

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
MAY 18, 2015**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 18, 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 PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS and NAUSER 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 May 4, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Trapp.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

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

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

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

AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Moyes, William, 107 Coventry Court, Ward 4, Term to expire May 16, 2016

BOARD OF PLUMBING EXAMINERS

Stretz, Chad, 310 Cumberland Road, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2016

COLUMBIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

White, Carmelita, 2 E. Clarkson Road, Unit B, Ward 5, Term to expire November 1, 2017

COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD

Hutton, Robert, 2252 Country Lane, Ward 3, Term to expire May 31, 2019

COMMUNITY TREE TASK FORCE

Haubner, Chris, 206 Loch Lane, Ward 4

DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Hammen, Janet, 1844 Cliff Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire May 1, 2018

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY COMMISSION

Bunger, Craig, 3408 Oakland Place, Ward 2, Term to expire June 1, 2018

Turner, Alyce, 1204 Fieldcrest, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2018

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Devine, Daniel, 710 Ridgeway Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2018

Donaldson, Meredith, 1001 Pheasant Run Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire May 31, 2018

Farnen, Ted, 5100 Blue Spruce Court, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2018

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Kim Kraus – Assistance of the City in purchasing 12.6 acres located at College Park Drive and Ridgemont Road.

Ms. Kraus, 2304 Ridgefield Road, commented that she represented over four dozen people in her neighborhood and in the adjacent neighborhoods, and asked those she was representing in attendance to stand and approximately ten people stood. She explained the County House Greenspace Preservation Group, which they had formed, was asking the City for assistance in purchasing twelve acres of land at College Park Drive and Ridgemont Road. The owners were interested in selling and had advised the Group on May 8 that two buyers were interested in the land for development. Since the Group could not raise the funds necessary to purchase this land themselves, they were asking for help. The Group did not feel this land should be developed due to the ongoing sewer flow problems in the area, the pollution of the Hinkson Creek and County House Branch Creek, and the serious traffic problems in the neighborhood. She explained the area could not support existing sewer connections or the new connections anticipated to be added due to current construction projects. The County House Branch Creek, which bisected the land, was a tributary to the Hinkson Creek, which was considered to be polluted by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). She noted the County House Branch Creek had essentially been a stormwater culvert, and development on the subject land would exacerbate pollution problems and would be contrary to clean up efforts. She commented that heavy traffic and speeding were the norm on their neighborhood streets. Their streets did not have any traffic calming mechanisms and had very few sidewalks, and served as connections between Stadium Boulevard, Fairview Road, Chapel Hill Road, and Forum Boulevard. She believed development at College Park Drive and Ridgemont Road would exacerbate known problems and felt the purchase of the land to be maintained as greenspace would benefit the entire community. The County House Branch Trail use had increased each year, and its use was anticipated to continue to grow with the extension on the north side of Stadium Boulevard to Rollins Road. Trail users that accessed the trail by vehicle parked on Ridgemont Road, near the intersection of College Park Drive, because there was not trail parking nearby, and the subject property had an area that was near ready for off-street parking. She noted part of the land could be converted to a stormwater collection area to allow the water to be naturally cleansed prior to entering into the County House Branch Creek and the Hinkson Creek. She explained this was the only large parcel of land available on the east end of the existing greenbelt that extended to the Twin Lakes Recreation Area and beyond, and felt the

greenbelt and the trail were jewels of Columbia and important to the citizens. She asked the City to assist the Group in purchasing the 12-plus acres of land at College Park Drive and Ridgemont Road, and reiterated the reasons the purchase would benefit the community.

Ron Marchionda – Opposition to roll cart and pay-per-throw changes.

Mr. Marchionda, 1012 Danforth Drive, stated he believed the only positive outcome of roll carts was a possible reduction in the current high cost of worker's compensation, and felt there were multiple negative outcomes to roll carts. The cost to purchase 34,000 carts would be a major expense, and would be even higher if recycling carts also needed to be purchased. He understood at least 16 new trucks would need to be purchased. He commented that safety was a concern to many elderly homeowners that would have to roll the carts to the street in the snow or had steep driveways, and that could result in possible lawsuits against the City. He noted the storage of roll carts could pose problems for those without garages or those with only one-car garages. He stated he also had environmental concerns as cleaning agents could go into the groundwater and roll carts would likely not result in fewer plastic bags going into the landfill. He commented that he believed the roll carts would be stolen or would remain in the street long after the trash was picked up, which would create an eyesore. He stated he was not sure how roll carts would help improve recycling, and suggested the City concentrate on increasing participation in recycling in businesses, hospitals, apartments, etc. If roll carts turned into a pay-as-you-throw agent, he believed some homeowners would store garbage for two weeks or more, which could create more problems. He stated the trash collection system the City currently had worked great, and wondered why it needed to be changed. He suggested the labor issues be addressed by lowering the weight limits of bags and reducing the current workload of 900 homes per day. He asked the Council to vote based on how the citizens in their respective wards wanted them to vote, and not based on their own opinions.

Josh Behounek – Support for the creation of an Urban Forest Master Plan.

Mr. Behounek explained he was a member of the Community Tree Task Force and noted they had already started working on some of the tasks assigned to them by the Council. He stated homeowner education workshops were already being held at the Shakespeare's south location and the City arborist website was being updated with new information concerning invasive pests and the benefits of trees. The next tasks on which they planned to work were the review of current tree policies and ordinances and the recommendation of methodologies for maintenance, but one of the greatest needs at this time was an Urban Forest Master Plan as there was a lack of an overarching vision of how the urban forest should look. As a result, the Task Force was asking Council to support the development of an Urban Forest Master Plan as it would create a roadmap with the detailed information, recommendations, and resources needed to effectively and practically manage and grow an urban tree canopy. It would also provide a shared vision for the future of the urban forest to inspire and engage stakeholders in the care and protection of trees. The goal of an Urban Forest Master Plan was to create a tool for the City to efficiently and cost-

effectively maintain and enhance the urban forest. He asked the Council for its support in creating an Urban Forest Master Plan.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(A) Construction of the Hubbell Drive PCCE #39 sanitary sewer improvement project.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Glenn Rice, 602 Redbud Lane, commented that he and his wife owned 114 Hubbell Drive, and he understood everyone on his street was on board with this project. He noted most of the property owners on Hubbell Drive had experienced water in the basements, flooding, etc. so a solution to these problems was sorely needed. He understood the engineers had indicated there might be a problem with the section of pipe that connected to their house and the location of the storm sewer box under the road. He noted he hoped the suggestions they had made during the neighborhood meeting would be taken into consideration by staff when developing the final plans.

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

Mr. Thomas asked for a response to the comments of Mr. Rice. Mr. Sorrell replied they would address moving the storm sewer to eliminate the conflict as the plans were prepared, and would go over those plans with the property owner when completed. He thought the concern of Mr. Rice was the conflict of the private lateral from his house getting to the public storm sewer main. Mr. Thomas asked if this project included the repair of private laterals. Mr. Sorrell replied it only involved extending the private lateral to the new public sewer.

Mayor McDavid stated he supported this project, and explained he believed this was an example of new development subsidizing legacy infrastructure in need of repair. He noted 40 percent of Columbians lived in homes built within the last 40 years, which had PVC pipes that would last 100 years, but substantial portions of the Fourth and First Wards had clays pipes in disrepair needing to be replaced. He believed it was a citizenship responsibility of those that had PVC pipes to pay to rehabilitate the pipes in disrepair through the user fees.

Mr. Thomas stated he viewed this differently as he believed the sewer system was a community sewer system that needed to be maintained by everyone, and the residents on Hubbell Drive had been paying into the sewer utility since its creation so they deserved to have their maintenance issue addressed. He felt this was different than when a brand new development came onto the system as a large portion of the cost of capacity of the sewer system would be subsidized by current residents for those residents in the new development.

Mr. Skala commented that he believed they had been remiss in terms of maintenance for some systems as they had assumed the systems would last forever. Since not enough money had been set aside for maintenance, they were now trying to catch up. He thought it was legitimate to take this approach to pay for some of that maintenance.

Mr. Trapp noted 80-85 percent of the last sewer ballot issue would go toward the repair and remediation of problems. Although the City might not have historically provided enough funding for maintenance, this Council understood the importance of maintenance.

Mr. Thomas agreed with the comments of Mr. Trapp and pointed out they had also increased the sewer connection fee.

Ms. Peters asked for the time frame for replacing the sewer line. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought they should be able to start this year assuming all of the necessary easements were donated. He also thought the project would likely only take 4-5 weeks to complete.

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans, specifications, and construction of the Hubbell Drive PCCE #39 sanitary sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(B) Construction of the St. James Street and St. Joseph Street PCCE #24 sanitary sewer improvement project.

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Nina Wilson-Keenan, 305 St. Joseph Street, asked the Council to support this project. She understood the tree canopy behind the homes would not be replaced, but believed a working sewer system was more important than the trees for most people. She commented that she had paid fees and taxes, and believed her sewer system should be comparable to those in other areas of town. In addition, they would pay a higher connection fee if they built an accessory dwelling unit on the property. She noted many of them had laterals that were in disrepair and understood the project on Wilson Avenue might have included the replacement of laterals, and asked for clarification.

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

Mr. Thomas asked if private laterals were repaired on any PCCE projects. Mr. Glascock replied the City would tie into a good piece of the pipe, so they might replace some of the lateral in some cases, but they did not go all of the way to the house.

Ms. Nauser understood typically the person's own private plumber would look at the lateral while the area was torn up to ensure there were no issues. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and noted the plumber could then take care of any issues on the private lateral for the property owner.

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans, specifications, and construction of the St. James Street/St. Joseph Street PCCE #24 sanitary sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(C) Construction of the FY 2015 sanitary sewer main and manhole rehabilitation project.

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the inflow and infiltration program was governed by Section 22-217.3 of the City Code, and asked if the criteria for eligibility in that section of the Code

had been satisfied for this project. Mr. Glascock replied he did not have that section of the Code in front of him so he could not respond specifically to it. He noted staff followed the City Code, and he assumed the criteria had been met as the Law Department would notify them if there was a concern.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor McDavid commented that this was a multi-million dollar project that would help address sewer needs, and reiterated he believed it was a citizenship obligation to replace aging pipes in the middle of the City. Mr. Thomas stated those with newer homes had not been paying into system for as long as the homes that had these problems.

Mr. Ruffin made a motion directing staff to proceed with construction of the FY 2015 sanitary sewer main and manhole rehabilitation project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(D) Consider an amendment to the FY 2015 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.

R85-15 Approving an amendment to the FY 2015 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds; reserving funding and designating Columbia Missouri Community Housing Development Organization and Show Me Central Habitat for Humanity as Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO); approving amendments to City of Columbia Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Program Administrative Guidelines.

Item D and R85-15 were read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked for an estimate of the purchase price of the homes on Hirth Avenue and Lyon Street. Mr. Teddy replied he would not be able to provide an estimate, but thought it might be in the low \$100,000 range. Mr. Thomas asked if the purchasers of those homes would be able to sell the homes for the market price. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and noted there was no restriction. He explained any profit made by the agency would be program income and could be used as indicated in the agreements with those agencies.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Teddy for his opinion on the use of a trust to maintain the permanent affordability of houses. Mr. Teddy replied he understood a community land trust model would set an affordable price and involve a guaranteed appreciation, but these homes would be owned in fee simple. He agreed the land trust model could work well when achieved. Mr. Thomas commented that he thought some on the Council wanted staff to consider that model for the future.

Mr. Teddy pointed out the loans the City made were due on the sale of the homes so the City had a financial interest in it as those funds could then be used elsewhere, and those funds had to be used for affordable housing. Mr. Thomas understood it was similar to a revolving loan. Mr. Skala asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied he had been speaking of the ordinary rehabilitation program where the City helped property owners rehabilitate their own homes. When the City invested HOME and CDBG dollars into properties needing repairs with homeowners demonstrating a financial need, the loans had to be paid to the City if the property was sold. The payment of those loans would then be considered program income and would need to be spent on affordable housing.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp commented that he was pleased to see the net zero approach and universal design features as it moved the needle. He also thanked staff for the new subordination policy as the previous policy had created an issue for one of his constituents in the past. He understood they would remove from consideration the part of the loan that was not forgivable for those that might want to refinance, and would move the policy in line with common sense and in trying to help people.

Mr. Ruffin commended staff in getting the word out to the community with regard to these programs as those that could benefit from the programs were grateful. He noted he had participated in a couple of the financial workshops hosted by the City, and staff had shared the information presented tonight at those workshops. He thanked staff for their work.

The vote on R85-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B106-15 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to services and fees in the Downtown Community Improvement District Solid Waste District.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked for clarification as to how recycling would be increased in the downtown. Ms. Mitchell replied staff had started working with the downtown last year to incorporate recycling into the fee structure so everyone would pay for the service since the containers were accessible to everyone. Ms. Nauser asked if there would be more opportunities for recycling and more containers. Ms. Mitchell replied yes. She explained they would convert roll carts to two-cubic yard rear loaders, which would be serviced 3 or 5 times per week, and they would add ten new locations in alleys where those containers could be supported. In addition, there would be three additional drop-off containers. Ms. Nauser asked if this could be a model for commercial recycling. Ms. Buffaloe replied that was the idea. She explained they wanted to show it could be included in the rate structure. Ms. Nauser felt the commercial component of recycling was sorely lacking so she hoped it would be addressed.

Katie Essing, 10 S. Tenth Street, stated she was the Executive Director of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and noted CID Board was in support of adding recycling to the solid waste district in the downtown. The majority of their constituents supported the addition of recycling, and this was a more equitable way to share the costs than how it had been previously handled. She pointed out their consumers expected and demanded recycling as well so they believed this would have a positive impact.

Mr. Skala understood there was a need for commercial recycling and asked if there would be an attempt to expand this to other problem areas, such as multi-family units and apartment complexes. Ms. Mitchell replied she thought the multi-family units were supported well by the bins available at those sites. They paid for residential service and were not considered commercial in nature, and had the one-time-a-week opportunity for curbside pick-up

or could take their recycling to store drop-off centers. She noted 80 percent of apartment dwellers had availability on-site.

Ms. Nauser asked if more recycling receptacles would be placed next to the trash receptacles in the downtown so those walking could recycle water bottles and other items they might have when shopping. Ms. Mitchell replied that had not been addressed, but understood the Downtown CID was looking into additional refuse containers for sidewalks and might look at recycling containers as well. Ms. Buffaloe noted an issue with street side recycling was contamination so they had partnered with the University of Missouri - School of Journalism this past year to help promote recycling in the downtown and to educate customers in the downtown. Mr. Skala commented that when traveling he saw these receptacles in pairs and thought these other communities likely had the same issues of education, etc. Ms. Buffaloe pointed out people would not walk an extra five steps to find a recycling bin if a trash bin was nearby.

B106-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows.

B109-15 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood rate increases had to be enacted as a function of the bond issue, but the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) had discussed delays on the rate increases until the report involving the fee structure and connection fees was completed, and asked for clarification as to why these rate increases were necessary now. Mr. Johnsen replied the primary focus of the bond issue was the replacement and upgrade of the existing system, so they needed to generate revenue from operations when issuing the bonds in order to repay them. He believed this was different from system expansion and new connection policies. He reiterated the bond issue focused on the replacing existing systems so existing rate structures and increases would be used to generate the revenue. He noted the WLAB had been given a first draft of a line extension or new connection policy, and the plan was to present it to Council on June 15. He pointed out this was a separate issue, and the purposes and time frames of that revenue stream were different.

Mr. Thomas recalled two-thirds of the \$100 million, which included bond and non-bond related projects, involved capacity expansion of the system. Mr. Johnsen replied the total estimated cost of all of the projects was around \$90 million. Mr. Thomas recalled \$60 million of that being for expansion. Mr. Johnsen commented that the bond focused on replacement and upgrades of the existing system. The items aimed at new expenses for new customers were left to be funded with the enterprise fund. He pointed out the enterprise revenue accounted for about 30 percent of the costs of projects identified on the list, while bond funds, which were aimed at replacement and upgrades, accounted for about 70 percent of the costs of projects identified on the list. Mr. Thomas asked if the \$60 million would not be used to serve a larger number of customers. Mr. Johnsen pointed out items such as the landfill

generator, which was expansion, had been included in the bond issue because it made sense financially due to the term of use.

Mr. Blattel stated about \$34 million in new bonds would be issued in July, along with the refinancing approximately \$22.5 million of the 2005 bond issue. He explained a question that would be asked was whether the City had a rate structure in place to guarantee repayment of those bonds. He estimated a savings of \$4 million when refinancing the 2005 bond issue if they maintained their current bond rating. Mr. Johnsen pointed out staff had worked hard for a better bond rating, and it actually improved from AA- to AA about a year ago.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and asked the Council to focus on as much renewable energy as possible. She believed it would be wise to move in that direction due to the fluctuating prices of natural gas and oil and the declining costs of solar energy.

Mayor McDavid commented that he believed the Council had to approve this so those that would purchase the bonds knew they were serious about repaying those bonds. He noted he had been trying to get the WLAB to provide him the cost of energy in Columbia, and understood he did not have an answer because they utilized seasonal and progressive rates. As a result, it was difficult for him to compare their costs to others in Boone County and the State of Missouri. He reiterated he wanted to know the cost of electricity in Columbia.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to vote against this ordinance because he did not agree with expanding the system, regardless of whether it involved one-third or two-third of the total project costs. He did not believe the multi-million dollars of expansion should be borne by the current customers as it was not logical or economically efficient. He noted he wanted to see the electric line extension policy and the electric system energy charge prior to voting on this issue.

Ms. Nauser stated she planned to support this ordinance as it would have a big impact on the community in terms of redundancy and capacity. She did not believe they wanted a power outage in the northeast creating an outage in the south because they did not have redundancy features. She noted many of these upgrades were in response to the federal government and regulatory agencies requirements, and felt this need had been created by current consumers of the system. While this might provide capacity for new consumers, she viewed this as a current capacity and redundancy issue. She felt they needed to approve this rate structure to pay for these projects so they were not subject to fines.

Mr. Skala explained he intended to support this ordinance. He noted they had discussed the dichotomy between capacity and new items previously. He commented that although he was inclined to support the idea connection fees, etc., they had agreed to support the bond issue, and as a result, he believed they had to honor it.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed any growth element to the necessity of this project was due to growth that had already occurred. Unless they refused to let those people connect to the system, they had to ensure the system had adequate reliability and redundancy. The authority to bond had passed easily and there was widespread community support for these projects. As a result, he believed they needed to increase the rates. He noted he was pleased the review of a line connection fee was forthcoming, but saw it as a

separate issue. He stated he also believed they needed to consider affordability in addition to the environment as those were sometimes competing values. He noted he would support this proposed ordinance.

B109-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, NAUSER. VOTING NO: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B113-15 Calling a special election to extend the one-fourth of one percent capital improvement sales tax.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

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

Mr. Skala commented that the Forum Boulevard project involved both the Fourth and Fifth Wards as the bridge was in the Fifth Ward, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Matthes replied that was correct.

Rick Shanker, 1829 Cliff Drive, commented that he did not believe the Nifong Boulevard and Forum Boulevard projects would alleviate the traffic issues and suggested those be re-evaluated.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, explained she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition and thanked the City for including funding for traffic calming, traffic safety, sidewalks, and bus shelters as they believed those items would play a key role in addressing pedestrian safety. She asked the Council to consider an increase in funding for sidewalks as the \$350,000 currently allocated would build only a half-mile of sidewalk a year for the next ten years. She understood the City had about 300 miles of streets without sidewalks on either side. She also asked the Council to reconsider the Forum Boulevard and Nifong Boulevard projects, which were the two large road expansion projects, as those projects would only build two miles of road while costing \$25 million and constituting 25 percent of the entire capital sales tax revenue over the next ten years. She pointed out those two miles of road would cost almost the same as all of the non-motorized transportation projects paid for by the GetAbout grant over the last ten years. She wondered if traffic study data was available to substantiate the need for these major infrastructure changes, and whether it was possible to resolve the congestion issue with lower cost solutions, such as a turning lane or a round-a-bout. She commented that expanding roads by adding lanes did not solve congestion, and the number of miles people drove increased proportionately to any increase in roads.

Syed Ejaz stated he was the Campus Community Relations Chair of the Missouri Students Association Senate and noted he was somewhat supportive of this as the student body had asked for infrastructure improvements. They had seen a lot of eroded infrastructure when touring Greektown and the East Campus neighborhood. He understood the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) played a role in improving infrastructure and hoped some funding would be allocated to those areas. He stated there was a dire need for sidewalks in Greektown and in the East Campus neighborhood.

Mr. Skala explained he was in support of the capital improvement sales tax and noted a fairly thorough discussion of this list had occurred at the recent work session. A few of

them had even pointed out the high cost of some of the projects during that work session. He commented that he thought those projects were needed, and hoped they could pare down some of the costs when the projects came before them on an individual basis. In reviewing the road projects and the other non-Citywide projects, which totaled about \$45 million, he noted 51 percent would involve Ward 5, 14 percent would involve Ward 4, 12 percent would involve Ward 6, 11 percent would involve Ward 1, 7 percent would involve Ward 3, and 5 percent would involve Ward 2. Although he planned to support this, he was concerned about equity, and pointed out there had been a pervasive attitude of neglect north of I-70. He thought projects involving Scott Boulevard, Forum Boulevard, and Nifong Boulevard, and the numbers shown here had led to that perception. He commented that the growth due to Battle High School in the northeast would demand attention within the next ten years, and urged the Council to be considerate of equity issues so they did not feed that perception. He reiterated he looked forward to these projects coming to Council on an individual basis so they could pare some of them down in an effort to accommodate all wards.

Ms. Peters asked how the previous ten year capital improvement sales tax had been split in terms of projects by wards. Ms. Nauser replied she thought projects in Wards 2, 6, and 3 had received the most from the previous capital improvement sales tax. Mr. Skala noted it had been more equitable than this list. Ms. Nauser explained the only Fifth Ward project had been a portion of Scott Boulevard.

Mayor McDavid commented that he thought Mr. Skala had represented his ward very well, particularly with his advocacy of Ballenger Lane. He noted the citizens of Ballenger Lane and those in the Fifth Ward that would benefit from these projects would need to vote as there was a 35 percent “no vote” built into anything they did. Those inconvenienced by bottlenecks and pinch points in the road system would need to vote, and if they did not, those roads would likely not be fixed. He understood the equity argument, but thought this was similar to the sewer system in that 70 percent of the \$140 million in projects were in Wards 1 and 4. Those sewer projects were a priority and needed to be fixed.

Ms. Nauser stated the Fifth Ward had not received an equitable share in 2005 as only the portion of Scott Boulevard from the bridge to Route K was in the Fifth Ward, and the City was now getting to that part of the project due to a delay in funding as a result of a decline in the economy and due to the new elementary school. She pointed out these were estimated amounts to do the most work staff felt might be necessary. The projects would still need to go through the normal public processes in terms of design, interested parties meetings, public hearings, etc. She noted the Fifth Ward had grown as thousands of new homes had been built toward the south and west of the community, and as a result, traffic had increased along Forum Boulevard. Homes for senior citizens, apartments, etc. were located along Nifong Boulevard, and there was no safe place for people to walk along Nifong Boulevard. She understood the traffic counts were higher on Nifong Boulevard and Forum Boulevard in comparison to other roadways. She explained she valued walking, biking, and trails, but noted the southwest part of the community was not conducive to people bicycling or walking along a sidewalk to get to work. In addition, the bus capacity did not exist to accommodate those in the Fifth Ward. The only alternative for many people was the roadways, and when the roadways became congested, they also became unsafe. She explained the recent

accidents were primarily in the Fifth and Sixth Wards on very busy roadways. She hoped the voters would come out to support these projects.

Mr. Thomas stated he would support placing this tax proposal on the ballot. The funding for sidewalks was almost twice the amount it had been on previous ballot issue ten years ago, and this proposal included traffic calming that would accomplish more than half of the 45 traffic calming projects that had been evaluated. He thought traffic calming needs would continue to increase as the residents of Miles Manor had recently approached him and Ms. Kraus had mentioned traffic calming needs in the Ridgefield neighborhood area earlier tonight. He suggested streets and neighborhoods be designed in a way more money would not need to later be spent on correcting design speeds. He thanked Mr. Skala for advocating for the bus shelters as he thought providing people the dignity and comfort of a proper place to wait for the bus was a good use of a small amount of money. He noted he was also supportive of the walking and biking shoulders for Ballenger Lane. He commented that he had major concerns about the Forum Boulevard project as he did not feel there had been a proper evaluation of need. He agreed there was a problem at the Wilson's Fitness Center caused by traffic turning left into or out of the Wilson's Fitness Center, but felt that could be addressed by a median and round-a-bouts to the north and south. He noted he would continue to advocate for that when this project came back to Council under the public improvement process. He stated the transportation mobility section of Columbia Imagined did not mention costly road expansion projects. The emphasis was on sidewalks, bicycle access, trails, traffic calming, an improved bus system, and the Columbia Regional Airport. He was not sure they were listening to the people with those costly road expansion projects. He stated he believed adding lanes and moving traffic faster would impact pedestrian safety negatively, and noted the recent pedestrian deaths involved roads with four or more lanes of fast moving traffic. He reiterated he would support placing this tax on the ballot even with his concerns of large road expansion projects.

Mr. Trapp commented that the analysis of Mr. Skala only focused on roads, and a large portion of the project list included public safety, to include a municipal service station or police station on the north side of town. He noted crime was the biggest issue as it negatively impacted property values, the sense of safety, sense of community, etc. He understood more people did not walk because they were afraid of crime than because they did not have safe pedestrian facilities. He pointed out that police station would improve response times in the absence of hiring more officers as officers would not have to go back and forth from the downtown location. It would contribute to the feeling of safety for the people on the north side of the community. He thought they needed to inform the public of the portions of this proposal that had universal or near universal support since voter turnout in August was generally low. He commented that he believed they were moving in the right direction in terms of sidewalks and traffic calming, and in addition to the funding allocated toward these efforts, they would get sidewalks through the complete street policy. He stated he had been criticized for not championing the insertion of Creasy Springs Road with the recent traffic fatality there, and agreed it was a need, but noted there were lots of needs throughout the City with only a finite amount of money. He explained he leaned heavily on the advice of the traffic engineers in terms of the most safety for the limited amount of funds.

In addition, the traffic volumes were orders of magnitude higher for the other roads than on Creasy Springs Road. He wished they could design a City where there was never a loss of a young life, and explained these decisions weighed heavily on all of them. He commented that this was not a proposal he would design if he lived in a perfect world, but thought it was worthy of support overall. He encouraged everyone to rally around this so they did not have even more inadequate funding to deal with the overwhelming responsibilities in terms of safety.

B113-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. 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.

- B107-15** Accepting conveyances for street, sewer, utility, drainage and temporary construction purposes.
- B108-15** Accepting conveyances for Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants purposes.
- B110-15** Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code as it relates to swimming pools; adopting the “Swimming Pool Ordinance and Guide for Swimming Pool Design and Operation.”
- B111-15** Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services; appropriating funds.
- B112-15** Appropriating funds for Columbia Values Diversity Celebration activities.
- B114-15** Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code as it relates to officers and attendance requirements for the public transit advisory commission.
- B115-15** Amending Chapter 15 of the City Code to make language in certain sections gender neutral.
- R79-15** Authorizing an amendment to the community housing development organization (CHDO) agreement with Columbia Missouri Community Housing Development Organization, successor in interest to Job Point, for the development of property located at 1101 Jefferson Street.
- R80-15** Authorizing amendments to HOME investment partnership agreements with Central Missouri Community Action, previously known as Central Missouri Counties’ Human Development Corporation, for the use of community housing development organization (CHDO) funds for development projects.
- R81-15** Authorizing the temporary closure of a portion of Marcassin Drive between Greengate Lane and Old Hawthorne Drive; granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages for the Marcassin Drive Neighborhood Block Party event.
- R82-15** Declaring official intent to reimburse certain electric utility project costs with proceeds of bonds.

R83-15 Authorizing a service agreement with Granicus, Inc. for subscription to and implementation of an agenda management software program.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

R84-15 Establishing a task force on pedestrian safety.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid explained this task force was being created to evaluate the recent incidents of pedestrian-vehicle collisions that had occurred in Columbia. The task force would be chaired by non-voting members, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Ruffin, and the other members would be appointed at the next Council Meeting. He hoped the task force would be data-centric as he wanted to know if this had been an unusual cluster, a trend, how Columbia compared with other similar communities, and what other communities had done to address the issue. He thought they should develop a contemporaneous model to evaluate how the City was doing to determine if the trend line had changed.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mayor McDavid for creating this task force in response to this serious situation in Columbia and for signing up for the U.S. Department of Transportation Mayor’s Challenge for Safer People, Safer Streets, which was a national effort. He understood there was a national trend of rising pedestrian deaths and injuries, and they could help determine why that was happening with a data-driven approach. He suggested the task force look at this issue in the framework of evaluation, education, enforcement, and engineering in developing its recommendations.

The vote on R84-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

The following bills were introduced by the Mayor unless otherwise indicated, and all were given first reading.

B116-15 Changing the uses allowed on C-P zoned property located on the southeast corner of Ponderosa Road and Nocona Parkway; approving a revised statement of intent; approving the C-P Plan for Discovery Park Lots 301, 302 & 303.

B117-15 Approving the Final Plat of Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 3 located on the southeast corner of Ponderosa Road and Nocona Parkway; authorizing a performance contract.

B118-15 Approving the Final Plat of Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 3A located on the southeast corner of Ponderosa Road and Nocona Parkway; authorizing a performance contract.

- B119-15 Changing the uses allowed on O-P zoned property located on the north side of Walnut Street and east of Calvin Drive (2311 E. Walnut Street); approving a revised statement of intent.
- B120-15 Approving the C-P Plan for Lot 4A of Red Oak South, Plat No. 1-A located on the south side of Grindstone Parkway, approximately 200 feet east of Norfleet Drive.
- B121-15 Approving the Final Plat of Valley View Point located on the southeast corner of Sunflower Street and Stadium Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract.
- B122-15 Approving the Final Plat of Cobblestone Cottages located on the southeast corner of Route K and Old Plank Road; authorizing a performance contract.
- B123-15 Authorizing a performance contract with Fred Overton Development, Inc. in connection with the Final Plat of Creek Ridge, Plat 1 located on the south side of Old Plank Road and west of Bethel Church Road.
- B124-15 Authorizing construction of pavement improvements along Broadway, between Providence Road and Hitt Street, including the reconstruction of some curb ramps to meet ADA requirements; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B125-15 Authorizing the realignment and reconstruction of a portion of Rangeline Road as it relates to Runway 13/31 improvements and the relocation of the Runway Safety Area at the Columbia Regional Airport; appropriating funds.
- B126-15 Authorizing a pedestrian trail license agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Hominy Creek Trail connection under I-70 and I-70 Drive SE.
- B127-15 Authorizing an agreement for donation of real estate with Red Oak Investment Company for property located along Grindstone Parkway and east of Green Meadows Road.
- B128-15 Authorizing the City Manager to execute a grant of easement for drainage purposes with Union Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren Missouri, relating to the Maguire Road extension project.
- B129-15 Appropriating funds for Water and Light Department Home Performance with Energy Star and photovoltaic rebate programs.
- B130-15 Accepting a conveyance for underground electric utility purposes.
- B131-15 Authorizing an amendment to the agreement with the Columbia School District relating to the use of a portion of Lange School property located at 2201 East Smiley Lane for park purposes.
- B132-15 Accepting a grant from the Youth Community Coalition (YC2) to be used by the Police Department for enforcement activities for underage alcohol use; appropriating funds.
- B133-15 Amending Chapter 12 of the City Code as it relates to term limits for Human Rights Commission members.
- B134-15 Amending Chapter 21 of the City Code as it relates to term limits for Citizens Police Review Board members.
- B135-15 Declaring the results of the election held in the City of Columbia, Missouri on April 7, 2015 relating to the issuance of Water and Electric System Revenue Bonds.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP56-15 Correspondence from the Community Tree Task Force relating to an Urban Forestry Master Plan.

Mayor McDavid commented that he believed the mission of the Task Force was to define the issues first, and for this to potentially be one of the recommendations.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with Mayor McDavid, and noted he thought the Task Force should provide the scope of an Urban Forestry Master Plan as part of their list of recommendations if they felt it was necessary. He hoped they would also consider whether the appointment of a permanent tree commission was necessary.

REP57-15 Response to the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council's Recommendations to the City Council.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that he believed this had some good ideas as well as some misconceptions, such as a depreciation fund. Mr. Matthes agreed, and noted the Charter indicated that there should be a depreciation fund if it was in keeping with generally accepted accounting principles. He explained generally accepted accounting principles accounted for depreciation, but did not fund depreciation. He gave the example purchasing a home in that it was cheaper to borrow money and pay it off over time than it was to save the money on an ever growing value of investment since homes tended to appreciate over time. The same was true for everything the City built. The asphalt and labor for streets would cost more in ten years than today, and the cost increase was generally greater than the interest on the debt. The \$20 million sewer ballot would cost about 30 percent more if they tried to save the money than by using debt. This was the reason cities did not use a depreciation fund to fund infrastructure. Debt was a more effective tool.

Mayor McDavid thought the Council would take a serious look at some of the recommendations, such as reviving a sewer advisory board.

Mr. Skala commented that he appreciated the recommendations of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) and the response of staff, and noted he thought a few of the recommendation of the DCLC had some merit to include a blue ribbon task force on infrastructure or the suggestion of Mayor McDavid for a sewer committee. He understood some of the rationale was that the staff already did some of this work and that they were experts. While he agreed that was true, he pointed out a board or commission was answerable only to the City Council and would provide a different perspective because they were citizen representatives. He believed both perspectives were necessary in making the best possible decision. He thought the Council should consider some of the recommendations as there was considerable merit in many, and felt the totality of the report might have been overwhelming as there were many items that went beyond the scope of what a citizen should do.

Mr. Thomas stated he appreciated the work that went into responding to the recommendations of the DCLC, but believed there had been some omissions. He commented that he felt there had been a rushed and non-transparent process for the TIF

district and the special development agreements, and believed it would behoove the City to acknowledge that in order to build trust. He noted he supported the idea of a sewer and stormwater commission as he felt many people would like to participate in reviewing, adjusting, and developing policy for those utilities similar to what the Water and Light Advisory Board did for the water and electric utilities. He commented that he also believed the proposal of the DCLC was good in that new development should pay for the initial expansion of infrastructure costs with all of the citizens then paying for the ongoing costs of repair and maintenance. He understood the traditional method of funding utility infrastructure was to seek voter approval for the issuance of bonds to be paid off by revenue from user fees, and that staff had indicated the users paid for the projects used by them over the life of the upgrade. He noted he disagreed with that statement as new users paid a small proportion of the cost of the new infrastructure, and believed discussions involving infrastructure expansion needed to be continued.

REP58-15 "Your 2015-2025 Street and Public Safety Projects" SpeakUpCoMo Results.

Mr. Matthes provided as staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought this was a good tool as they could see the number of respondents, etc.

Mr. Trapp thought they wanted to create as many new ways as possible for people to become involved.

Mr. Thomas asked if the survey had been promoted through social media. Mr. Matthes replied yes. He noted he could foresee this helping with more complicated projects.

REP59-15 Downtown Safety Camera Use by the Columbia Police Department.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was still opposed to government surveillance cameras, although she was supportive of private sector surveillance of individual property. She noted Britain, which had over four million cameras, did not find much statistical evidence that cameras deterred crime, and Baltimore had indicated there had not been any statistical evidence of displacement or decline in the crime rates. In addition, turf battles amongst gangs moved to areas without cameras. In Chicago, two neighborhoods were studied and there was an impact in only one of the neighborhoods. A study in Washington had shown crime rates in the experimentally controlled area were roughly the same. Since the data was vague and this country's citizenry was constantly being watched, she was philosophically opposed to the use of government surveillance cameras. She understood the Police Department had indicated a desire for more cameras to be placed in other locations, but pointed out the data showed only 68 incidents were caught on camera with only 13 arrests, which was only 19 percent. She thought their clearance rate on other crimes was higher than 19 percent. She commented that over 18,000 crimes had occurred from 2011-2014, and only 68 had been reported in the downtown with 13 arrests. She did not believe they were getting their money's worth with these cameras and would not support increasing the number of cameras. She preferred an increase in the number of police officers so they could continue

with the community policing philosophy. She pointed out the number of crimes were declining when looking at rates between 2011 and 2014.

Mr. Skala stated this issue had been precipitated by an assault in a parking garage and noted the City had always had cameras in the parking garages as it was a public safety issue. He explained his opposition was to placing cameras on public streets and sidewalks as it was a step too far for local government, and pointed out he would be happy to encourage or provide incentives for private businesses to place cameras on their own properties. He disagreed with the surveillance of people just walking down the street for no particular reason, and noted the data reinforced the idea that this was not an efficient use of money.

Mayor McDavid commented that he understood there were 68 cameras in City Hall in 2010, and four of those cameras pointed toward Broadway. In addition, there were eight cameras on every bus. He stated Boone Hospital had 750 cameras while the University of Missouri had well over 1,000 cameras. He stated the Downtown CID had a vested interest in safety for customers and visitors, and believed there was an opportunity for them to manage security in a private way. He suggested the Downtown CID invest in a privately operated camera as they had the funds. Mr. Skala and Ms. Nauser both agreed that was a good idea.

REP60-15 Use of Pesticides that Affect Bee Populations.

Ms. Nauser understood this product was used the most on sports turfs, which were near environmentally sensitive areas, and noted she wanted the Parks and Recreation Department to use safer products on the sports turfs as well. She stated data showed 40 percent of beehives had died in the past year and some states had seen the death of over 60 percent of their bee populations due to the combination of mites, poor nutrition, and pesticides. A Harvard study published in May had indicated two popular pesticides and the neonicotinoids were likely the cause of colony collapse disorder, so the evidence was starting to show these chemicals were harming pollinators and without pollinators there would be no food. She thought they should take every step possible to protect them. She understood the cost could rise \$3,000 to \$6,000, and believed that was a small investment in saving a valuable asset.

Mr. Trapp stated he agreed with Ms. Nauser, and commented that he would be amenable to using the council reserve funds if it made this change occur quicker and if it was not possible within the confines of the Parks and Recreation Department budget. He agreed it was an existential threat and they needed to preserve their pollinators. He commented that it would also be helpful if citizens had yards where plants flowered at different times.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed it was a relatively small contribution to the decline in bee populations and in ensuring the situation was not exacerbated as they were talking about the food supply.

Mayor McDavid asked for clarification on how this would impact some of the facilities, such as golf courses. Ms. Nauser replied she thought this type of pesticide was predominately used on sports turfs, such as soccer and football fields, and not on the golf courses. Mr. Huffington stated that was correct. He explained they had moved away from the use of this chemical on golf courses as there was a more efficient product on those fewer

acres. There were more acres to manage with the sports turfs, which was why they continued to use the product at those locations. The sports fields needed to be clean and weed-free and generally involved bluegrass or fescue, so there was not a pollinating habitat there. He noted the pesticide was used one time in the middle of June and was immediately watered into the ground so no chemical was left on the leaf.

Ms. Nauser stated she still believed they should set the example so others would follow suit.

Mayor McDavid explained he wanted to make sure staff would be able to accommodate a change. Mr. Huffington replied they would be able to accommodate it.

Mr. Skala asked for the cost differential. Mr. Huffington replied a neonicotinoid product would cost about \$350 to apply, and the cost would be about \$5,000 if they switched to a different product. Mr. Thomas asked for the acreage involved in the application. Mr. Huffington replied 32 acres of sports turf. Mr. Thomas understood it would be an annual impact of about \$5,000. Mr. Huffington stated that was correct. Ms. Peters asked if it would continue to only involve one application per year. Mr. Huffington replied yes.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a way to verify the plants purchased had been raised neonicotinoid-free. Mr. Huffington replied one would have to talk to the breeder of the plants. He explained the plants would be labeled or the vendor could be contacted. Mr. Thomas asked if the Parks and Recreation Department currently vetted this. Mr. Huffington replied they did not vet it. Ms. Nauser suggested the City consider only purchasing neonicotinoid-free plants as well. Mayor McDavid stated he had concerns the public would feel the Council was not focused on the big picture. Ms. Nauser commented that if Home Depot and Lowes could move in this direction, she believed the City could as well. Mr. Matthes stated this would be placed in the Parks and Recreation Department budget.

REP61-15 Vision Commission Implementation Status and Media Mention Reports.

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

REP62-15 Intra-Department Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Dillon Falk, 2200 Ridgefield Road, explained he was with the contingent earlier in the evening that had approached the Council with regard to assisting with the purchase of land near the County House Branch Creek. He pointed out only 1-2 acres of the 12-plus acres was an open field while the rest was a natural habitat. He noted this property was adjacent to his and was a habitat for deer, groundhogs, red foxes, eagles, etc. He believed this land needed to be preserved because once the land was developed the ecosystem would not be recoverable. He understood the City had spent money on a trail in that area and wondered why they would allow an apartment complex to be built there. He asked the Council to either purchase the land or to help the residents purchase it.

Mayor McDavid asked Mr. Falk to e-mail the Council with the specific location of this property. Mr. Falk replied it was on College Park Drive near Stadium Boulevard. Mr.

Thomas understood it was on College Park Drive, south of Stadium Boulevard, at Ridgefield Road. The County House Trail ran along the subject property and the Ridgefield Park, and then traveled under Chapel Hill Road, the Twin Lakes Recreation Area, and the MKT Trail.

Mr. Skala asked for the cost of the land. Mr. Falk replied he thought it was about \$50,000. Mr. Skala asked if the owners were interested in selling the land. Mr. Falk replied yes. Mr. Thomas stated it was owned by the Lutheran Church, just north of Stadium Boulevard. They had planned to build a school at that location, but had since abandoned those plans. Ms. Nauser asked if it was \$50,000 total or \$50,000 an acre. Mr. Falk replied he thought it was \$50,000 total.

Mayor McDavid understood the parks sales tax ballot had money for land acquisition, but noted he did not know how much money was remaining. Mr. Matthes stated he thought all of that money had been spoken for, and noted he would follow up by talking to the current owners.

Mr. Thomas pointed out there was an upcoming ballot issue as well. Mr. Matthes stated staff would look into the situation.

Mayor McDavid asked staff to provide a follow-up report on Creasy Springs Road as that had previously been provided about five years ago.

Mr. Thomas stated he continued to receive complaints of late night carousing from non-student downtown residents and thought they did not want to scare away non-student residents from the downtown as they wanted a mix of different types of people in the downtown. He was told an earlier “last call” time for the bars might be politically difficult to impose, so he wanted to know how many people were underage. He understood the Police Department conducted sting operations and asked for a report on what that involved, how many had been conducted in the last year, the outcomes, the costs, etc.

Mr. Thomas suggested the City look into OppSites, a marketing website for property where the community had strong visions for how a property developed. He understood this company marketed property and plans to smart growth-oriented developers and was successful at finding speculative developers. He pointed out the owner always had the right to not talk to a prospective developer since they were not part of this transaction.

Mr. Thomas commented that Joshua Arri, a Fourth Ward resident, wanted to retire U.S. flags that were torn and tattered in a respectful way by incinerating them for his Eagle Scout project. He explained Mr. Arri had asked the City of Columbia to be the beneficiary of the project, so he had signed the Boy Scouts paperwork to allow the project to move forward. A ceremony to retire the flags would be held at Stephens Lake Park on June 14 if anyone wanted to attend.

Mr. Skala suggested the City act on some of the recommendations of the consultant with regard to in-ground fiber since the state legislature had not intruded upon local control over in-ground fiber during this past session and they likely had a year respite. He asked staff to look into what could be done to act on some of the recommendations.

Mr. Skala commented that he had found himself defending the IBM deal as he has supported it when he was previously on Council. He understood the City had the obligation of purchasing the building with everything in place to guarantee the improvements occurred, and had been agreeable to that investment. He had not liked the confidentiality aspects of the process in that the Council only knew the company as Project Tiger and had only inadvertently found out it was actually IBM. He also had not liked the fact the Council was not aware of the incentives provided by others. He understood IBM had been laying-off employees, but that there were still 543 employees. A news report, however, had indicated there were no more than 124 cars in the parking lot of the IBM facility, which raised questions as to whether some of these people lived in the community. He wondered if an audit was necessary or even possible as a lot of people were concerned. He asked if there was any way for the City to know the number of employees at IBM and the number of those employees that lived in the community or if that had to be relegated to the State of Missouri. Mr. Matthes replied he would look into whether there was a way to verify IBM's latest report to the State of Missouri.

Mr. Trapp stated he had toured IBM when they had built the storm shelter and it appeared that there were more than 125 people working there.

Mr. Trapp noted he had been by a constituent with regard to pawn shop reform. He understood burglaries were incredibly hard to solve and one burglar could drive the numbers to make it look like there was a crime wave, which affected property values, and thought they should look at ways other than catching the burglar in the act since that was difficult. The suggestion to him was to require pawn shops to have a three-day wait period prior to paying for any accepted item, and to place photos of the accepted items on a website so people would be able to look at the website for their stolen items. If there was stolen property, the police could make the arrest when the person showed up to collect their money. He asked staff for a report as to whether this was a viable idea and for that report to include information on what other communities did with regard to pawn shops.

Mr. Trapp asked for a report on the policy of the Police Department with regard to wearable cameras in comparison to the national standards so they could see where Columbia stood.

Mr. Ruffin noted a number of houses had been demolished on Rogers Street, across from Jefferson Middle School, and this had created a concern in the neighborhood. He asked for a report that would include the student housing developments that had already been approved and built, along with any other student housing developments that were in process of being built with their slated dates of completion, number of beds, etc. He also wanted the report to include any developments that were in process and could involve the removal of existing homes and structures. Mr. Matthes stated staff would do their best to provide the information, but noted they like the Council could not always pinpoint student apartment complexes as students could live anywhere. He pointed out staff might also not be aware of some projects since structures could be demolished without providing plans for

the site. Mr. Ruffin commented that he had heard a private owner was building apartments on Rogers Street and wanted more information. Mr. Matthes noted they would let Mr. Ruffin know if they had that information.

Ms. Nauser asked that sidewalks along Fire Station No. 7 be considered to be constructed as part of the budget process as that property had been developed in 2008 and still did not have sidewalks. There was also a sidewalk gap on Green Meadows Road near Bethel Street and the synagogue that needed to be considered.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk