

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
APRIL 20, 2015**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 20, 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 THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP and SKALA were present. The Deputy 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 April 6, 2015 and the special meeting of April 13, 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**

Upon her request, Mayor McDavid made a motion to allow Ms. Nauser to abstain from voting on B80-15 due to a conflict of interest. Ms. Nauser noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that one of the easements involved her family business. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

**Oath of Office – Michael Trapp, Second Ward Council Member.**

The City Clerk administered the Oath of Office to Council Member Michael Trapp, and Mayor McDavid presented him with a framed Commission of Office.

Mr. Trapp stated his appreciation for the voters of the Second Ward for allowing him the opportunity to continue to represent them. He thanked his family, friends, and others in the community for their support, and noted he looked forward to another three years.

**Announcement of the Mayor’s Climate Protection Agreement Award Winners.**

Mayor McDavid explained the Mayor’s Climate Protection Agreement award program had been established to recognize excellence in sustainable practices demonstrated by local businesses and organizations and to promote a culture of environmental responsibility. He recognized the inaugural winners, which included Schneider Electric, Quaker Manufacturing, Main Squeeze, and the Columbia Art League in the Resource Conservation category, Shelter Insurance in the Pollution Prevention category, the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture in the Environmental Stewardship category, and OHM Professional Offices: Home of Simon

Oswald Architecture and CM Engineering and the Columbia Area Career Center in the Innovative Best Practices category.

**Presentation of the Financial Audit Results.**

Ed Scavone stated he was the Chair of the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee and was delivering the City’s audit report to the Council in accordance with the audit standards. He noted the Committee met on March 19 with Kevin Smith of the external audit firm of McGladrey, LLP and the City’s Finance Department Director, Mr. Blattel. He commented that none of the transactions noted were material or unusual as defined under the professional standards, no adjustments were required, and there were not any disagreements between city management and the auditors over the application of significant accounting principles. The four audit products were the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, the Single Audit Report, the Passenger Audit Facility Report, and the Management Letter. He noted the audit firm appeared competent in their work, and provided a good level of communication with the Committee and City staff.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

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

**AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD**

Cecil, Gregory, 1700 Oak Cliff Place, Ward 4, Term to expire May 16, 2019

Riddick, John, 602 Rollins Court, Ward 4, Term to expire May 16, 2019

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

John, Martha, 2011 N. Country Club Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire May 1, 2020

**COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

Liu, Jenna, 4814 Norfolk Court, Ward 5, Term to expire March 1, 2017

**COMMUNITY TREE TASK FORCE**

Sax, Jean, 1904 W. Fenton Road, Boone County

**DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA LEADERSHIP COUNCIL**

Peckham, Nick, 15 S. Tenth Street (Business), Boone County, Term to expire May 1, 2018

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Harder, Dan, 1803 Bluff Pointe Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire May 31, 2019

Rushing, Joy, P.O. Box 61, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2018

Mayor McDavid explained Ms. Peters had served on the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group as a general public representative and former Council Member, Ms. Hoppe, had served as the Ward 6 Council Member representative, and understood Ms. Peters had agreed to take the place of Ms. Hoppe as the Ward 6 Council Member representative on that Group. Ms. Peters stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid noted Ms. Hoppe had served as the Council representative on the Collaborative Adaptive Management Stakeholder Group, and Mr. Skala had agreed to take her place. Mr. Skala stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala made a motion to appoint Barbara Hoppe to the general public representative on the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved unanimously by voice vote.

## **SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

### **Mary Hussmann – Roll carts and Pay-per-bag.**

Ms. Hussmann, 210 Ridgeway Avenue, stated she opposed the divisive roll cart and pay-per-bag proposals of the City to alter residential garbage collection. She understood City staff contended that the main reason for these proposals was to increase recycling, but recycling was already a daily habit for many Columbians in terms of residential recycling as it was an easy-to-understand system. There was, however, a great need for improvement in other areas, such as businesses, work places, public government buildings, and many apartment dwellings. She displayed photographs, and suggested the City require all demolition and reconstruction permit applications to include an effective recycling plan. She understood only garbage dumpsters were provided to apartment complexes, and suggested recycling dumpsters be placed next to all garbage dumpsters. She stated there was not a single City recycling dumpster in the public housing areas. She suggested the City start by ensuring anything that could be recycled at City Hall was being recycled. She noted recycling dumpsters were scarce downtown and that resulted in far too few businesses recycling. She thought recycling would increase if every business throughout town had a recycling dumpster beside its trash dumpster. She urged the Council to direct City staff to move its efforts away from changing the residential trash system and to prepare a report regarding the need for recycling at businesses, apartment complexes, etc. She thought Columbians would support that investment as it would achieve a healthier and more attractive community.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**(A)** Construction of accessible parking improvements on the northeast corner of Broadway and Eighth Street, the northwest corner of Broadway and Tenth Street and on the south side of Broadway adjacent to the alley between Hitt Street and Waugh Street.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked for clarification regarding the policy for accessible parking prior to the ordinance change. She wondered if the person previously only needed an ADA sticker on their car or if another method had been used. Mr. Glascock replied he did not recall the details, but understood people did not have to pay the meter at spaces with the accessible parking sign at that time. He noted the City now charged at the Short Street parking garage, and these spaces would be metered as well.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Thomas stated he was pleased to see this project moving forward as it involved funds allocated to the Disabilities Commission in response to their request for a number of good projects.

Mr. Trapp applauded staff for timing this project with the resurfacing of Broadway as he understood it was sometimes difficult to plan for different projects at the same time. He stated his appreciation for staff for their extra attention and for being efficient with the use of resources.

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

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **B74-15 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to the definition and standards associated with accessory dwelling units.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Creech provided a staff report.

B74-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

### **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.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Creech provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood the ordinance would only require a sidewalk on the narrow stem. Mr. Creech stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood the recommendation of staff to the Planning and Zoning Commission was to deny the variance request. Mr. Creech stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid understood the ordinance was written to grant the sidewalk variance on the basis of the Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation. Mr. Creech stated that was correct.

Hal James, 2700 Limerick Lane, explained he owned the subject property, and noted there was not a sidewalk on Barberry Avenue. He noted the City had property nearby and a sidewalk was not built along those properties. He commented that he understood staff had subsequently recommended approval of the variance and asked the Council for approval as well.

Mr. Thomas understood the ordinance requiring a sidewalk was triggered by development or platting, and asked if such a process had occurred with the City-owned property. Mr. Creech replied not to his knowledge. Mr. Thomas asked if development of a park would trigger the need for a sidewalk for park property. Mr. Creech replied typically yes. Mr. Thomas asked why that had not happened with this park. Mr. Creech replied he thought

the park had recently been dedicated and did not believe any work had occurred yet. Mr. Thomas asked if the City was planning to construct sidewalks. Mr. Creech replied he did not know.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. James for meeting with him to discuss this issue. He agreed it might look silly to construct 30 feet of sidewalk, but felt sidewalks needed to be constructed along neighborhood collectors, major collectors, and arterial streets. He noted City ordinances allowed for the incremental development of sidewalks and pointed out there were a tremendous number of homes in the area along with a park.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend B75-15 by removing Section 4 so the variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction was not granted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Trapp commented that this would only involve 30 feet of sidewalk since the frontage was only 50 feet and there was a 20 foot driveway. He did not believe it would be a usable piece of sidewalk. He noted Barberry Avenue was an unimproved road at this time, and believed it made more sense to construct the sidewalk when the road was improved as he did not feel this 30 feet of sidewalk would remain and be used when it was improved. Since it would not serve a purpose until the road was improved, he did not plan to support the motion to amend B75-15.

Mayor McDavid stated he generally believed they should fulfill the City's policy of constructing sidewalks, but felt this situation was unique in that it involved such a narrow area. He explained if it had not been a stem lot, he would have likely voted in favor of the motion.

Mr. Skala stated he tended to agree with Mr. Thomas. He understood the Planning and Zoning Commission vote was split even though the majority had recommended the granting of the variance. In addition, the staff recommendation was to not grant the variance per policies established by Council. He explained in this situation he was inclined to be consistent the ordinance requiring the sidewalk, and as a result, he would support the motion to amend B75-15.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend B75-15 by removing Section 4 so the variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction was not granted was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas, Mr. Ruffin and Mr. Skala voting in favor of it.

B75-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: RUFFIN. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B78-15 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for air service marketing and promotion services; appropriating funds.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

B78-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**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.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Community Development Department had the capacity to support a planning process for this corridor over the next 6-12 months. Ms. Thompson replied expenditures made by the City related to this would be reimbursable under the CID Act. Mr. Thomas asked if staff could be allocated to work on this project. Ms. Thompson replied she was not sure any staff allocations would be required. Mr. St. Romaine thought the City could entertain the idea of potentially hiring a consultant and having the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) reimburse the City or participate in the cost of that planning process.

Mr. Skala understood there had been a City initiative to underground utilities over the last few years, and asked if the issue of responsibility would be problematic. Ms. Thompson explained any particular work completed in the right-of-way or with utilities would have to be coordinated with the City. She stated she was not sure they were in a position to determine what difficulties might ensue if that was a project the CID undertook. Mr. St. Romaine commented that one of the purposes of the CID was to try to improve the aesthetic appearance of the Business Loop, and undergrounding existing overhead lines was a way to accomplish that goal. The cost of undergrounding was extremely expensive in this area so the City and CID would have to work closely to determine the best course of action.

Mayor McDavid asked if \$300,000 was the estimated amount of revenue that would be generated by the CID. Mr. St. Romaine replied the applicant would need to answer that question.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyons Street, stated he was the President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association (NCCNA) and noted he had communicated by e-mail with Jack Miller since the public hearing on this CID had been held. He explained he had asked Mr. Miller for a representative of the CID to meet with the nearby neighborhood associations and residents prior to tonight's meeting, and Mr. Miller declined to do so since the CID did not yet have an existing Board. Mr. Cullimore noted the surrounding neighborhood associations, interested citizen groups, and residents went ahead and met on April 18, and the general agreement was that the formation of the CID and the appointment of a CID Board was premature since there had not been a public process for determining how corridor development along the Business Loop should happen. They felt corridor planning needed to occur before redevelopment, and this had not yet happened. They recommended the establishment of the CID be postponed until some of the planning could occur, and understood that could be done by defeating this ordinance or by tabling it. He pointed out he had provided the Council by e-mail a list of CIDs that had been successful and unsuccessful in Missouri, and thought the difference was the amount of public oversight. He stated they were concerned about representation and oversight, and encouraged the Council to defeat or table this item until those issues were resolved.

Pat Kelley, 1007 Grand Avenue, explained she was the Treasurer of the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association and commented that there had been a beautification project a number of years ago at the corner of Providence Road and Business Loop 70. A result of that project was that three-phase 220 volt utility poles, which were industrial-sized poles, were moved to the Ridgeway neighborhood, to include one in her yard that had caused her to lose a beautiful maple tree. Due to that past history, she believed it was important for the surrounding neighborhoods and public to be included in planning for these types of projects. She stated she hoped the poles that had been moved to the neighborhood would be placed underground as part of any undergrounding done on the Business Loop corridor. She urged the Council to vote against this ordinance until there was more neighborhood inclusion.

Paul Love, 100 Sondra Avenue, commented that he did not believe there were any borrowing limits to the CID and that it would stay in existence until it no longer owed money, which meant it might be in existence for longer than 20 years. He did not understand how this group was able to approach and convince 53 percent of business owners along the Business Loop, but could not meet with the surrounding neighborhood associations or residents. He noted this would be located in a working class neighborhood and would affect a lot of people that shopped for groceries in the area. He thought it would be nice for the people in the neighborhood to have a chance to know the plans and have a better understanding of what might happen.

Robert Hollis, an attorney with offices at 1103 E. Broadway, stated he was representing the Business Loop CID, and if approved, the sales tax generated would be about \$230,000 annually and the assessments would generate approximately \$50,000 annually. He pointed out Mr. Miller had reached out to Mr. Cullimore and the other nearby neighborhood associations after the last council meeting, and had explained that decisions could not be made at this time since there was not a Board and because no one had the authority to do anything on behalf of the CID at this time. He pointed out the CID had hosted a number of public meetings even though there was not a requirement for anyone to be involved.

Mr. Ruffin asked if anyone had attended those public meetings. Mr. Hollis replied yes. Mr. Ruffin asked for the results of those meetings. Mr. Hollis replied the meetings were primarily for property owners within the proposed CID so they included PowerPoint presentations on how the CID worked, etc. Mr. Ruffin understood notice had not been sent to residents in the surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Hollis stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser understood state statutes dictated the formation of a CID. Mr. Hollis stated that was correct, and noted they had followed the state statutes and did more than was required as the meetings that were held were not required. Ms. Nauser understood the state statutes did not require neighborhood associations or property owners outside of the boundaries of the CID to be notified. Mr. Hollis stated that was correct.

Chris Burnam stated he was the owner of the Parkade Center, which was located on Business Loop 70, and noted he had been involved in the organization of the CID. He explained doing business on the Business Loop presented a multitude of challenges. Although the infrastructure was in place, there were many property owners and not all of those property owners had the same goals. He explained they had tried to get as many

people together as possible and to be as inclusive as possible, and had notified every property owner that had frontage on Business Loop 70. During the meetings, they discussed the possibilities of how they could bring recognition to the issues that were unique to redeveloping this urban corridor with Columbia. He noted some business owners were absolutely opposed to this CID, while others, like him, were willing to raise their own taxes to fund the nucleus of a group that could begin an advocacy process to really make the Business Loop a great place to be like it was in the 1960s. He pointed out some of the business owners on the west side of the Business Loop had started a phenomenon of bringing rebirth to an old and tired area without requiring any additional impact on City infrastructure. He explained they needed to address challenges with City regulations in mass, and also needed a way to market the area to the public. He apologized for the fact the neighborhood associations had not been included, but noted he did not view this process to be different than that of the Downtown CID. He pointed out they wanted the surrounding neighborhoods to be supportive because they were their customers.

Jack Miller, 2201 Country Lane, stated he owned True Media, which was located on Business Loop 70, and pointed out he had reached out to the neighborhood associations since the last council meeting. He explained they wanted to include the neighborhood associations in the long term planning of the Business Loop, but not a lot of planning had been done yet. Their first objective in creating the CID was to organize themselves. He noted the goal of the proposed CID Board was to be inclusive and obtain ideas from others, to include the City of Columbia. He stated the CID would allow them to create a Board and organize their group so they could have conversations with the City and neighborhood associations. He felt meeting prior to the formation of the CID was a waste of time because he, nor anyone else, had the authority to represent the business owners at this time. Currently, they were only an ad-hoc group of property owners trying to do their best to improve their neighborhood. The vote of Council tonight to establish the Business Loop CID would provide the basis of an organization to pull everyone together to develop a long term plan for the best use of the Business Loop.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, wondered if individual projects, such as streets, sidewalks, the undergrounding of utilities, etc., would require City staff involvement, public notices, and other public procedures that usually accompanied such projects.

Mr. St. Romaine stated he likened this to the Downtown CID whereby everyone was aware of its existence and its relationship with the City. He noted the City had just approved a project for more accessible parking spaces on Broadway. Mr. Thomas felt that was a different situation as the money for those spaces came from the City's budget, and not from the revenues of the Downtown CID. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if there was an example of where CID revenues had been used for public improvements that would fall under the purview of the Council. Mr. St. Romaine thought the City had received funding from the Downtown CID to help fund downtown safety officers, and that the Downtown CID had purchased a vehicle for those officers.

Ms. Thompson noted the Downtown CID recently came to the City with regard to gateway enhancements at the corner of Providence Road and Broadway and in other areas of the downtown. She stated that work would require coordination and agreement with the

City since it would involve public property. Any work on public property within the Business Loop CID would also require extensive coordination with City. Mr. Thomas asked if this was the case even if the funds came from the CID. Ms. Thompson replied yes, and explained it was because City-owned property was involved. The CID had the authority to spend CID money on any purpose allowed under the Act, which included business promotion or enhancements on private property, but they could not do work on public property without agreement with the City. She pointed out one major difference between the Downtown CID and the proposed Business Loop CID was how the CID Board was appointed. For the Downtown CID, the Council received a slate of officers from the CID, and either accepted the slate or did not accept it. If the Council chose not to accept the slate, the Downtown CID would propose a new slate. For the proposed Business Loop CID, the officers would be appointed based upon the requirements of the CID Act, which required approval by the Mayor with the consent of the Council. The Business Loop CID could make recommendations to the Council, but if the Council did not accept the recommendations, the Council could appoint anyone they believed met the qualifications and would fulfill the goals of the City cooperatively with the CID in accomplishing the mission of the CID.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline Street, commented that Columbia had many CIDs, and as a result, consumers paid different prices due to the different taxes charged by the CIDs. He noted there were many low income and fixed income residents in the First Ward, and felt this was a regressive tax as it would be damaging to those that were trying to get out of poverty. He asked the Council to vote against this proposed CID and to be cautious of the amount of taxation on the poor.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any CID other than the Downtown CID currently. Ms. Amin replied there was a North 763 CID as well. Mayor McDavid noted there were many TDDs within the City, which were similar in structure, but did not require Council approval.

Vicki Kemna, 1801 E. Calvin Drive, Hartsburg, Missouri, stated she had been on the planning committee for the CID as part of her job at Boone Electric Cooperative, whose headquarters was located on Rangeline Street. While that property was not within the proposed CID, two other properties they owned were within it. She explained she became involved as she had seen a decline in the area, and was unsure of how else they could fund improvements other than through a CID. She thought improvements to the area would also help with public safety, and urged the Council to vote in favor of the establishment of the Business Loop CID.

Paul Land, 4104 Joslyn Court, explained he owned a couple of properties on the Business Loop and had taken the initiative to improve those properties. He pointed out this was a challenging corridor, and noted he was not sure there was any other area in Columbia with five linear miles of commercial properties. He stated it took a lot of effort to put this together, and believed they would be able to accomplish more together than individually. He thought the fact they could get over 51 percent of the property owners and over 70 percent of the assessed valuation demonstrated the need to do something jointly. He pointed out they could not ignore their neighbors because those people were their customers, and safety would be a priority. He urged the Council to vote in favor of the proposed ordinance tonight as it was long overdue.

Tom May, 3913 Gailcrest Drive, stated he worked for BreakTime, an entity that owned property on the Business Loop, and pointed out the neighbors were their customers so their voices were important to them. They had worked for quite some time to develop a plan and build cohesiveness with other property owners on the Business Loop for a better community and area. He commented that he felt the Business Loop was a gateway to the community as many had to go through the Business Loop to get to downtown, and it had been neglected for years. He explained they wanted to create a collective voice so they could work with the City and other property owners in developing an area that would make the community proud.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he had attended some meetings and had suggested to Mr. Miller to not develop a financing mechanism until the planning was complete. He did not believe the City should give up control of everything just because of the financing issues. He agreed they had done a lot of work, but did not believe the City should be saddled with a bad process for the next 23 years due to 2-3 years of work. He commented that he did not believe the Council appointing the board of directors provided enough control. He recommended this CID not be approved until a meaningful and well-developed corridor plan was completed and in place because the City would not have the necessary controls going forward once it was established. He asked the Council to either defeat or table the proposed ordinance to allow for long-term planning.

Mayor McDavid stated he planned to support the establishment of the Business Loop CID. He understood Business Loop 70 began in 1925 and was the main thoroughfare until the mid-1960's when Interstate 70 was constructed. He commented that some sections of the Business Loop were terrific, but other sections did not make him particularly proud. It was an area that had potential, but needed help, and the City had not done its part. They now had a group of property owners that were willing to tax themselves to help improve the area, and the sales tax would only generate about \$250,000 per year. He noted this was the front door to the University for many that traveled to Columbia, and he wanted a nicer front door, which was why he would support the establishment of this CID.

Mr. Skala explained he planned to propose tabling this for six months. He believed the idea of the CID and the work many had put into trying to establish it was commendable, but felt it was a bit premature. He stated he was not sure why they could not meet with the neighborhood associations as nothing would be lost. He pointed out the CID included a lot of projects, but no one seemed to know what the priorities would be once the revenue was generated. He commented that he thought exempting groceries from any sales tax increase associated with the CID would be a good gesture. He pointed out the City did not have any control with TDDs, and had more control with CIDs. He reiterated he thought it would be worthwhile for a few months of conversation with the customers of the Business Loop.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table B83-15 to the October 19, 2015 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas agreed this was a very much needed project and acknowledged the work completed by the members of this group thus far. He stated he was confident the streetscape would be improved by the CID, but like Mr. Skala, he did not believe there was any real threat to slowing down the process. He felt neighborhood planning was important and thought the process would be strengthened by working with the neighborhoods as it

would build more general public support and Council support. He believed the six month delay to allow for more inclusive planning and a more articulated plan with budgeted numbers for projects would be beneficial. Since the establishment of the CID would grant taxing authority, it was more than just the appointing of the board of directors.

Ms. Nauser stated she could not support the motion to table. She noted the state statutes had been followed and it was difficult to negotiate and agree upon projects when there was not an established entity. She believed this was similar to any other corporation or non-profit in that a board of directors was needed to make those types of decisions, and at this time, no one had the authority to negotiate for the group. She did not believe this should be delayed to first develop a corridor plan as that could take years. She noted there would be some protection for the public as any work done in the public right-of-way would need to come before the Council. She reiterated she would not support tabling this issue and stated she planned to support the establishment of the Business Loop CID.

Mayor McDavid commented that there was no assurance this group would be back or in existence in six months. He thought Mr. Skala's idea of exempting groceries from the sales tax was interesting, and assumed that could still be done after the CID was established. He stated he would oppose tabling this issue.

Ms. Peters asked if grocery stores could be exempted.

Rick McConnell stated he was with Gillmore and Bell, the legal counsel for the City on the Business Loop CID, and explained the statute for the sales tax authority under the CID Act was fairly specific. It exempted motor vehicles, boats, trailers, etc., but did not speak to groceries so he did not believe it was exempted from sales tax. Mr. Trapp asked if it would be within the authority of Council to exempt sales tax. Mr. McConnell replied no. Ms. Thompson thought the only option would be to exclude those businesses from the boundaries of the CID.

Mr. Trapp commented that he lived in the Parkade neighborhood, and Business Loop 70, which he believed needed some love, was their downtown. He did not think those that had banded together to try to improve the neighborhood were solely driven by self-interest. He felt there was some neighborhood pride and an appreciation of what had occurred to date. He noted there were beginnings of a mini-renaissance with Mizzou North, True Media, and Parkade Plaza, and felt it was important to validate the efforts of those that had worked hard to make this happen. He understood there was a desire by those involved to do corridor planning, and that took resources. The City had many opportunities to plan for this area and had not done it due to the lack of resources, and this was a step toward generating those resources. He believed the corridor planning would include a robust public process and that creating the Business Loop CID was the next logical step in improving that part of the community.

Mr. Ruffin stated he supported the establishment of the Business Loop CID as it was long overdue and would provide funding for some very necessary improvements to the area. He commented that he also supported the engagement of neighborhood groups, and had been persuaded by those involved in the formation of the CID that they would pursue public engagement. In addition, he was not sure anything substantive could be accomplished in six months. He encouraged the organizers of the CID to make a herculean effort to reach out to

the surrounding communities to solicit their concerns and participation at every level going forward. He stated he was not supportive of delaying a decision tonight.

Mayor McDavid thought the Council would have more control over the administration of the Business Loop CID as they would appoint the board of directors. They only accepted or rejected a slate with the Downtown CID.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Thomas to table B83-15 to the October 19, 2015 was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas, Ms. Peters and Mr. Skala voting in favor of it.

B83-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: THOMAS, SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**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.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked for clarification of the 50 years on the amendment sheet, and wondered if a 50 year old property was considered historic or if it was an arbitrary age. Ms. Thompson replied some properties were considered historic at 50 years, but others that were 100 years old might not be considered historic, and it was within the purview of Council to change that number.

Ms. Nauser asked if there was a definition of historic as she did not believe everything 50 years old or older was historic. Ms. Thompson replied the National Register of Historic Places had some guidelines, and noted some buildings could be architecturally significant. She explained historical significance usually dealt with whether something of historic value had occurred on the property.

Mr. Skala commented that this issue had been discussed by the Planning and Zoning Commission some years back after a review by the Historic Preservation Commission and the 50 years originated with some of the recommendations that had been given to them. He thought that was why 50 years was referenced.

Ms. Nauser asked if that was when the 30 day delay in demolition was established to allow for Historic Preservation Commission review. Mr. Skala replied yes.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was an inventory or map showing where all of the buildings within the Downtown CID that were 50 years old or older were located. Ms. Thompson replied no. Mayor McDavid stated he believed it would likely encompass all buildings within the Downtown CID except for the new student housing buildings.

Ms. Peters asked if there was any demolition application other than that of the building in which Shakespeare's was housed. Mr. Creech replied he was only aware of the one for the Shakespeare's building.

Kurt Mirtsching, 7551 S. Bennett Drive, commented that he had worked in downtown Columbia his entire adult life as had the owners of Shakespeare's Pizza, the Louis family, for whom he worked, and they considered themselves strong stakeholders in downtown Columbia. He noted they cared about downtown Columbia and pointed out he had actually

served for many years on the Board of the old Central Columbia Association (CCA), which was a former downtown association. He explained they had never owned the property they called home, and on May 31, their lease would be up and they would vacate the property. He commented that any delay in their plans would have a very real and substantial negative financial impact on their business. They planned to lease space on Eighth Street and would return to the corner of Ninth Street and Elm Street with a fifty year lease in the summer of 2016 after construction was done. He noted they anticipated a loss in sales while in their temporary location as that facility would not accommodate all of their equipment and was not ideally set up as a pizza place. He explained they would re-create as close to what they currently had when moving back to the Ninth Street location, and pointed out they were saving the bricks and would try to save the tin ceiling. They would add a much needed larger party room and the patio would face Ninth Street. They would also have newer and bigger ADA compliant restrooms. In addition, the area they used as staff would be greatly improved so they could make more pizzas and make them faster. He commented that the building was not historic. It was just old. He reiterated they would be back in the same location, but the key was for everything to be done as soon as possible, and establishing a moratorium would keep them in the Eighth Street location for a second football season, which would be a very real and substantial loss. He asked the Council to avoid a moratorium that would only hinder their ability to be good caretakers for the next fifty years for what many referred to as an icon of the community.

Mr. Ruffin asked if there were any plans for what would be on top of the box, i.e. on top of Shakespeare's Pizza. Mr. Mirtsching replied he had heard a number of different things, such as apartments, offices, etc., and noted he had been concentrating on only their part of the building, which would be in the same spot within a bigger building around it. He pointed out the Downtown CID had voluntary design guidelines for buildings such as this, and once the developers became aware of those guidelines, they had realized that 90-95 percent of what they were already planning to do conformed to those guidelines. He thought this building could be a showcase for downtown Columbia.

Jim Loveless, 2404 Topaz Drive, explained he was the Executive Director of the Central Missouri Development Council (CMDC) and stated he was personally against this action, and although the Board of the CMDC had not met, he was confident that the Board would feel the same way. He noted he was not personally against the preservation of the community's cultural heritage, and did not believe the members of CMDC were against it either. He believed Columbia needed to strive to preserve its buildings of architectural and historical significance, such as the Armory and the Blind Boone Home, but this proposed action appeared to be put forth to preserve a single building, which was somewhat analogous of spot zoning. This technique had been used a couple of years ago to preserve the Niedermeyer building, which had some historic significance, but since that time there had not been any concentrated or significant effort on the part of the Council to establish criteria for preservation. If the Council was serious with regard to preserving such buildings, it needed to establish criteria and codify it in ordinance form so everyone understood the rules.

Jim Meyer, 104 Sea Eagle Drive, stated the legal basis for police powers of local government rested on protecting health, safety, and public welfare, and asked under which of

those headings the Council could justify the proposed ordinance. The fee simple bundle of rights was ancient in common law and included the right to erect improvements and demolish improvements on land. In addition, owners of property had the burdens of ownership in that they paid taxes, insurance, and maintenance fees, and their equity in their investment was at risk in the market. He wondered about the burden of those whose aesthetic sensibilities were offended by plans to remodel and construct new buildings, and whether property owners, who had all of the risk, should be held to the standards of parties that held no costs. He believed the approval of the proposed ordinance would expropriate property owners and was manifestly unjust, and urged the Council to vote against the ordinance.

Katie Essing stated she was the Executive Director of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and explained the CID Board opposed this measure. The Board was supportive of looking into a process for the demolition of historic property as historic structures were valuable to the downtown, but found the moratorium to be unnecessary and potentially detrimental to property owners and the rights of those owners.

Paul Love, 100 Sondra Avenue, commented that the owners of Shakespeare's Pizza had done an amazing job of carrying the same culture and design forward in their newer locations and believed they would do the same in this new building. He pointed out they had already given up their lease on the property and would be moving out of the building, and if this passed, the building would remain vacant. He thought they needed to respect the rights of the property owners as they had worked well with their tenants and had even provided them a favorable deal of a fifty year lease. He did not believe the Council should delay the project.

DeeAnna Walkenbach, 407 Pyrenees Drive, stated she did not believe the project involving Shakespeare's Pizza should be held up as it would not be fair to have provided permission to do what they had planned and to then delay it. She thought a six month moratorium was still needed for any new applications as the downtown did not have the necessary infrastructure for more of these types of buildings. She believed the health of Columbia citizens would be at risk until the infrastructure was in place, and asked the Council to consider those comments.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B85-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mayor McDavid hoped the amendment, which would grandfather the demolition application for the property where Shakespeare's Pizza was currently located and change the designation from historic structures to fifty years, would pass as they had the unique opportunity to have an iconic business in place for a couple more generations. He believed the business was historic, but the building was not historic, and by passing this amendment, they would preserve Shakespeare's Pizza.

Mr. Thomas stated he was supportive of exempting any building that had already applied for a demolition permit, but noted he was not sure how he felt about the criteria of buildings within the national historic district or buildings fifty years old or older.

Ms. Thompson commented that based upon correspondence received, they could not use the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification. Ms. Thompson explained it could not be used as descriptor for which building

could be excluded from the ability to obtain a demolition permit because those buildings had not received due process related to demolition when going through the process for the National Register of Historic Places designation. From a legal standpoint, there was concern to continue to use it as a moniker.

Mr. Thomas stated he supported both parts of the amendment based on those comments.

Mr. Skala commented that he believed it was inherently fair to make the exception for the building that housed Shakespeare's Pizza and it was inherently unfair to single out a particular business. He noted he planned to support a moratorium for further consideration for other properties in the downtown area. He pointed out there had been a demonstrated interest in historic preservation, and he did not believe it would penalize anyone to discuss the issue and potentially put some rules in place.

Mr. Ruffin stated he intended to support the amendment, but noted he was concerned about the plans for the rest of the building. He explained he was concerned the ambiance of Shakespeare's Pizza would be overshadowed by a ten-story student loft complex. He hoped there was a procedure somewhere that would allow for more input with regard the finished and final look of that building so it would not lose what made it so special now.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B85-15 per the amendment sheet was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala commented that a lot of the controversy could have been avoided if they knew the type of use for the rest of the building. Due to the amount of money invested in infrastructure, he believed the community was a stakeholder in this development. He reiterated he did not believe there was anything wrong with having these conversations, and did not feel it would be punitive to have this respite so they could try to come to some sort of agreement.

Ms. Nauser stated she believed this ordinance was punitive and an attempt to stop future student housing from being built in the downtown. She noted the sewer and electric issues had either been addressed or were in the process of being addressed. The citizens had graciously approved an increase in stormwater fees, and there would be many projects in the downtown area. She pointed out any building constructed would have to meet the current codes and ordinances. She did not feel any property owner had the obligation to tell the City what they planned to build, and noted they would only build what the current codes and ordinances allowed. This action implied the City did not have confidence in its C-2 zoning district rules. The 30 day demolition grace period to allow the Historic Preservation Commission to work with property owners of historic properties was a result of a similar conversation a few years ago. She believed this would penalize property owners as it would prohibit the ability for them to exercise their current property rights. She was supportive of saving historic properties, but did not believe a moratorium was the appropriate tool.

Ms. Peters commented that she was in support of a six month moratorium. She noted the City was in the process of reviewing its zoning codes, which included development in the downtown. She agreed everyone needed to know the rules and felt it would be helpful for that zoning to be in place. She stated many believed the current C-2 zoning district was a problem, which needed to be addressed. She asked when the review of the zoning codes

would be done. Mr. Creech replied he believed the proposed zoning code would be clearer in six months, but he did not think it would be in place by then. Mr. St. Romaine agreed, and noted he thought it would next year before they had anything in a format that could be considered for Council approval. Ms. Peters suggested they ask the Historic Preservation Commission what exactly needed to be preserved in the downtown as everything was over 50 years old except for the new student housing buildings, and because a building was old did not mean it was something worth keeping. She reiterated she believed it would be beneficial for the Historic Preservation Commission to determine which buildings in the downtown were worth keeping, and to then talk to the property owners with regard to what could be accomplished. She thought a better plan than reacting to a demolition permit application was needed.

Mr. Thomas stated he had a number of concerns with the proposed legislation and felt it was in response to one building. He did not feel there had been an adequate conversation, and he had not had the opportunity to speak to people on all sides of the issue. He commented that he was unclear as to the rules and noted they had changed since the legislation was introduced two weeks ago. He was supportive of the suggestion of Ms. Peters to obtain feedback from the Historic Preservation Commission, but explained he was not supportive of a moratorium at this time. He was interested in whether the grace period prior to demolition needed to be longer and if there were ways for demolished buildings to live on in any new buildings, similar to what was planned for Shakespeare's Pizza. He noted the Historic Preservation Commission could even recommend a moratorium, but pointed out he would not be supportive of it tonight.

Mr. Trapp stated he was largely in agreement with Mr. Thomas. He understood there was a lot of concern regarding the City's historical assets and the City's sense of place, and believed that needed to be honored in some fashion, but did not believe a moratorium was the way to proceed. He explained he had wrestled with this issue when the Niedermeyer had been proposed for demolition, and had actually voted in favor of a moratorium then because it seemed to be an extreme situation. He commented that he liked the 30 day grace period and thought an extension could be considered. He recalled the Council being provided a list of options from the Historic Preservation Commission after the Niedermeyer building was proposed for demolition, and suggested they revisit that report. He believed the comment of Mr. Loveless was fair in that the Council had not moved forward with more robust historic preservation legislation even when they had the opportunity. He stated this was a wake-up call with regard to the need to examine what they wanted in terms of a sense of place in the downtown, but did not believe a moratorium was the way to proceed. He reiterated that they should re-examine the report they had previously received from the Historic Preservation Commission to determine what could be done.

Mayor McDavid pointed a moratorium had not saved the Niedermeyer property. It had been saved due to the involvement of the private sector and included a lot of negotiations. He noted no one liked change, but Columbia was growing, so downtown Columbia would look different. If they did not want student housing downtown, he thought they needed to decide where it might be appropriate. He believed moratoriums were bad policy, and felt

their rules should be predictable, consistent, and certain. If they did a good job in setting policy, there would not be any ad-hoc issues or controls necessary.

Mr. Skala stated he rejected the idea this would take away from private property rights and noted this would only be a delay to allow for a productive discussion and to ensure a better policy was crafted due to the rapidly changing downtown area.

Mayor McDavid noted the five historic districts along with the National Register of Historic Places could be found on the City's website. In addition, the Historic Preservation Commission had designated 119 properties as notable properties. He pointed out there was not much the City could do to prevent changes to those properties in terms of legislative authority.

B85-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, SKALA. VOTING NO: THOMAS, NAUSER, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP. Bill declared defeated.

## CONSENT AGENDA

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

- 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.
- 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.
- B84-15 Appropriating Law Enforcement Training funds for police officer training.
- R64-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of the Hubbell Drive PCCE #39 sanitary sewer improvement project.
- R65-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of the St. James Street and St. Joseph Street PCCE #24 sanitary sewer improvement project.
- R66-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of the FY 2015 sanitary sewer main and manhole rehabilitation project.
- R67-15 Setting a public hearing: consider an amendment to the FY 2015 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.
- R68-15 Forgiving a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) demolition loan on property located at 1004 N. Seventh Street; authorizing a full deed of release.

- R69-15 Authorizing an agreement with Gentry Estates II, L.P. for HOME funds for the Gentry Estates Phase II housing development project for senior citizens.
- R70-15 Transferring funds to the Office of Cultural Affairs for disbursement to Columbia Access Television (CAT-TV) in FY 2015.
- R71-15 Approving the Discovery Park Subdivision Preliminary Plat 2 located between A. Perry Philips Park and U.S. Highway 63, north of Discovery Parkway.
- R72-15 Authorizing application and execution of an agreement, as co-recipient with The Curators of the University of Missouri, for a Financial Assistance Award from the United States Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration for site development at Discovery Ridge, a University of Missouri Research Park supporting new-tech economic development for mid-Missouri; authorizing execution of all other documents associated with program implementation.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER (except for B80-15 on which she abstained), PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. 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.

- B86-15 Rezoning property located north of Stadium Boulevard and east of Cinnamon Hill Lane from District A-1 to District PUD-11; approving the statement of intent; authorizing a development agreement with Park7 Development Group, LLC; approving the PUD Plan of The Avenue at Columbia.
- B87-15 Approving the Final Plat of Kitty Hawk Manor, Plat No. 5, a Replat of Lots 57 through 65 and part of Lot 66 of Kitty Hawk Manor Plat No. 2, located on the south side of Gypsy Moth Drive and west of Parker Street; authorizing a performance contract; vacating a utility easement located on Lot 6 within Kitty Hawk Manor, Plat No. 5.
- B88-15 Authorizing an annexation agreement with Crazy Squirrel, LLC for property located north of I-70 Drive Northwest and west of Gibbs Road (Tract 2 and Tract 5 of Abilene Acres).
- B89-15 Authorizing an annexation agreement with Wild Rabbit, LLC for property located north of I-70 Drive Northwest and west of Gibbs Road (Tract 1 of Abilene Acres).
- B90-15 Granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations, and a waiver from the requirements of the City Code, relating to construction of a sidewalk along a portion of the north side of Stadium Boulevard adjacent to Lot 3B of Boone Quarry Plat 3A (2620 N. Stadium Boulevard).
- B91-15 Authorizing the reconstruction of Runway 13-31 (Phase I) and Taxiway B at the Columbia Regional Airport; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.

- B92-15 Authorizing 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 with pedestrian push buttons and countdown timers, and reconstruction of six driveways to meet ADA requirements; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B93-15 Authorizing the acquisition of easements and land in fee simple for construction of the Garth Avenue Sidewalk Project, between Worley Street and Sexton Road.
- B94-15 Authorizing a first amended and restated cost participation agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation improvements to the Stadium Boulevard corridor from Broadway to I-70.
- B95-15 Authorizing a pole removal and relocation agreement with Union Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren Missouri, relating to the Scott Boulevard Phase III Street Improvement Project, from Vawter School Road to Route KK.
- B96-15 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with the Transportation Security Administration, acting by and through the designated representative of the General Services Administration – Public Buildings Service, for the lease of office space in the North Terminal Building at Columbia Regional Airport.
- B97-15 Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Public Works Department – Parking Utility Division.
- B98-15 Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget to add positions in the Water and Light Department and Information Technologies Department; amending the FY 2015 Classification and Pay Plan by adding and reassigning positions in the Water and Light Department and Information Technologies Department; appropriating funds.
- B99-15 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B100-15 Authorizing Amendment #1 to the lease and memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Conservation as it relates to the construction of a portion of the Grindstone Creek Trail within the C.B. Moss Memorial Wildlife Area; appropriating funds.
- B101-15 Authorizing an amendment to the PCS antenna co-location agreement and a memorandum of lease with T-Mobile Central LLC relating to the lease of property on Chapel Hill Road (Fire Station No. 6).
- B102-15 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with Columbia Public Schools, Boone County Sheriff's Department and the 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court – Juvenile Division to establish a cooperative relationship for the handling of school-related delinquent acts by juveniles.
- B103-15 Authorizing a summer food service program inspections participation agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services.
- B104-15 Appropriating asset forfeiture funds for a staffing optimization study in the Columbia Police Department.
- B105-15 Accepting and appropriating donated funds to be used for the Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement Awards.

## REPORTS AND PETITIONS

### REP47-15 Board of Adjustment (BOA) Information.

Mr. Thomas thanked staff for this information as it clarified a few issues for him.

### REP48-15 Citizens Police Review Board - Supplement to the 2014 Annual Report.

Mayor McDavid asked for historical trends to be included in future reports as he wanted to know if arrests and uses of force were increasing or decreasing. He reiterated he wanted historical contexts when this report was provided next year.

Ms. Nauser commented that when the Citizens Police Review Board had been established there was some concern that this Board would be a rubber stamp for the Police Department, but this report showed that was not the case as there was not always agreement.

### REP49-15 Intra-Department Transfer of Funds Request.

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

## COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline Street, commented that he believed the Council had a hand in the amount of violence in the community, and believed an increase in the cost of groceries would create more violence.

Mr. Elkin referred to a recent shooting, and stated he thought they needed to ensure previously incarcerated people were on their medication because those without their medication tended to act destructively.

Mr. Elkin commented that BreakTime, at the corner of Stadium Boulevard and Highway 63, had a crack in its building as did The Domain, which was an apartment complex, due to the use of fill dirt prior to construction. He believed a strong foundation was needed for all construction sites and for the pace of construction to slow. He suggested the use of green concrete.

Kara McGee, 717 N. Seventh Street, commented that students were only in town for a limited time and noted she was not certain if out-of-state developers had the best interest of students at heart. She understood the University of Missouri was the economic engine in Columbia, but did not feel they should be at odds with low income members of the community. She agreed the downtown should not be the only place for student housing, but noted she did not want the student population to be at odds with the community by continuing to displacing people. She thought the issue was not only where to place students, but also with regard to affordable housing for all Columbia citizens. She was happy they would be looking at growth, but noted sustainability was as important as growth.

Ms. Nauser noted she had received a complaint from an individual asking that the meters in front of the Ragtag movie theater be longer than two hours because someone attending a movie at 5:00 p.m. would likely get there a few minutes early, and then not be covered by a two-hour meter if the movie was two hours or longer. Mr. Trapp understood the individual wanted a three-hour meter by the movie theater. Mr. Thomas thought there were

five-hour meters nearby. Mr. St. Romaine pointed out the parking garages were an option as well. Mr. Thomas understood this individual did not feel safe parking in the garages at night. Mr. St. Romaine thought a geographic map showing the locations of the different meters might help. Mayor McDavid suggested informing Ragtag of meter locations longer than two hours so they could advise their clients.

Ms. Nauser understood Lowe's and several other chains were considering no longer selling pesticides with neonicotinoids due to their impact on pollinators, such as bees and butterflies. She asked for information regarding the kinds of pesticides and herbicides the City used, and for the City to consider stopping the usage of products with neonicotinoids. Mr. St. Romaine replied staff would report back to Council.

Mr. Thomas suggested the Council ask the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to make recommendations for actual legislation involving the preservation of historic properties by looking at other communities. He commented that the HPC could recommend for a moratorium if they felt it was necessary.

Mr. Trapp thought the Council had received a report with some options from the HPC previously, and suggested they start with that report.

Ms. Peters suggested they ask the HPC to provide more information as well so the focus included the issues of building in the downtown. Mr. Thomas agreed they should ask the HPC for their thoughts.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding whether the City should build a sidewalk along Barberry Park so they were in compliance with their own rules. He did not believe it helped them when enforcing those rules on other property if they were not compliant themselves.

Mr. Thomas explained he had previously asked for information regarding a proposal whereby the City developed neighborhood districts and collected money from property owners to be placed in a fund to build a sidewalk elsewhere in the neighborhood where there was a nexus on a street with more pedestrian traffic or traffic generators and destinations if they felt a sidewalk variance was justified. Mr. St. Romaine thought this would be discussed during the May 18, 2015 pre-council work session.

Mayor McDavid commented that he wanted to know the cost of electricity in Columbia. He understood the City was cheaper than Boone Electric at times, but not in the summer. He thought the cost for City customers was 13.5 cents per kilowatt hour while it was only 9 cents per kilowatt hour for Boone Electric customers in the summer. He wanted to know what middle class families paid for electricity. Many affluent students lived in small apartments, but were not in Columbia during the summer. He understood it could be up to three percent more expense due to the renewable energy initiative. He asked the Water and Light Advisory Board to provide an index showing how expensive electricity was in Columbia.

Mayor McDavid stated he would announce the formation of a Pedestrian Safety Task Force on May 8 during Bike Walk Wheel Week. He noted Mr. Thomas and the

Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission had supplied the energy behind this initiative as there had been some fairly high profile pedestrian accidents and fatalities recently in Columbia. He wanted this Task Force to provide trend lines for pedestrian safety in terms of whether there had been an increase in accidents in Columbia and benchmarks from comparable communities, such as other Midwestern and SEC college communities. He also wanted to know the priorities in terms of infrastructure to determine if they had the right priorities with regard to enhancing safety, and for metrics to allow them to follow this contemporaneously so they could determine if they were doing better or worse in future years. He stated he planned to ask Mr. Thomas and Mr. Ruffin to be co-chairs of the Task Force. He anticipated it including representatives of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission, the Disabilities Commission, the Public Transit Advisory Commission, the PedNet Coalition, the Missouri Student Association, the Columbia Public Schools, etc.

Mayor McDavid commented that had invited Gary Ward, the University of Missouri - Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs, to present to Council. He stated he did not believe they had done a good job of planning as they had not incorporated the leading driver of growth in Columbia. Since 2000, the University of Missouri had a 49 percent increase in its student body, and the City had not seen that coming. As a result, they now had large box student apartments scattered throughout Columbia. He wanted students to be able to walk to campus, and did not believe they needed to be downtown to walk to campus as there were areas adjacent to campus that were not in the downtown. He explained he wanted to engage senior leadership at the University of Missouri and thought they would tell the City to plan for 3,000 more students. He commented that he wanted feedback from the public, the neighborhoods, and the colleges surrounding downtown regarding student housing as well.

Mr. Skala pointed out him, Ms. Nausser, and Ms. Hoppe had met with the University Communities Council at the National League of Cities conference, and suggested the Council consider some of the options they learned there.

Ms. Nausser suggested they consider a permanent liaison between the University of Missouri and the City of Columbia. Mr. Skala stated that was the Fort Collins model.

The meeting adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk