park for the Fourth of July Celebration and Fireworks Display.
- B82-15**     Appropriating funds received from donations and miscellaneous revenue to the Parks and Recreation Department.
- B83-15**     Approving a petition requesting the formation of the Business Loop Community Improvement District; authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Business Loop Community Improvement District; authorizing certain actions and documents and prescribing other matters relating thereto.
- B84-15**     Appropriating Law Enforcement Training funds for police officer training.
- B85-15**     Establishing an administrative delay on the processing of applications for demolition of structures located in areas included on the National Register of Historic Places.

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

- REP42-15**    Distributed Diesel Generation.

Mr. Johnson provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid stated he had spoken with a representative of one of the companies, and this made the generators more costly because they had accrued a financial benefit due to the benefit to the City. Since the City no longer benefited, these companies would be solely responsible, and that would increase their costs. Mr. Johnsen replied there were

companies in the business of buying, selling, and leasing generators, and the City did not intend to be in competition with those services.

Mr. Johnsen explained that as staff worked through the details on a site by site basis, they intended to work with the Water and Light Advisory Board before bringing any future actions back to Council.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted to know the City's investment in this, and wondered if the City would receive compensation for the investment if the company took it over. Mr. Johnsen explained the customer arrangement did not fully compensate for the value, so they would use them where they could attain value from them as a utility. He was not sure how they would charge the customer for the investment as the company would either purchase it from the City or the City would take it from the company and not provide the service any longer. Ms. Hoppe understood it would be sold to the company or would be removed from that site to a City location. Mr. Johnsen stated they could move them to pump station sites as a back-up.

Ms. Hoppe understood the pollutants emitted from stationary engines were known to or suspected of causing cancer and other serious health effects. If the City took them over, she hoped they would be placed where there would be minimum exposure. Mr. Johnsen pointed out it was the same emissions that came from trucks and cars on the roads. Ms. Hoppe suggested they not be placed next to a day care center.

#### **REP43-15 Enforcement of Sidewalk Snow Removal.**

Ms. Britt provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked about the enforcement available. Ms. Britt replied staff would send the charges to Municipal Court, and the judge would make a determination. Ms. Thompson stated the fine was a maximum of \$500. Mr. Thomas understood this type of case had never been sent to court. Ms. Britt stated that was correct. She explained the action of staff this past year had been to notify the owners that were in violation and to ask them to comply. They had not taken the next step of sending charges to court.

Ms. Hoppe suggested staff focus on the priority routes and increase the enforcement efforts there. She explained Broadway was a priority street, but many property owners did not clear the sidewalks along the street for pedestrians. She believed enforcement would change the habit of not clearing the sidewalks.

Mr. Thomas stated he was supportive of increasing enforcement efforts. He noted the Daniel Boone Regional Library had failed to fulfill its obligation from the corner of Garth Avenue and Broadway to the end of their property, where the new bus stop was located, for at least five days after the snow had fallen.

Mr. Skala suggested a similar approach with snow removal as they had with mowing in that notification be provided to the property owner, and if the issue was not addressed, the City would hire someone to mow the property and tax bill the property owner. Ms. Britt understood several cities did this. Mayor McDavid thought that suggestion was worth pursuing. Mr. Skala believed it was more palatable than a fine because the snow was removed and the property owner was paying for that service. Mayor McDavid understood this would be focused on certain areas like Broadway.

Mr. Thomas suggested the City communicate the ordinance requirements and the priority routes with the high schools as high schools students in his neighborhood had made money clearing snow this winter. He thought someone with a flyer on the door was more likely to call someone to assist with snow removal.

Mr. Trapp suggested educating snow removal services on the ordinances also, as they sometimes piled snow over the sidewalks when clearing lots causing the sidewalk to still be impassible when the snow was gone elsewhere. He thought it was beyond people not shoveling their lots. Some companies even pushed the pile onto the street making the street impassible.

Mr. Skala understood the City had a flyer with strategies on how to clear the driveway so the snow plow did not come back through and block the driveway, and suggested more of that type of educational outreach.

Mr. Trapp thought they all agreed more enforcement, if possible, was needed.

**REP44-15 Documentation of Perspectives Related to Single-Use Plastic Bag Ordinance.**

Ms. Hoppe commented that she understood some people felt the Council should only address certain issues, but in a democracy, when a number of people with thousands of signatures come to the Council for an issue to be considered, she thought it was the responsibility of Council to look into the issue. This issue had been referred to the Environment and Energy Commission for a recommendation, and had led to a public discussion. The Council ultimately decided the City was not ready to move in this direction as this time. She noted it was the responsibility of the Council to listen to the public when they were petitioning the City.

**REP45-15 Vision Commission Implementation Status and Media Mention Reports.**

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

**REP46-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

Mayor McDavid presumed the \$28,678 transfer was a purchase that needed to be shifted to a different budget. Mr. Matthes stated he thought that was correct.

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that if he was elected he would ask for a change in policy of the use of CDBG funds so no more than 80 percent of sidewalk projects would be funded with those funds as other funding sources should be utilized more for those types of projects.

Mr. Clark stated most of the complaints he heard regarding snow and ice removal involved the downtown or the central city area, and suggested enforcement efforts be improved on complaint driven issues in those areas.

Mr. Clark believed the report regarding distributed diesel generation was lacking in terms of benefits, how much had been saved, and the possible pricing. He hoped more detail would be provided in the future.

Mr. Skala asked if speed monitors could be placed on Rice Road and Kelsey Drive as the first step in determining if traffic calming might be necessary.

Mr. Skala thanked Ms. Hoppe for all of her work over years and noted it had been a pleasure working with her.

Mr. Skala reminded everyone to vote tomorrow as there were some important issues on the ballot. He noted the bond issues would save money, and pointed out economic development would be severely impacted without these kinds of resources.

Ms. Nauser wished Ms. Hoppe the best in her future endeavors. Although they did not always agree, they had accomplished a lot of good things for the community over the years.

Ms. Nauser explained the drainage ditch on Nifong Boulevard, between Monterey Drive and Santiago Drive, tended to back up so much and for so long that ducks were making their home there and cattails were growing along there. She asked if staff could clear out the drainage ditch so the water did not pool as she believed it would be a health hazard for citizens that lived nearby in terms of mosquitos in a couple months.

Ms. Nauser stated there was a proliferation of advertising signs in the rights-of-way that had not been authorized. She asked staff to look into how this issue could be addressed.

Ms. Nauser understood another recycling location had been lost, and asked staff to look into how the City might be able to require space for recycling facilities in new developments, such as multi-family apartment complexes and large commercial developments. Public/private partnerships had worked in the past, but over time those locations were lost due to redevelopment or changes in ownership. She felt this issue impacted the community since it limited the ability for citizens to recycle, and placed more recyclable items in the landfill, which ultimately cost City taxpayers more money. She asked staff to look into an ordinance change that might go through the Planning and Zoning Commission, and noted she did not want to wait until the roll cart discussion was complete as it was a separate issue.

Mr. Trapp understood the City had rented a dumpster to a house on Iris Street since November, and asked for more information. He noted the dumpster was first in the street and was now in the yard, and questioned why they would allow a dumpster to be located in a yard for 5-6 months. He asked staff to look into the situation.

Mr. Trapp stated there were two raised concrete medians with plastic delineators where Barnwood Drive teed into Abbeywood Drive, and he believed this was a traffic calming attempt as one was on Barnwood Drive as it approached Abbeywood Drive and the other was in the middle of Abbeywood Drive. The delineators were all broken, and it was not a popular feature in the neighborhood. He noted the one on Abbeywood Drive had some traffic calming effects as it narrowed the roadway, but wondered if the one on Barnwood Drive even served a function. He asked staff to look into this issue.

Mr. Trapp noted Ms. Hoppe had been a great mentor to him through the campaign process when he first ran for Council and during his time on the Council, and thanked her for helping him learn and grow. He recalled Helen Anthony stating Ms. Hoppe was the conscience of the Council, which he thought was kind and true. He felt the Council as whole would now need to be more careful and conscience of protecting the rights of the individual because it was an important perspective. He commented that even when he did not agree with it, he had appreciated from where it came.

Ms. Hoppe stated Columbia was the 15th fast growing city in the nation and the 7th fastest growing mid-size city, and as a result, she believed the City needed to look at it staff levels in all areas and notify Council of needs. She understood more police officers were needed, but felt more staff was needed in the Community Development Department in terms of enforcement for code violations, snow removal, etc. She asked staff to provide a report that reviewed staffing levels in relationship to population and area growth, and to compare that information with information from other communities.

Ms. Hoppe noted she had been the Council Member representative to the Collaborative Adaptive Management (CAM) Stakeholder Group for the past two years. She explained the Group met at least once a month and sometimes twice a month, and since she could no longer be the City representative, she stated the Council would need to replace her. She commented that she had been asked to attend the next meeting with the new representative to introduce that person to the Group, and explained she would be happy to do that.

Ms. Hoppe stated she understood some Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) members were concerned about the Hinkson Creek as they had reviewed the Department of Natural Resources stream team data, which had indicated the level of water quality had decreased.

Mayor McDavid asked if they were using their own metrics or if they were using the stream condition index. Ms. Hoppe replied she was unsure of the details. She suggested the EEC get on the agenda for the CAM Stakeholder Group so they could discuss any concerns and learn about CAM studies.

Ms. Hoppe stated it had been a pleasure to work with each and every council member and noted this Council was very diligent in its decision making even though they came to different conclusions at times. She believed they were all very ethical, and noted she had the highest respect for them all. She thanked City staff for its hard work, and noted it had been a pleasure to work with them. She also thanked the management fellows and city clerk for all of their work.

The meeting adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk