

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

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 6, 2015, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID and RUFFIN (arrived at 8:11 p.m.) 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 June 15, 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

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

2015 Lang Award Presentation.

Mayor McDavid presented Genie Rogers with the seventh annual Howard B. Lang Jr. Award for Outstanding Volunteer Service to the City of Columbia, which was established to recognize individuals with significant volunteer activity, impact, and initiative in support of the City of Columbia and its mission. He noted Ms. Rogers had served the City well for many years, first as an active member of the Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission, and now as a member of the Columbia Housing Authority Board, devoting many hours to low income persons.

Ms. Rogers thanked the Lang family and former City Manager Leo Hill for creating this generous award for public service. She also thanked Mary Ann McCollum and Phil Steinhaus for sponsoring her and the City of Columbia for making these kinds of events happen. She pointed out she knew Howard and Mary Kay Lang and loved them very much. Mr. Lang had been a mentor to her husband, David, in the practice of law, and gave him his first job at Shelter Insurance. Mr. Lang was also a role model as no one had done as much volunteer work as him. She commented that Columbia was the best place to live due to the many people who answered the call to participate in the process. She acknowledged her family and friends that were present, and commended the City staff she had worked with when serving on boards and commissions. She stated there had been many challenges over the past 37 years, and noted she hoped some of the actions she had been involved with would enhance the community and be an agent of change for the people that received those services.

Mayor McDavid thanked Ms. Rogers for her service to the City of Columbia.

Proclamation presentation recognizing July as Parks and Recreation Month.

Mayor McDavid explained the U.S. House of Representatives had designated the month of July as National Parks and Recreation Month in 2009 in recognition of the great societal value of parks and recreation facilities and their importance to local communities. Since then, the City Parks and Recreation Department had joined hundreds of other parks and recreation agencies in engaging communities during Parks and Recreation Month. Mayor McDavid introduced Mikayla Logan, a 2015 graduate of Hickman High School, who had maintained a 3.2 grade point average in high school while participating in varsity track and field and basketball, and noted she would assist him in reading the local Parks and Recreation Month proclamation. Prior to participating in high school activities, Ms. Logan had participated in several Columbia Parks and Recreation Department activities, to include jazz and ballet lessons, the S.T.A.R.S. camping program, and Blue Thunder Track Club. In the fall of 2015, Ms. Logan planned to continue her track and field career at Southeast Missouri State University.

Ms. Logan and Mayor McDavid read the proclamation recognizing July as Parks and Recreation Month in the City of Columbia.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(B) Construction of improvements at the intersection of Stadium Boulevard and Old Route 63.

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluffdale Drive, understood the Council had previously instructed staff to find funding for the Shepard Boulevard to Rollins Street trail. She asked the Council to reconsider Option 4, and to use GetAbout Columbia funds to help pay for this project in an effort to enhance safety along Stadium Boulevard from Old 63 to Ashland Road. Option 4 would only cost \$900,000, while Options 1 and 3 would cost significantly more, and as a result, might not be fully funded. She noted Option 4 would allow the City to fund other GetAbout Columbia projects, and stated she believed it had been reviewed by MoDOT to be incorporated into these plans if the City decided to proceed in that direction.

Sutu Forte, 627 Bluffdale Drive, urged the Council to reconsider Option 4 as it would improve the precarious situation of walking or biking along Stadium Boulevard. It would also improve the connection between the Shepard Boulevard neighborhood and the many apartments in the area, which in turn would help initiate a mode shift. She suggested the construction of a retaining wall between the street and the sidewalk be included as a part of

Option 4 if that option was reconsidered, and for lower traffic speeds on Stadium Boulevard, so it was safer for bicyclists and pedestrians

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

Mr. Skala asked if any of the GetAbout funds were fungible with respect to this project. Mr. Nichols replied this project would not be funded with GetAbout funds. Mr. Skala assumed it was not even a possibility. Mr. Glascock stated it was not a project that had been selected for the use of GetAbout funds. They had completed GetAbout funded projects in the area, and had provided the sidewalk that traveled under the bridge as an example. This particular project was an intersection project in partnership with MoDOT to improve traffic flow. Mr. Nichols explained it was a 50-50 cost share project.

Mr. Thomas thanked staff for studying the delay at the intersection as he felt data was important when making decisions involving major expenses. He thought this was a good benchmark when looking at other intersections where there might be a need to add a turn lane to reduce long delays. He also thanked MoDOT for allowing the City to construct all four crosswalks for a complete crosswalk plan. He understood the City used the National Association of City Transportation Officials Urban Street Design Guidelines, which indicated crosswalks should be the norm at intersections on streets with more than 3,000 vehicles per day, with speeds higher than 20 miles per hour, and with two or more lanes, and that the practice of discouraging pedestrians from crossing the street by leaving uncontrolled crossings unmarked was not a valid safety measure because it encouraged unsafe risk-taking behavior. It also indicated all legs of signalized intersections must have marked crosswalks unless pedestrians were prohibited from the roadway or section. Based on those guidelines, he thought it was important to have crosswalks at all legs of the intersection, and noted he planned to make a motion at the end of the Council Meeting for a policy resolution or commitment for crosswalks at all legs of intersections in the future unless a valid reason could be established to do something different.

Mr. Trapp stated he appreciated staff re-contacting MoDOT as he believed this project was better with four marked crosswalks. He noted he also appreciated the traffic counts to justify the dual left turn lanes. He thanked Mr. Thomas for asking staff to consider crosswalks at all legs of the intersection.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for the project, including crosswalks on all four legs of the intersection and northbound dual left turn lanes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(A) Consider the FY 2016 Capital Improvement Project Plan for the City of Columbia, Missouri.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Blattel provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood each project would have to come before Council for a public hearing and approval in the future regardless of Council's action tonight. Mr. Blattel stated that was correct. Mayor McDavid noted the City had a long list of needs, and this

represented the best current priority list. Mr. Blattel pointed out it was based on funding available for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Thomas understood the City would ask the voters to approve funding another ten years of capital improvement projects, and asked if some of these projects were contingent upon a “yes” vote in August for the capital improvement tax. Mr. Blattel replied yes.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased to see stormwater projects on the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan and thanked the voters for their support of the stormwater fee increase. He noted the recent heavy rains highlighted the on-going stormwater issues, and explained he was looking forward to getting ahead as opposed to using all of the funds to stem the worst of the damage.

Mayor McDavid understood no action was needed tonight and they were only holding a public hearing on the priority list.

Mr. Thomas commented that there was reference to Rollins Road at Rock Creek and asked if that was where the trail would come out at Rollins Road. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mr. Thomas understood that culvert would be replaced in fiscal year 2016, and asked if there would be any consideration to threading the trail underneath to reduce the amount of back and forth on the south side of Rollins Road. Mr. Glascock replied it would be reviewed by staff, but pointed out the estimated cost did not include the trail.

Mr. Skala noted bus shelters were also included on the project list for about \$100,000, and this met the emphasis of equity in the strategic plan. He thanked staff for including it in the CIP.

Ms. Nauser stated she was pleased to see the Green Meadows Circle sidewalk project on the list and noted she would happily support this list of projects.

(C) Discuss the Downtown Charrette Report and options for development of the southeast corner of Broadway and Providence Road.

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Brent Gardner, 2209 S. Country Club Drive, stated he was the Chair of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) and noted they had asked the Council for a public discussion on this property as it was vital to Columbia. The hope of the DCLC was to determine if there was public or political will to enter into conversation with the property owner to lease the property. They had not discussed eminent domain, the taking of the property, or purchasing the property. They were only suggesting a market-based conversation with the owner to see if he would be interested in a lease situation. He commented that he believed there were hybrid potentials in developing the property to incorporate the park, the creek, and the property. He reiterated they were only asking for a discussion to determine if there were any great ideas and to obtain a public feeling for it.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, commented that she was a member of the DCLC, and noted the CVS proposal had been discussed at her first official DCLC meeting. She

explained that she had received numerous phone calls on her cell phone on May 7, and had learned they would begin as telemarketer calls with a transfer to her number if they wanted to speak to someone. She tried to determine who was making the phone calls without any luck, and had since filed a complaint with the Police Department as she had learned it involved CVS. She questioned any company that would behave in this manner or hire people that would behave in this manner.

Nick Peckham, 15 S. Tenth Street, explained he was a member of the DCLC and emphasized the importance of Flat Branch Creek to the history of Columbia and the ecology of the neighborhood. He noted he was supportive of the rights of people that owned private property to do what the law permitted, whether it was to rent to CVS or something more appropriate. He believed an entry to the City that was more of a masterpiece than an afterthought was more appropriate, and asked the Council to do what it could to encourage that behavior.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, asked the Council to strengthen local business, foster local investment, and improve opportunities for low and moderate income residents within the City while preserving the heritage of Columbia's very beginnings. He also asked the Council to recognize the merits of and to support the local redevelopment of the Flat Branch gateway, which had been championed by Brent Gardner. He commented that the southeast corner of Providence Road and Broadway was the birthplace of Columbia, and urged the Council to turn that corner into a shining display of the vision, dedication, hard work, and spirit of local enterprise and civic investment. He thought the Council should support a transformation of the property into the central hub of the trail system or preserve and support the repurposing of those historic buildings as a center for locally owned businesses, a place for small scale entrepreneurs, or a dedicated community workshop and skills training center. He understood local government support for local enterprise had an average return of 18 to 1, and urged the Council to invest in Columbia instead of Rhode Island, the location of the corporate headquarters of CVS. He believed the owner of the property would be satisfied with receiving money from local sources, and would entertain a reasonable long term lease offer as part of a public-private partnership. He commented that the Council had a chance to demonstrate that citizen endorsed prerogatives still carried weight and that Columbia's history and future mattered more than the convenience of an out-of-state corporation.

Matt McCormick, 300 S. Providence Road, stated he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and noted the City had many codes, ordinances, policies, etc. for businesses and the community to follow. Businesses worked to meet these guidelines and wanted to abide by the rules, but it was difficult for individuals to invest in Columbia through entrepreneurship, new business, business expansion, etc. when the rules continuously changed depending on the people or project. He believed there needed to be a stop to arbitrary changes in policy until the zoning code update review was completed. He asked the Council to allow the community to work through that review process together, which would then allow businesses and jobs to grow and thrive in Columbia.

Chris Fulcher, 2712 Bayonne Court, commented that five County Commissioners had been appointed by the Governor in 1821 to establish the City of Columbia, and Jefferson Fulcher, one of those Commissioners, was his great, great, great, great, great grandfather.

He believed the City needed to honor place just as they did people, and that was the reason he was supportive of a better way to use the space. He stated he was supportive of economic development and business, but felt balance was needed. He noted those Commissioners had the foresight to set aside land for the University well before the University was established. He thought those in Columbia needed the same foresight now to plan the community in a way that would set it apart from other cities. People would not remember Columbia because of a CVS across the street from a Walgreens at a major intersection, but would remember Columbia if something different and lasting that highlighted the community was chosen. He asked for balance as the Council made this decision.

Deanna Walkenbach, 407 Pyranees Drive, explained CVS had recently announced it would be in Target stores and would thus have a pharmacy operating in Columbia. Due to this announcement, she was not sure it was necessary for a huge CVS store to be built at the corner of Providence Road and Broadway as there were better uses for that property.

Deb Sheals, 406 W. Broadway, stated she agreed with most of what had been said tonight. She explained she did not support limiting the options of the property owner with regard to what to do with the property, but felt they had a great opportunity to hold a public conversation about that property. She believed Flat Branch Creek could be an asset to the community and liked the idea of a hybrid development. She suggested they allow for a conversation to determine the possibilities as they currently did not know the cost of development or what might be an option to showcase the downtown area.

Austin Tipton, 2418 Whitegate Drive, stated he was a native of Columbia, Missouri, and pointed out that intersection had been an eyesore for as long as he could remember. He felt CVS or any other development should be able to build there if the development was within the parameters of the zoning regulations and the other rules established by the City, and believed a bad precedent had been set by the Council in holding a public hearing on what should happen with this property. He thought they owed it to CVS to allow them to bring a plan to the table. If that plan was not acceptable and CVS walked away, the City could then have this discussion. Until then, he believed they needed to honor the fact the property was in private ownership and a company was planning to build at that location. He suggested they allow this process to work itself out, and to only become involved if it fell through.

Mark Wahrenbrock, 2400 Hillshire Drive, hoped there was room for a compromise solution that would allow a greenway to line Providence Road forming the entrance to the downtown, while still allowing commercial development where the ice house and other structures were located, as that had been a commercial area since the late 1800s when a branch line had been built to the Katy railroad at Mokane. He reiterated he hoped for a ribbon of green with the creek and a trail. He understood the City already owned a 70-foot section at the intersection of Providence Road and Broadway, and thought that could be extended south to connect Flat Branch Park to the intersection in order to provide access and a visual screen to whatever was developed on the other side.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he commiserated with those that were frustrated the City did not have well-settled processes, development standards, guidelines, etc. He understood the City had adopted some interim C-2 guidelines for the

downtown, and believed everyone was here today because CVS was having trouble dealing with those guidelines. He hoped the Council would continue to support staff as they had indicated the CVS proposal did not abide by the rules and regulation established, and that those interested in this issue would become more involved in the Unified Development Code process. He noted the H3 Charrette report had indicated the City needed to get more use out of the square footage downtown, and although the square footage was owned by individuals, he did not feel only those individuals' desires adequately represented what the City needed. He suggested performance zoning be considered along with form-based zoning, especially for downtown properties since they needed to accomplish many goals, and pointed out the building, as had been presented by CVS, did not serve enough purposes.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning, and provided a handout of a proposal she believed many wanted to see for the downtown. She did not know if it would work for CVS or the property owner, but felt they needed to consider historic preservation in terms of a museum, a food forest, etc. She asked Council to consider the suggestions in the handout she had provided.

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

Mr. Skala commented that there would be no action on the CVS proposal tonight, and noted there had already been two Council actions on CVS in the past, both being denied. Those proposals had been rejected because they did not conform to the existing laws and guidelines, to include a second story and sewer access. He understood there would soon be a third proposal from CVS. He pointed out the DCLC had approached him to sponsor a public forum and he believed it to be a public trust exercise, a situation whereby the Council would allow the public to speak on a topic independent of it being in private ownership, there being any lease or contract, etc. He thought it was always good to invite the public to discuss what they wanted for this important part of the community. He also believed this was an information gathering exercise, and appreciated those that had come to the meeting to offer suggestions. He thought this would help the communities grow and engender trust in local government.

Mr. Thomas understood the owner of this property was the ultimate decision-maker on any proposal involving his property, and he did not believe this public hearing infringed upon that in any way. He felt this was a visioning opportunity, and provided the Comprehensive Plan as an example of a visioning process the City had been involved with that involved private property. He noted he agreed with Mr. Skala in that it was important to allow the public to express their thoughts on items of interest, and to have a discussion. He stated he had encouraged people to e-mail him their thoughts, and believed 20 percent of those that had contacted him felt the City should not be involved, while the other 80 percent felt there were exciting possibilities for this particular location and had encouraged him to try to keep those ideas alive. He commented that one of the greatest assets in the area was the Flat Branch Creek, and many communities had centered economic generators around creeks or ribbons of green as it attracted people to the area and improved the value of the area. He encouraged the Council to consider some possibilities. He thought the creek could be uncovered while leaving plenty of room for a high performing commercial building, and felt that approach might even generate more sales tax than the current CVS proposal. He did

not feel they should restrict their imagining to what had been presented thus far. He stated he would be supportive of directing the City Manager to approach the property owner and express official interest in the lease or purchase of all or a part of the property in order to determine if a deal could be made.

Mayor McDavid read a letter from the property owner to the City Council, which indicated the property had been purchased in 1979 and placed in a trust for the family in 1991, and that the property was not for sale. The letter further indicated the property owner had signed a contract with CVS, and thus, saw no point in tonight's public discussion, which was confusing to the citizenry because other options were not available. Mayor McDavid commented that he believed the vision of the DCLC was brilliant, and noted he would prefer to see that vision than a CVS as would most people. He pointed out the H3 Charrette, which had been conducted in 2003, had many ideas, to include a plan for extending Flat Branch Creek while retaining the ice house. It also included an integrated funding plan, which involved tax increment financing (TIF) and was ultimately roundly defeated by the City as a way of funding \$70 million of downtown improvements. During the TIF discussion, the DCLC had been silent and the City currently did not have the money necessary for those projects. He noted they did not have money for the number of needed police officers, and people were asking them to consider spending \$5 million on 1.4 acres. He stated he was sure the property owner would not mind leasing the 1.4 acres to the City for \$300,000 or \$350,000 per year, but at the end of those 30 years, the City would not own the property. In addition, the City would have to pay to demolish the buildings, which would likely involve asbestos removal since it was a 100-year old building, so it would essentially be a \$7 million project.

Mr. Ruffin arrived at 8:11 p.m. during the comments of Mayor McDavid.

Ms. Nauser commented that she could not recall the City ever holding a public hearing to discuss the potential use of public funds to purchase or use a piece of privately-owned property that was under contract with a private company. She did not understand how this conversation would enhance the view of the general public of their government. She believed this did the opposite as her constituents felt government was overreaching in terms of private property rights. She also believed the C-2 interim zoning changes were made due to the CVS development and a few other housing developments in the downtown. Those changes had impeded these developments that were in the works because they now had to re-engineer their plans to meet the new restrictions and requirements. She pointed out Columbia did not have aesthetic or architectural zoning ordinances, so the Council could not tell private property owners how façades needed to look to fit in the downtown. She commented that she did not mind a CVS store opening as Columbia had a growing community of elderly people that needed pharmacies and because it would provide jobs. She did not believe it made financial sense to convert a prime commercial property into a park as it would take funding away from the schools in terms of property tax and from police, fire and other essential city services in terms of sales tax. She noted only a few businesses could afford this high of a price for this property, and did not feel a restaurant could generate enough revenue to demolish the building, pay property taxes, etc. She commented that she was also not sure the property owner would even talk to them after the City had purposefully attempted to destroy a contract between two private entities.

Mr. Trapp commented that although he had not championed the holding of this public hearing, he had voted in favor of it in order to provide an opportunity for the public to share their thoughts. This hearing had also allowed a platform to express any problems with converting the property to a park. The letter from the property owner made it clear the property was not for sale. In addition, the City did not have an unlimited amount of money for green space acquisition, and this would result in them getting less for the amount of money since it was in a highly valuable commercial area and not located elsewhere. He noted the CVS proposals had come before Council twice. A zoning change had been requested the first time, which was not a property right issue, and when it came to zoning changes, the Council could consider the overall community good, whether the development complied with plans, etc. Ultimately, the Council decided the proposal was inadequate. CVS had come back to the Council a second time with a proposal that fit within the existing zoning classification, but would need a sewer easement vacation, and the City routinely negotiated issues such as this for the public good. In vacating the sewer easement, the Council needed to consider whether the City had another adequate way to handle the sewer, and in that situation, an accommodation could not be reached. He reminded everyone that if the CVS proposal came before the Council a third time, they would have a narrower concept since it was not a rezoning request, and would potentially involve property rights. He thought it was a false dichotomy to say they were determining whether the property should be a park or a CVS. If CVS came before them again, it would only be a question of whether they had accommodated the sewer issue and complied with the law. He noted this hearing was independent of that decision, and he hoped the public now had a better understanding of the situation.

OLD BUSINESS

B162-15 Changing the name of “Diamond Creek Lane” located south of Old Hawthorne Drive East to “Screaming Eagle Lane.”

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood the change to Loop came from City staff and not the residents. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid stated he understood the general concept of changing the name of a street when it went in a different direction, but did not feel as though it was an absolute, and provided Creasy Springs Road as an example of a street with a 90 degree turn without a name change. He commented that he tended to get confused by curving streets having different names. Mr. Teddy agreed there was confusion as to when one street ended and the other began in those situations.

Mayor McDavid understood this was a request to change Diamond Creek Lane to Screaming Eagle Lane. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mayor McDavid understood the Council had the power to approve or deny the change. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and clarified the Council could also ask for a modification to be considered. If the Council chose to request the consideration of a modification, additional process would be required.

Mr. Thomas asked how the houses would be numbered. Mr. Teddy replied there was already a sequence for Screaming Eagle Lane in that it was 5800 at the far west and went into the 5900 range. The numbering would continue in that sequence as if it were a west-to-east street. He provided the interstate highway system as an example in that it had an odd/even pattern that was supposed to follow cardinal directions, but there were portions of the highways that traveled in the other direction. He explained a new road name was required in the middle of the curve if the road alignment involved a single significant change in direction and the road continued for a significant distance after the change, so Council had to determine whether it was significant. He pointed out this involved a single block, and would not be as significant as Old Hawthorne Drive itself, which was a gigantic loop.

John Blakemore, 5924 Screaming Eagle Lane, stated he represented 100 percent of the neighbors, and they all supported this change. He noted this curve was a gentle curve and homes faced both east/west and north/south. In addition, there was considerable question as to where the street name would change to cause the least confusion. He understood the least confusing route to any emergency was the quickest and most direct, and the quickest and most direct route would occur if Screaming Eagle Lane hit Old Hawthorne Drive at both ends. It would also be the least confusing way to get to any emergency on Screaming Eagle Lane. He pointed out no other street intersected Screaming Eagle Lane or was proposed to intersect it on the plat. He explained there were no residences on Diamond Creek Lane at this time, and the owner of those lots was supportive of changing that segment to Screaming Eagle Lane. He commented that current house numbers were chiseled in stone on house fronts making any changes untenable. He understood City staff opposed Screaming Eagle Lane and supported changing "Lane" to "Loop" because the term was the only clear means of communicating the character of the street within the name itself, but the neighbors felt "Loop" was out of character. He provided examples of streets with similar situations, and those included Bower Lane and Trellis Lane. He pointed out a change from "Lane" to "Loop" would require the current residents to change dozens of legal documents, such as wills, mortgage deeds, passports, etc. He urged the Council to support their request to retain the name of Screaming Eagle Lane from end to end. He asked those in the audience in support of this request to stand, and approximately 20 people stood.

Mayor McDavid stated he would vote to support the request of the residents for the street to be named Screaming Eagle Lane.

Mr. Skala commented that he agreed as it made the most sense while being the least intrusive.

Ms. Nauser commented that she never really understood this policy, and noted the street to get to her home changed names three times, which she felt was confusing. She stated she would also support Screaming Eagle Lane as the name so no one would have to change their address on any legal documents.

Ms. Peters stated she also supported the request of the residents, and noted she had visited the site to try to figure out where the curve was for the name change.

Mr. Trapp commented that one of the defining characteristics of Columbia was for streets to just change names, which made it difficult to follow addresses around curves, etc. He believed this was a good change.

Mr. Thomas commented that there could be concern if Screaming Eagle Lane was ever extended further east or Diamond Creek Lane was ever extended further south, and assumed that would not occur. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and explained it was a terminal street. He noted there would be other street names on the other side of Old Hawthorne Drive.

Mr. Ruffin stated he thought they should honor the wishes of the people that lived in the area, and noted he would support this request as well.

B162-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B163-15 Approving the Final Minor Plat of Broad Building Supply located on the southeast corner of Brown Station Road and Paris Road; authorizing a performance contract; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations, and a waiver from the requirements of the City Code, regarding sidewalk construction.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been discussion at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting indicating the property owner might be compelled by MoDOT to make crosswalk improvements at the intersection if they constructed the sidewalks, and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied he understood highway departments did not care for a single leg that would land a pedestrian on an intersection corner without a sidewalk. Mr. Thomas stated he did not believe that had been a part of the discussion. He understood the applicant had indicated they might be compelled to invest another \$20,000-\$30,000 into crosswalk improvements if they built a sidewalk. Mr. Teddy explained the sidewalk ran along the frontage and would connect the existing sidewalk to the end of the property. Mr. Glascock pointed out it would be in the MoDOT right-of-way so they would need to obtain a permit from MoDOT. Mr. Thomas noted most of the Planning and Zoning Commission members had indicated they were not inclined to grant the variance, but felt it would be harsh if the applicant had to also build the pedestrian crosswalk. He asked if that could be required by MoDOT. Mr. Teddy replied MoDOT could raise an objection to an incomplete pedestrian facility in their right-of-way since the terminus of the sidewalk would be in the Paris Road right-of-way. Mr. Thomas understood MoDOT might be able to force the property owner to build the crosswalk. Mr. Teddy stated he did not know how they might respond to a sidewalk permit at that location. He thought they might want a complete section. Mr. Thomas understood one possibility would be for the City to take on the expense of installing the crosswalk if it was justified for the long-term. Mr. Teddy thought that might be tied to a larger scale development project or a public improvement project.

Mr. Skala asked if the sidewalk that paralleled Paris Road had been installed when the street had been improved. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mr. Skala understood there was not anything on the other extension of Brown Station Road either.

Ms. Nauser understood this development involved a 3,000 square foot addition, and because it was so minor, they would not have to comply with the City's other regulations, to include stormwater regulations. Mr. Teddy stated they would not have to do a retroactive improvement for what already existed.

Mike Vorwerk stated he was an engineer with Civil Engineering Design Consultants and was present on behalf of Millman Lumber. He noted this was a low pedestrian traffic area as the area was primarily low density industrial. It would be a sidewalk to nowhere if extended to the north because Brown Station Road converged with the Columbia Terminal Railroad and was eventually parallel to the railroad. As sidewalk continuing to the north would likely never service anything in the future even if similar upgrades were made to the other three legs of the intersection of Paris Road and Brown Station Road. He commented that the cost of the sidewalk with the potential MoDOT issues would be about 40 percent of the cost of the building addition. He noted Brown Station Road was an unimproved road and did not have curb and gutters. Also, a traffic signal cabinet sat a few feet below grade at the intersection, and additional costs would be involved if it had to be moved to be at-grade. He understood City staff rarely supported sidewalk variances, but had supported it in this situation due to topographic and other challenges on the site. The Planning and Zoning Commission supported the variance as well.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification as to whether staff supported the variance request. Mr. Teddy replied staff weighed the criteria, and although some of the criteria had supported the variance, the majority of the criteria had not supported it.

Mr. Thomas asked if the crosswalk system for the intersection could be placed on the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan in a future year. He thought if MoDOT required the applicant to make improvements, the City could show MoDOT it was already in the plans for the City to build, so the applicant would be relieved of the burden.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed the policy of requiring sidewalks to be built where they were missing was important, and noted staff had recommended not granting the variance. The property owner had not paid a cost that new development was required to pay as they were required to build sidewalks. He did not believe it was unfair to require this property owner to build the sidewalk as long as they could protect him from having to build the crosswalks at the intersection.

Mr. Skala commented that he agreed with Mr. Thomas in that he felt the property owner should be required to build the sidewalk, but not be burdened with the intersection improvements. He thought they should connect sidewalks when possible due to the potential for residential areas. He asked if anything could be done to alleviate the concerns. Mr. Matthes replied that project could be added to the CIP as there would likely be demand in the future as nearby areas developed.

Mayor McDavid asked if sidewalks would be required when Brown Station Road was improved in the future. Mr. Teddy replied he thought so as sidewalks were currently included as part of public improvement projects. Mayor McDavid understood they would not prevent a sidewalk from being built at that location in the future by granting a variance to it today. Mr. Teddy stated the Code indicated a sidewalk could still be constructed as part of a public project or tax bill process, so the possibility was not eliminated.

Mr. Trapp asked if that stretch of sidewalk would be usable if the road were to be improved or if it would have to be torn out due to the grading differences. Mr. Glascock replied that road did not have curbs and gutters, and current street standards required curbs and gutters, enclosed drainage systems, etc., so the sidewalk would be torn out when the road was improved in the future.

Ms. Nauser understood Brown Station Road ran parallel to the railroad nearby and felt the entire road would need to be moved in order to improve it and provide adequate space. Mr. Glascock stated it would be built toward the west so it would not be built toward the railroad. Ms. Nauser commented that she was not sure how the road could be moved due to the Transload facility. Mr. Glascock pointed out there was a lot of right-of-way in that area as it was Old Route B. Mr. Matthes asked if improving Brown Station Road was in the CIP. Mr. Glascock replied no.

Mr. Skala asked if the sidewalk would still need to be removed if the road was widened on the other side. Mr. Glascock replied curb and gutter would be needed on both sides of the road, and the sidewalk would be torn out because the road would need to be raised.

Mr. Glascock pointed out there was a signal at the intersection already, so islands, etc. would be needed to make the intersection accessible by sidewalks. It would likely involve a lot of money.

Mr. Thomas noted they were discussing placing that intersection project in the CIP far out in the future, and understood there was not a reason from the perspective of the City Code for a sidewalk to be built that would connect to the sidewalk already on Paris Road. Mr. Glascock understood MoDOT was now requiring maintenance money for anything built within their right-of-way that they were responsible for maintaining. He noted he was not sure it would be required in this situation as he had not spoken with MoDOT regarding this project.

Ms. Nauser understood the relocation of the box that controlled the traffic signal could create an additional cost as well. She noted this was only a 3,000 square foot addition, and other codes or ordinances had not been triggered by this improvement. She thought it was intrinsically unfair to require the construction of \$10,000-\$20,000 of sidewalk improvements for a sidewalk to nowhere for a 3,000 square foot addition, especially when the property owner could be tax billed for the improvement at a later date. She felt sidewalks were needed on the other side of the road where the new subdivisions and school were located. She did not believe anyone would walk to Peabody as part of their daily stroll as the landfill was located there. She stated she would support the variance request.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend B163-15 by deleting Section 4 so the sidewalk variance would not be granted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala and Mr. Thomas voting in favor of it.

B163-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B167-15 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking along the north side of Greeley Drive.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that some of the residents were concerned with the potential nuisance of one resident parking 8-10 vehicles on the street close to driveways as it created sight distance issues, and asked if parking could be limited a number of feet from the driveways by striping it like they did in the Benton Stephens neighborhood. Mr. Glascock replied it was only a possibility if there were curbs on the street. Mr. Nichols stated he thought this street was unimproved. Mr. Skala asked if the asphalt could be striped. Mr. Glascock replied they could try the edge, but noted he was not sure it would work. Mr. Matthes asked if the issue was on the south side of Greeley Drive. Mr. Skala replied yes. Mr. Matthes thought the City could prohibit parking on the north side of Greeley Drive and try to stripe the south side of Greeley Drive. Mr. Skala stated he would be open to anything that would discourage people from parking too close to a driveway. Mr. Glascock noted staff would need to look into it to determine what treatment might work.

Mr. Nichols explained staff had received the same feedback from the residents on Greeley Drive. The reason they were recommending a restriction to parking on the north side was because they did not want to create an unintended consequence of people driving down another street. Mr. Skala stated he thought it was an improvement to not allow parking on one side, and noted he only wanted to resolve the nuisance issue.

Mr. Trapp understood the parking restriction would be on the north side of Greeley Drive because the concern was that vehicles would travel down another street, but noted those parking on the south would also likely travel down another street when leaving. Mr. Nichols stated that was a good point, and explained the Fire Department wanted one side restricted. Mr. Skala understood there had not been a preference by staff. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala understood there were more rental properties on the north side than the south side of the street, and thought they might want to prohibit parking on the south side instead.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B167-15 by replacing “north” with “south” so parking was prohibited on the south side of Greeley Drive instead of the north side.

Ms. Nauser asked Mr. Skala if he thought the residents would be happy with that change since they were expecting parking to be restricted on the north side. Mr. Skala replied the street was not highly populated, and the north side had some multi-family residential units whose residents did not provide much input. Mr. Nichols asked if there would be a concern that the gentleman with all of the vehicles would move them to the other side of the street. Mr. Skala replied he was not sure they could legislate that behavior.

The motion made by Mr. Skala to amend B167-15 by replacing “north” with “south” so parking was prohibited on the south side of Greeley Drive instead of the north side was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Skala thought this would improve the situation of those people trying to get out of their driveways.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend B167-15 by replacing “north” with “south” so parking was prohibited on the south side of Greeley Drive instead of the north side was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Trapp commented that parking restrictions were inconvenient when people were used to parking in the street, but pointed out it would also be inconvenient if a fire truck could not get to a home that was on fire. He noted he had supported restricting parking on one side of Leslie Lane, his side of the street, in order to allow the buses to flow freely, and had a neighbor that still would not talk to him. He understood change was difficult, but felt fire trucks needed to get down the street.

B167-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B169-15 Authorizing the Havens Drive and Wilderness Way Area customer transfer agreement with Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Boone County, Missouri.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

B169-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN. 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.

- B160-15 Rezoning property located on the east side of Brown Station Road and south of US Highway 63 from PUD-12 and M-R to M-R and M-C; approving a revised statement of intent; setting forth a condition for approval; requiring a traffic study.**
- B161-15 Approving a major revision to the 1109 Locust Street C-P Plan located on the north side of Locust Street, between Hitt Street and Waugh Street.**
- B164-15 Approving the Final Plat of Red Bird Run Subdivision located on the west side of Old Plank Road and south of Glasgow Drive; authorizing a performance contract.**
- B165-15 Authorizing construction of sidewalk improvements along the south side of Elleta Boulevard from Rangeline Street eastward to the existing sidewalk; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**
- B166-15 Authorizing 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; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**
- B168-15 Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Public Works Department; amending the FY 2015 Classification and Pay Plan to add and close positions.**
- B170-15 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County Family Resources for additional funding for the Parks and Recreation Department's Career Awareness Related Experience (CARE) Program for youth employment placement and mentoring services.**

- B171-15 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County Family Resources for additional funding for the Parks and Recreation Department’s Adapted Community Recreation Program.
- B172-15 Authorizing a participation agreement for state investment in local public health services with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services.
- B173-15 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for the Show Me Healthy Women program.
- B174-15 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for the Children’s Health Insurance Program health services initiatives.
- B175-15 Appropriating funds to recover costs associated with the formation of the Business Loop Community Improvement District.
- R104-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of sanitary sewer improvements along the MKT Trail and Providence Road from Stadium Boulevard to Elm Street, more specifically described as the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 1.
- R105-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of sanitary sewer improvements along Elm Street from Providence Road to Hitt Street and along Sixth Street from Elm Street to south of Broadway, more specifically described as the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 3.
- R106-15 Setting a public hearing: replacement of a failing storm box and inlets at the intersection of Ninth Street and Elm Street, more specifically described as the Ninth and Elm Storm Drainage Replacement Project.
- R107-15 Setting a public hearing: replacement of traffic signal equipment and construction of improvements at the intersection of Ninth Street and Elm Street, more specifically described as the Ninth and Elm Pedestrian Scramble Project.
- R108-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of street and sewer improvements along a portion of Discovery Drive, from the intersection of Discovery Drive and Discovery Parkway southeastward, more specifically described as the Discovery Drive Roadway and Sewer Extension Project.
- R109-15 Authorizing various Adopt a Spot agreements.
- R110-15 Transferring funds to offset expenditures relating to the August 2015 special election for extension of the capital improvement sales tax.
- R111-15 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement for professional engineering services with Allstate Consultants LLC relating to the Phase I development of the Southeast Regional Park – A. Perry Philips Park and Gans Creek Recreation Area.
- R112-15 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for construction phase services for reconstruction of Runway 13-31 and Taxiway B at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R113-15 Authorizing the notice of the sale of Water and Electric System Refunding and Improvement Revenue Bonds, Series 2015.

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

RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

R114-15 Establishing a Mayor’s Task Force on Infrastructure.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid explained the genesis for this proposal had been the high degree of difficulty in understanding the current conditions of infrastructure. They could view the finances of each infrastructure area in the budget, but if they wanted to know more about long-term planning, they also had to review the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan. In addition, if they wanted to know the current conditions, they had to look at the latest ballot proposal. He noted it was inherently difficult to come up with a cogent analysis, and due to the confusion and contention, he was proposing a Mayor’s Task Force on Infrastructure. He wanted the task force to address water, electric, sewer, stormwater, and streets, which would involve defining the current conditions, analyzing plans for maintenance and improvements, evaluating funding needs, and recommending whether permanent advisory boards should be established to monitor future needs. He commented that if the Task Force was approved by Council, he would appoint Chris Kelly as Chair, and at least four technical experts with knowledge in these specific infrastructure areas. He stated he would likely solicit a recommendation from Mr. Ruffin since the First Ward clearly had substantial infrastructure deficiencies and from the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) since it clearly had infrastructure deficiencies in electricity, sewer, and stormwater. He noted he would also solicit recommendations from the other Council Members. He pointed out Bill Weitkemper had been a harsh critic of infrastructure management, and stated he would appoint him if he were nominated by a Council Member. He suggested the mandate of the Mayor’s Task Force on Infrastructure be sufficiently broad without superseding or usurping the mandate of the Water and Light Advisory Board. He noted the Water and Light Advisory Board was one of the reasons he believed they needed this Task Force, and he only wanted the Task Force to review electric capacity. He thought Columbia could greatly benefit from a broad public evaluation, and the Task Force would move them in that direction. If Council approved the establishment of this Task Force, he planned to solicit recommendations immediately in order to complete appointments by the August 3, 2015 Council Meeting.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with many of the comments of Mayor McDavid, but thought they had previously discussed appointing a permanent commission for stormwater and sewer infrastructure so they did not encroach upon the purview of the Water and Light Advisory Board. He noted the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) had suggested a blue ribbon panel for infrastructure, which he felt might have been a bit too broad, but thought a permanent commission was more appropriate. He explained he had participated on the previous Infrastructure Task Force, which had failed in its mission due to it being a very political body, and one reason for its failure was the fact they had restricted discussion to roads, and had not discussed sewer, water, etc. He stated he was more inclined to favor a more permanent board or commission with appointments being made like normal, which was independently by all of the Council Members. He commented that he could not vote for a

temporary task force as an interim measure to get where they needed. He noted he had trouble voting against any infrastructure advisory group, but believed they needed a permanent commission with a broader vision.

Nick Peckham, 15 S. Tenth Street, stated he was a member of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) and noted that item (2) from the August DCLC report had referred to the Infrastructure Task Force mentioned by Mr. Skala. He understood it had been established on July 6, 2010 with guidelines for determining fair and balance cost allocations and funding sources among stakeholders, and ensuring infrastructure implementation was aligned to with the comprehensive growth plan, but noted the Task Force had not accomplished what it had been established to accomplish, which he felt was a serious concern. He commented that the DCLC learned many people had been surprised to realize the only business the City was really in was to provide infrastructure for its citizens, and believed that was another concern. He was not sure a one-year time line was appropriate for such a dynamic and on-going problem for a developing community, and believed on-going consideration of the economic side would be needed as the community grew. He asked the Council to consider recommendations (2) and (3) of the August DCLC report to Council when deciding on whether to establish this Task Force or some permanent board or commission. He also asked that the Council meet with the DCLC to discuss the report.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, commented that he had concerns regarding the establishment of this Task Force, and asked them to consider the comments of Mr. Skala. He thought they had a pretty good idea of the sewer and stormwater issues as they could be seen during every rainfall, and felt a permanent commission for those issues was necessary. He was not sure a time line of twelve months was appropriate as he believed it would not provide enough time to gather the necessary information to make a sound decision. He reiterated he believed this should be permanent body that should serve a broader purpose than any existing permanent infrastructure board or commission.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he agreed with Mr. Skala and Mr. Cullimore. He believed they needed to restore, improve, and maintain a high level of service for public infrastructure by conducting a thorough assessment of current and future needs, 30-40 years out, and developing a detailed ten year construction plan to meet those needs. A fair, equitable, and reasonable way to pay for everything could be established at that time. He commented that he also thought the City's revenue streams needed to be reviewed and pay-as-you-go plans to finance infrastructure operations, maintenance, and replacement costs needed to be created. He agreed with the DCLC report in that long-term infrastructure planning was needed, and independent and professional assistance should be engaged so the data was complete and trusted. He understood the City had staff working in each infrastructure area, but noted he did not feel they had the time or the background for overall planning in a broad manner. He stated he believed the City's infrastructure was broader than the categories mentioned by Mayor McDavid, and hoped the Council would include solid waste, transit, etc. in a revised approach.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning and noted they had submitted "Plan B" to the Council about a year ago with regard

to infrastructure. It included suggestions to decrease infrastructure costs and requirements by developing net-zero energy buildings, requiring green roofs and permeable surfaces, etc. She agreed with Mr. Clark in utilizing experts as experts could help with these initiatives. She also suggested code changes so net-zero buildings were more widely built, and for the City to lead by example.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that he had been a resident of Columbia following the progress of the City during the past 46 years. He noted he was a member of the Water and Light Advisory Board, and had been a member for 25 years, but his comments were not reflective of the Board as they were his professional and personal opinions. He explained the recent Water and Light bond issue had been passed with a 68 percent approval rating, and that the issue had been thoroughly deliberated by the Water and Light Advisory Board. He commented that he had worked with four different directors of the Water and Light Department and was a licensed professional engineer that had dealt with public infrastructure for 41 years. In his capacity as Chair of the Water and Light Advisory Board, he reviewed a lot of material to help him deliberate on what was needed for the future of the Water and Light Department. He listed his other credentials, which included a Master's in Public Administration with an emphasis in Public Finance, and believed the inclusion of the Water and Light Department operations for this Task Force was redundant since those responsibilities and authorities were given to the Water and Light Advisory Board per the City Charter. He also believed it was premature to create this Task Force given the pending reorganization in the Public Works Department and Water and Light Department in terms of infrastructure. He noted an annual report was given to the Council regarding the infrastructure of the Water and Light Department, and it included what had been done and what would be needed. He was uncertain as to the problem they were trying to fix, and asked the Council to remove water and electric infrastructure from responsibilities of the Task Force.

Ms. Nauser stated she agreed it was redundant for water and electric to be included for this Task Force to review, and suggested they only consider including electric infrastructure in the downtown. She believed the primary issues involved sewer and stormwater infrastructure.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend R114-15 so water and electric infrastructure was not included as infrastructure to be reviewed by the Task Force. The motion died for a lack of a second.

Mr. Trapp stated he would be supportive of limiting the purview of the Task Force to only downtown electric infrastructure in terms of the water and electric portion.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend R114-15 so only downtown electric infrastructure was included to be reviewed by the Task Force when it came to water and electric infrastructure. The motion was seconded by Mayor McDavid.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification from Mr. Trapp as to why he would propose this amendment. Mr. Trapp replied he thought Mr. Conway made some good points regarding the qualifications and overall competency of the Water and Light Advisory Board, but also understood a task of this Task Force would be to convey the complexity of infrastructure and

planning needs to the public and thought an extra voice to explain the electrical needs in the downtown in terms of capacity could complement the effort.

Ms. Peters commented that one of her concerns was that this would be a huge undertaking for those on the Task Force. She believed it had encompassed so much for only a year's worth of time, even with the amendment. She felt the amount of expertise needed for Task Force members and the amount of staff time that would be needed to educate the members would be overwhelming. She thought they might be better to apportion it without going back to the silos. She suggested something that was more manageable.

Mr. Skala stated he did not see a conflict between the Water and Light Advisory Board and this Task Force or any future permanent board or commission. He thought they would be better served by getting more advice from the experts. He understood the emphasis was on the downtown area because that was where much infrastructure exigency existed, but felt it was broader as everything was connected. He reiterated he believed one of the reasons the previous Infrastructure Task Force had failed was because they had limited themselves to a very narrow portion of infrastructure. He stated he was inclined not to support limiting any infrastructure considerations to the downtown.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mayor McDavid to amend R114-15 so only downtown electric infrastructure was included to be reviewed by the Task Force when it came to water and electric infrastructure was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Ruffin voting against it.

Mr. Trapp commented that he generally liked creating task forces better than creating new permanent boards and commissions because they had perennial slots to be filled on existing boards and commissions. In the heat of the moment, issues tended to draw a lot of attention and interest, but over time that interest faded. He noted there were only so many people that would be willing to do the immense amount of work to participate on boards and commissions, which was why there was overlap. He commented that he believed Mayor McDavid had done a great job in the past of not promoting any particular ideology. He explained Mayor McDavid had the same discretionary power of appointing people on the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, and in retrospect the people Mayor McDavid had appointed to the Task Force that he had been uncertain about had served really well. It had been a diverse and interesting group of people that had brought much expertise to the table. He believed a similar approach had been followed for the Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety, and that Mayor McDavid had been responsive with regard to who served on that Task Force. He was confident Mayor McDavid would choose other people that enjoyed the trust of the community, like Chris Kelly, to serve on this Task Force. He also liked the fact topic experts would be included on the Task Force so they had informed discussions. He stated he would support the establishment of the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure.

Mr. Skala stated he believed it would be beneficial for their work session with regard to the DCLC report to be held prior to establishing this Task Force since that had been requested by several Council Members a few months ago. At that time, they could also discuss this being a task force or commission and any other organizational issues.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table R114-15, as amended, to the September 21, 2015 Council Meeting.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was not necessarily convinced a standing commission was necessary. They had experts at the staff level and the CIP Plan had served them well in the past. She pointed out it was not an issue of the City not planning for infrastructure needs. The City had just not anticipated a surge in student housing in the downtown. She explained the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had consisted of a group of people without a political agenda, and suggested the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure be structured with people who were interested in the topic and knowledgeable of the issues and topic matter without a political agenda to promote one issue over others. She thought the work could be done in a year if the people were passionate about the issues. She stated she felt the suggestion of the DCLC was too broad and encompassing, and noted she would not support tabling this resolution.

The motion made by Mr. Skala to table R114-15, as amended, to the September 21, 2015 Council Meeting was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mayor McDavid stated he would vote against the motion to table this item as he did not feel they were exclusive of each other. He thought they could have a conversation with the DCLC and move forward with the Task Force at the same time.

Mr. Skala commented that he would not vote to create a Task Force prior to having a conversation with the DCLC regarding their report.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Ms. Peters to table R114-15, as amended, to the September 21, 2015 Council Meeting was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Skala and Ms. Peters voting in favor of it.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had initially been concerned that this Task Force would be political, but noted he liked the appointment of Chris Kelly. He asked Mayor McDavid to gain consensus from the Council and to discuss the appointments with them prior to making those decisions. He stated he would support the establishment of this Task Force with those expectations. He believed a high-level conversation about infrastructure was very important and felt a discussion on the way new infrastructure was paid for to accommodate a growing community was within the scope of the Task Force. He hoped a standing stormwater and sanitary sewer commission emerged from this Task Force. He agreed the Water and Light Advisory Board had great technical expertise in terms of technology, planning, prioritization, different ways of funding the utility, billing, etc., and felt similar input from a citizen advisory board was also relevant to the stormwater and sanitary sewer utilities. He understood the previous Infrastructure Task Force had not been successful and suspected the problem had to do with leadership and the people that were on that Task Force. He thought they could come up with a good group this time that could make unbiased and technical recommendations. He reiterated he would support this resolution.

The vote on R114-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: SKALA. 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.

- B176-15 Authorizing the issuance of Water and Electric System Refunding and Improvement Revenue Bonds, Series 2015.
- B177-15 Appropriating bond proceeds for FY 2015 electric capital projects.
- B178-15 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.
- B179-15 Changing the uses allowed on C-P zoned property located on the southeast corner of Lenoir Street and Roosevelt Avenue (4130 and 4150 S. Lenoir Street); approving a revised statement of intent.
- B180-15 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 Business Loop 70 East and east of Providence Road (405 Business Loop 70 East); accepting conveyances for sidewalk and temporary construction purposes.
- B181-15 Approving the Final Plat of The Gates, Plat No. 2 & 3 located southeast of the intersection of Old Plank Road and Abbotsbury Lane; authorizing a performance contract.
- B182-15 Approving the Final Plat of Willow Falls, Plat No. 1 located west of the terminus of Blue Ridge Road and Clydesdale Drive and north of Prairie Lane; authorizing a performance contract.
- B183-15 Approving the Final Plat of Sarrazin Estate Subdivision located on the south side of I-70 Drive SE and west of St. Charles Road (5108 I-70 Drive SE); authorizing a performance contract.
- B184-15 Authorizing construction of the Ridgemont Road PCCE #20 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B185-15 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on a portion of the east side of Fay Street.
- B186-15 Authorizing an inter-governmental cooperative agreement with the County of Boone and The Curators of the University of Missouri for assessment of bacteria levels in Hinkson Creek.
- B187-15 Authorizing a financial assistance agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for the purchase of commercial recycling compactors; appropriating funds.
- B188-15 Authorizing application for transit planning, operating and capital assistance grants.
- B189-15 Appropriating Federal Aviation Administration grant funds and transportation sales tax funds for costs relating to the reconstruction of Runway 13-31 and Taxiway B at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B190-15 Appropriating funds for costs associated with advertising for the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B191-15 Accepting conveyances for sewer, street, sidewalk, drainage and utility and temporary construction purposes.

- B192-15 Authorizing a banner attachment agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri to allow for the attachment of banners to City light standards in the campus area.
- B193-15 Appropriating funds for the upgrade of the control room at the Municipal Power Plant.
- B194-15 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B195-15 Authorizing a license agreement with Bates County, Missouri for use of the City of Columbia police canine tracking software program.
- B196-15 Authorizing an agreement with the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission to perform pool inspections in accordance with the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act.
- B197-15 Accepting a donation to be used for the Mayor’s Climate Protection Agreement Awards; appropriating funds.
- B198-15 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code as it relates to membership of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council.
- B199-15 Authorizing an artist’s commission agreement with Don Asbee for the design and fabrication of a memorial bench to be placed in the Grindstone Nature Area in memory of Kim Scholl; appropriating funds.
- B200-15 Appropriating funds for the installation of dusk to dawn lights along the interior trail and walkways at Stephens Lake Park.
- B201-15 Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget by adding positions in the Police Department and Parks and Recreation Department; amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget by deleting a position in the Parks and Recreation Department; amending the FY 2015 Classification and Pay Plan to add positions.
- B202-15 Authorizing an intergovernmental agreement with the County of Boone relating to the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program and the allocation of FY 2015 funding.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP71-15 Austin, Texas Economic Development Model.

Ms. Button provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that he would like to hold a work session to discuss the details of this report along with the comparisons of what was done within Columbia, Missouri versus Austin, Texas. He explained some people in the community were uncomfortable about the extent to which the Regional Economic Development Inc. (REDI) public-private partnership was merged in political issues. He wanted to look at some of the details to perhaps create a better cooperative arrangement between REDI and the City of Columbia. He reiterated he felt the discussion would be worthwhile regardless of whether changes were made.

Mayor McDavid thought this was a very interesting report in that it showed Austin, Texas was a very pro-job and pro-economic growth community. He noted Austin had been ranked #1 in economic growth and job development for cities with a population over 200,000 and Columbia had been ranked #1 in the same category for cities with a population under 200,000. He felt that showed the degree of success of REDI. He commented that he believed this public-private blend had worked well because so much of Columbia’s economic

growth was based upon the University of Missouri, and as a result, they needed to be involved and had been involved. He commented that hard work was involved in convincing companies to locate in Columbia and to remain in Columbia at the same or at a higher staffing level. He noted Columbia paled in comparison to Austin in terms of incentives provided. In addition, the Austin Economic Development Department had \$43 million in revenues and funded chambers of commerce. Boone County had Chapter 100 bonds that could be provided as an incentive, but Columbia really did not have any incentives. He stated his disappointment for the demise of the Enhanced Enterprise Zone (EEZ) over the definition of blight as his definition of blight was a 20 percent poverty rate and a 45 percent free and reduced lunch rate in the Columbia Public Schools, and noted that while Columbia did a great job of bringing in PhD level employment, they were not doing a good job of bringing in \$40,000 per year manufacturing jobs because they did not have incentives to offer. He encouraged the Council to recommit to finding jobs for the underserved as there was no way out for those individuals without quality jobs.

Mr. Trapp stated he was in agreement with many of the comments made by Mayor McDavid. He believed this was a great report to compare and contrast Austin with Columbia. He noted he was impressed with the robustness of their incentives to attract and keep jobs. Their unemployment rate was 3.8 percent, which was similar to that of Columbia, but their black unemployment rate was only 9 percent so they were significantly outperforming Columbia in that respect. The City of Columbia needed to address the skills gap and also needed to work hard to bring in jobs that would not require a college education.

Ms. Nauser commented that she believed Columbia did a great job considering the small amount of funding provided. She thought they would need to do better in terms of incentives and economic development if they wanted to compete as there were many communities similar to Columbia. She understood some in the community were concerned about transparency in terms of not knowing which companies had been in contact with REDI, but noted companies did not want their competitors knowing where they might be locating or if they would receive incentives. She stated the Council had been involved many times, but had not known the company name. She thought Columbia had a good and successful model.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Economic Development Director in Austin, Texas answered solely to the City Administration or if that person answered to a governing body of private community investors. Ms. Button replied it was a City department, and the Director reported to the Deputy City Manager. The Austin Economic Development Department funded five chambers of commerce and invested and participated in other strategic plans within the community, such as *Opportunity Austin*, through their structure in the organization. Ms. Christian pointed out that was a multi-county partnership. Mr. Thomas asked if the Economic Development Department staff sat on those committees. He wanted to know the level of interaction. Ms. Button replied they did not have that level of detail. Ms. Christian understood they provided the majority of funding for those efforts, and the Austin Chamber of Commerce coordinated it. The Economic Development Director was a part of the process since that person sat on that Board.

Mr. Matthes pointed out Ms. Button reported solely to him, but had a relationship with the REDI Board.

Mr. Skala commented that one of the issues with the IBM deal was that the Council did not know who the other players were in bringing IBM to Columbia so they were making a decision to purchase property as an incentive without knowing all of the details. He pointed out he had voted in favor of it and still felt it was a good idea. He only wished they had better claw-back provisions, and noted they had not been privy to those negotiations. He stated he did not believe they needed to be exactly like Austin as Columbia did not have \$43 million to provide in incentives, but noted Austin had a more conventional model in that the public and private relationship was separate so the politics were removed. He agreed economic development was important to the community. He understood REDI had begun with only six members, two of which were the City Manager and Mayor, and now it had about 24 members. He was uncomfortable with taxpayers providing \$500,000 per year without a good degree of separation.

REP72-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line, thanked the City Manager for contacting him regarding the recent death of a homeless individual and understood Mr. Trapp had more information to share with him.

Mr. Elkin understood Mayor McDavid was on a committee regarding the future of the Boone County Fairgrounds and hoped agriculture would be considered in some manner as the previous owners of the Fairgrounds had been involved with sheep, cattle, horses, etc.

Mr. Elkin stated he recently learned those leasing vehicles might affect taxes collected at the State level, and potentially at the local level.

Mr. Elkin asked if the REDI meetings were open to the public and for the time and date of the next meeting. Mr. Skala replied the next REDI meeting would be held on Wednesday at 11:30 a.m. at the REDI offices.

Rick Shanker, 1829 Cliff Drive, commended Mr. Matthes for recently stating the disparities between the “haves” and the “have nots” was what kept him up at night. He noted Mr. Matthes’ comments on the local radio show were reflective, insightful, and appreciated.

Mr. Shanker displayed a photo of a sewer collecting water on University Avenue, and noted the water had been running down that street for three years now. He displayed another photo from Williams Street and explained the water froze every year causing pedestrian and traffic problems. He displayed another photo of the corner of University Avenue and Williams Street to show a different angle. At one time, he was told it was a leak from a house on Rosemary Lane, and although the issue on that property had been resolved, it had not resolved the problem of this running water. He hoped this problem would be addressed as part of the CIP.

Mr. Shanker displayed photos taken after a storm last year and after the most recent storm showing broken masts, and asked for the help of Council in making the process of re-

connecting electric lines quicker. He understood the City Manager could declare an emergency so a permit would not be needed and the Water and Light Department could complete the inspection. This would allow customers to be hooked up to electricity more quickly. He asked for this to be considered for future storm events. He explained the current process was for the property owner or contractor to obtain a permit, for the contractor to complete the work, for the contractor to contact someone to inspect the work inspection, for the work to be inspected, for the Water and Light Department to be contacted, and then for the power to be restored. The inspectors had to do their normal work along with these inspections so it took longer for the power to be restored. He understood the Water and Light Department was comfortable with the suggested change.

Ms. Nauser asked if staff could look into the suggestion of Mr. Shanker. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mr. Trapp introduced his intern, Zachary Weston, who was in the audience, and explained he and Zach were involved in a pro-active constituent outreach on Newton Drive, which was a high crime area. Zach had knocked on doors to invite people to a barbecue and a neighborhood meeting, and had learned people had seen improvements since the last time they had held a neighborhood meeting. In addition, there was a better neighborhood feel and sense of well-being. He noted Newton Drive dead-ended into Baxter Park, which was an undeveloped property at the end of a low-income, largely African-American street. A few years ago, the neighbors had indicated they wanted a shelter and some playground equipment, but they were now unsure of the shelter. He stated they still wanted a swing set, asked staff to consider that possibility. He pointed out he and Zach planned to approach the residents of Bodie Drive with regard to a barbecue and a neighborhood meeting next.

Mr. Skala asked that the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) report be discussed at the September 21, 2015 work session. He also wanted a work session with regard to REDI. He thought the DCLC report should be at a two hour work session, while the REDI topic could be scheduled for a one hour work session. Mr. Matthes stated they could schedule the DCLC report for September 21 and the REDI discussion for September 8.

Mr. Skala thanked staff for resurfacing Keene Street as they had done a remarkable job.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to add a pedestrian crosswalk system at the intersection of Brown Station Road and Paris Road to the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas understood they all wanted more police officers to enable the Police Chief to implement community policing in a manner such that a certain percentage of an officer's time would be allocated to get to know the residents of a particular neighborhood or set of neighborhoods to build a trusting relationship as a majority of citizens were law abiding citizens. He was not sure Police Department policies reflected the concept of community policing in the way the Police Chief had verbalized, and asked if the written policies of the

Police Department could be reviewed by staff to determine how community policing was addressed in those policies. He thought they might want to consider re-writing the policies to explicitly state that was how the City envisioned the Police Department operating in the future.

Mr. Thomas understood one of the recommendations of the Task Force on Community Violence was for cultural competency training for the Police Department in terms of learning to communicate effectively with people from different cultures, whether that involved people of different races, with different income levels, of different nationalities, or with different focuses, so officers did not misunderstand anyone and were not misunderstood. He suggested the Police Department also provide implicit bias training to determine whether an officer had built-in implicit biases when responding to certain people and certain situations. He asked staff to review the current Police Department training portfolio and to provide a report to Council.

Mr. Thomas suggested the Council move forward with a use tax in order to collect revenues on on-line sales as on-line transactions undermined the City's regular sales tax revenues and the general fund. He understood by not having a use tax, the City was losing a lot of sales tax on building materials utilized by the development industry as those were being shipped into Columbia after being purchased from low tax areas. He understood it would take a public vote to establish the use tax.

Mayor McDavid stated he understood there was widespread support for a use tax by the other communities within Boone County, but the issue was presenting it so it did not sound like they were imposing a new tax. He thought they needed to structure it in a way it might pass without jeopardizing other important ballot issues. He also believed every community within Boone County needed to put it on the ballot at the same time.

Mayor McDavid explained he and Ms. Nauser, the Mayor Pro Tem, would be unable to attend the July 20, 2015 Council Meeting, and asked Mr. Trapp to preside over the next Council Meeting. Mr. Trapp was agreeable.

The meeting adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk