

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
AUGUST 3, 2015**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, August 3, 2015, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP and SKALA were present. The 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 July 20, 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**

Mr. Trapp asked that B217-15 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B217-15 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Thomas.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

**Columbia Cosmopolitan Luncheon Club Presentation.**

Phil Hanson provided a handout and stated he was the Past President of the Columbia Cosmopolitan International Club. He explained the Club had been involved with parks and recreation in the community for over 70 years, and that they would fund up to \$125,000 for a shelter house and playground at Nifong Park in an area to be recognized as Cosmo Corner.

Dick Otto stated he was the President of the Boone County Historical Society (BCHS) Board of Directors, and noted they were excited about the offer from the Columbia Cosmopolitan Luncheon Club and the proposed partnership with the City with regard to improvements in historic Nifong Park, which was home to the BCHS museum and galleries. The BCHS was excited about the proposed large shelter house, playground, and increased parking areas with a lighted walkway for all park guests. He commented that hard surface parking, handicap accessible spots, appropriate lighting for safety concerns, and overall ease of access was a necessity for those using Nifong Park and its services. He thanked the Columbia Cosmopolitan Luncheon Club and the City of Columbia for their leadership on this proposal.

Mayor McDavid thanked the Columbia Cosmopolitan Club for its 70 years of commitment to the community.

## APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

The following individuals were appointed by Mayor McDavid to the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure.

### **MAYOR'S TASK FORCE ON INFRASTRUCTURE**

Chris Kelly, 2706 Bristol Lake Drive, Ward 6

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, Ward 5

Gregg Coffin, 417 S. Fifth Street (business), Ward 4

Jen Hedrick, 2801 Woodard Drive, Suite 103 (business), Boone County

Cody Darr, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court, Suite 105 (business), Ward 3

Bill Weitkemper, 3717 Bray Court, Ward 4

Tony Grove, 902 Range Line Street (business), Ward 4

Katrina Boles, 1109 Again Street, Ward 1

Kim Kraus, 2304 Ridgefield Road, Ward 4

## SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

### **Breck Anderson, President Delta Tau Delta Fraternity House Corporation - Extension request of three years for compliance with Ordinance No. 020209 related to the installation of a sprinkler system in the shelter located at 506 E. Rollins.**

Breck Anderson stated he was the President of the Delta Tau Delta House Corporation and explained they had started a capital campaign on January 1 to raise \$3 million to build a \$6 million fraternity house.

Bob Cunningham explained he was an architect and his firm, Cunningham + Associates, specialized in the design of fraternity and sorority houses. He noted they had been involved with the fire sprinkler requirements since its inception, and were working with several organizations to update or replace houses to meet the requirement. He commented that meeting the deadline would require construction to be underway now. He understood seven years might appear to be adequate in terms of installing sprinklers in buildings, but the process was complicated. He explained Delta Tau Delta began discussions on how best to meet the new requirement within the first year of the establishment of the requirement, but noted it had taken almost two years to form a committee of volunteers with the time and expertise necessary to participate. It then took another six months to engage an architect and fundraising company, and another year for developing and evaluating options. Once the decision to build a new house was made, it took another four months for the building to be designed, and fundraising efforts began soon after, but those efforts, unfortunately, did not allow the project to begin construction this year. He commented that fraternity and sorority houses had relatively few beds, which made new construction difficult to fund without a fundraising campaign, and noted raising funds in a timely manner was dependent on the generosity of alumni. He asked the Council to provide Delta Tau Delta more time so the necessary funding could be raised.

**Katrina Boles and Karie Watson - City sewer and stormwater runoff problems in the Again Street neighborhood.**

Katrina Boles, 1109 Again Street, and Karie Watson, 1105 Again Street, provided a handout and asked Council for its help in fixing an immediate infrastructure problem that posed public health and safety problems in their neighborhood. They explained a three-foot by eight-inch hole was located in the main sewer line that ran against the foundation of home at 1105 Again Street, and understood City staff had been aware of this since at least September 2014. They showed a video of a flash flood in July, 2015, and noted the water was exploding from two overloaded intake drains and from Worley Street. They understood the City had purchased and removed the house at 1107 Again Street in 2003 as part of a plan to replace the stormwater system so it was accordance with stormwater utility policies, but that project was yet to be completed. They explained sewage backed up in multiple homes on the block during heavy rains, and displayed a video of the damage in one of the homes. Ms. Boles noted her six month old child had to be removed from the unsafe conditions of her house until clean up and remediation was completed. She stated a sump pump had been properly set up to divert basement and foundation water to the yard, causing more sewage to go into the stormwater system. Ms. Watson explained they were aware of the inflow and infiltration work, but were told those actions would not be enough to address the problem. In July of 2015, they had the creek tested for e-coli and very high levels of sewage were found. Ms. Boles stated stormwater runoff with high levels of sewage traveled through a park next to West Boulevard Elementary where children played, and as a mom she was concerned about children playing in the area. The sewage created a public health issue, and the flash flooding created a safety issue. They commented that the home values in the area were dramatically impacted as the homes tended to sell for under their value at auctions or from house flippers to unsuspecting buyers. There was a huge cost to the property owners due to sewage clean up and restoration. Their suggested solutions were outlined in the handout, and those solutions had come primarily from the City's Public Works Department and from residents witnessing the water flow. They understood Council assistance was needed to allow staff to proceed with many of these solutions, and asked for a plan along with the date of completion to be put in writing. She invited the Council and concerned citizens to meet with them on Wednesday, August 12 at 6:30 p.m. at Again Street Park to walk through the neighborhood problem.

**Craig Anderson, Sigma Nu Fraternity Rho Chapter Advisor - Request for variance/extension from the Fire Code sprinkler system installation requirement.**

Craig Anderson provided a handout and stated he represented the Housing Corporation Board for the Sigma Nu Fraternity Rho Chapter. He explained he had been an advisor for two years and had been involved in planning for a new house since its infancy. He noted the structure at 710 S. College Avenue had been overdue for a major overhaul for many years, and they were in the process of raising \$6 million to build a new fraternity house. Plans would be finalized in March of 2016 with construction starting on June 1, 2016. They were asking for a variance to the Fire Code and an extension to the March 2016 deadline for installation of a sprinkler system to May 2016 when fraternity members moved out at the end

of the school year. As a result, members would only be in the house for two months past the deadline. He explained the existing structure would then be demolished with a new structure being built during the 2016-2017 school year. He commented that sprinklers were a costly update to the existing structure, and it did not make sense to add a sprinkler system to a nearly depleted building that would need to be demolished in the near future. He stated the planning and fundraising efforts for a new home began around 2007-2008, and it was very difficult to accomplish in a timely manner when alumni like himself were working on this in their free time. He referred to the handout, which was a letter from the President of Cissell Mueller Construction of St. Peters, Missouri, ensuring Sigma Nu was under contract to begin building in June 2016.

**Lawrence Lile - Environment and Energy Commission recommendations concerning 2015 building codes.**

Lawrence Lile, 7425 E. Route Y, Ashland, Missouri, explained he was a member of the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) and noted the Council would receive a letter and other information regarding the 2015 building codes from the EEC at the next Council Meeting. He noted the EEC was recommending the 2015 International Energy Conservation Code for residential and commercial buildings be adopted verbatim. The codes were written by a national body of experts as part of the International Code Council, and included architects, engineers, economists, builders, and building scientists that looked at projected energy costs to determine the most economic manner in which to build a structure for the building owner. He commented that the City had adopted the residential code verbatim in 2012, and many homes were still being constructed, so he did not agree with the argument that fewer homes would be built with stricter energy code requirements. He explained a structure built with the 2015 commercial energy codes would save 23 percent over the current commercial energy codes enforced within Columbia, and the money saved would stay in town with the property owner. He noted reducing peak demand benefited everyone in the community as it was the most expensive energy purchased, and thus, requiring the construction of efficient buildings was in the best interest of Columbia citizens. He commented that the EEC was also recommending the City adopt the solar-ready requirements of the building codes. This meant providing for space for solar equipment, future piping to an electrical panel, and an electrical panel. The EEC did not feel the solar-ready requirements would result in much of a cost as it only required a sticker on the electrical panel and a sketch showing where the space was located. Buildings without south facing roofs or buildings that were shaded would not have to comply.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**(A) 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.**

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock and Ben Ross, a consultant with Engineering Surveys and Services, provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked for an estimate with regard to how long the trail would be impacted, and whether it would be completely closed for a period of time. Mr. Ross replied a portion of trail users would be closed, but it would not be closed completely and a detour route could be established. They still needed to discuss the detour with the Parks and Recreation Department as those plans had not yet been finalized. The goal was to not have any complete closures and to provide for a detour.

Ms. Peters asked how long it would take to complete both relief sewer projects. Mr. Ross replied he understood the goal was to start work in the winter so there was less of an impact to the trail, but believed it would likely take over a year. Ms. Peters asked about the sequencing of the projects. Mr. Ross replied he did not believe that had been finalized, but understood both projects would be bid at the same time. Mr. Glascock explained staff would like the portion that impacted the trail to be completed in the winter since the trail was generally used less then. The remaining portions would be completed in the summer months. He pointed out one of the reasons for trenchless technology was to limit the impact on traffic.

Mr. Skala asked if trenchless technology was generally more or less expenses than trenching. Mr. Ross replied trenchless was more expensive in terms of pipe construction, but the overall cost with trenching was dependent on the cost of surface restoration. He commented that it would not make sense to utilize trenchless technology through an open grass field, but it would make sense in a downtown neighborhood or street since there were economic costs in addition to construction costs.

Mr. Ross explained Project No. 1 would utilize trenchless technology across the University Power Plant and under Providence Road.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition and agreed this project needed to be completed. She pointed out the MKT Trail was used for transportation and asked that accommodations be made for those that used it in that manner as it connected huge portions of residential areas to the central community where 50 percent of their members worked or attended school. She asked that appropriate detours be made available and signed so people could continue to utilize the trail and knew where to go.

Peter Yronwode, 203 Orchard Court, explained he was primarily concerned with Project No. 1, and commented that while there was some argument with regard to the actual value of this in addressing the larger sewer infrastructure issues primarily in the First Ward, he was satisfied with the way the consultants had handled this project thus far. He commended them for their ecological sensitivity, willingness to accommodate the trail as an important public amenity, and willingness to be forthcoming with him and other citizens. He stated he believed this was a model of how infrastructure issues should be handled within the City. He commented that he had not paid as much attention to Project No. 3 because it had less immediate impact on the ecology, forestry, and wildlife, which were his primary concerns. He noted the MKT was completely polluted with Japanese honeysuckle, and understood there had been some recent efforts by the Parks and Recreation Department staff to reduce or eliminate this invasive species. He thought the elimination of existing

honeysuckle and preventing the reseeding of honeysuckle could be addressed as part of this project since there would be a tremendous amount of land disturbance, and asked the City to consider it for the ecological integrity of the MKT Trail.

Pam Cooper, 403 West Boulevard South, understood this sewer would improve capacity, but was concerned about wet capacity in terms of what would happen downstream where the sewer line from this project would connect to existing sewer lines. She commented that she had reports the City had sent to the Department of Natural Resources, which listed the date, time, and nature of sanitary sewer overflows and basement back-ups that had occurred in relation to rain events, and believed there was a clear pattern of specific manholes associated with the Flat Branch main that blew up frequently during significant rain events. Some of those manholes were adjacent to the MKT Trail and in proximity to the Flat Branch Creek and Hinkson Creek, so overflows contributed to feces in the creeks and on the trail, which the City then had to sanitize. She stated Utility Engineering Supervisor, Steve Hunt, had indicated to participants of a walking tour that the Flat Branch Relief Sewer project would address capacity issues only during dry weather, and asked what would happen with the intensity and frequency of the sewer surcharges that caused the manhole explosions in the lower part of the sewer main past the golf course with the completion of this project and the build out of the downtown student apartments. She wondered if it would stay the same, increase, or decrease.

Mayor McDavid asked Mr. Glascock to respond to the questions of Ms. Cooper. Mr. Glascock explained the City was trying to reduce inflow and infiltration so there was more dry weather capacity. If rainwater infiltrated the sewer system, the capacity would be less in wet weather. The area downstream referred to by Ms. Cooper had a relationship with the Sewer Plant, and it had much greater pumping capacity today than in January due to the way the Plant now operated. Staff now understood how to get more water through the system so fewer manhole lids flew off.

Ms. Peters asked if this meant the manholes would no longer blow. Mr. Glascock replied they would blow less frequently.

Ms. Peters asked if the existing sewer line this project was connected to was smaller in diameter. Mr. Glascock replied no. He explained a 36-inch pipe would connect to two 30-inch pipes downstream.

Mr. Skala asked if these projects would help prevent backflow into residential homes in the First and Fourth Wards. Mr. Glascock replied it was dependent upon whether it was in the influence zone where the Plant could assist, and those areas had not yet been studied. It would not have an effect on Again Street, but would have an effect on the larger trunk lines that ran down the main branches.

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

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 1. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(B) 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.**

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if this sewer would drain much of the area from the East Campus area to Providence Road. Mr. Glascock described the basin area on a diagram.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin.

Mr. Skala understood this project was needed because the existing infrastructure was worn, but asked if it was also driven by growth in the downtown area as increased capacity was needed for the recent high density growth. Mr. Glascock replied capacity would be increased by this project. He pointed out a 2004 study had identified the need for relief sewers and additional capacity then.

Mr. Thomas understood this project was linked to the next two projects, which included a stormwater project and pedestrian access at the Ninth Street and Elm Street intersection. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Ruffin directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 3 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(C) 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.**

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Peters asked if staff was expecting the need to replace more storm sewers in the downtown area. Mr. Glascock replied he thought this was the worst, but noted there were others with the potential of needing to be replaced. He explained the downtown area had not yet been smoke-tested to determine connections, but thought this was likely the oldest since it was the lower area.

Mayor McDavid understood the stormwater box beneath Bangles Bar and Grill would be addressed when development occurred in that area. Mr. Glascock agreed. He commented that he believed boxes such as that one were adequate in terms of handling what they were already handling. The one at Elm Street and Ninth Street was small so it was starting to cave.

Mr. Thomas asked if this stormwater inlet delivered stormwater to Peace Park. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mr. Trapp stated he participated in the walk-through and agreed with Mr. Yronwode in that this had been a great process. He appreciated staff combining these projects as he understood they had different planning horizons, protocols, and rules. He also appreciated staff taking into account the stakeholders, such as the University, and keeping the trees in mind. He felt the process had been very thoughtful, and was pleased it was moving forward.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the Ninth and Elm Drainage Replacement Project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(D) 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.**

Item D was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Bitterman provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if cars could still turn right during the scramble. Mr. Bitterman replied no. He explained pedestrians were not able to cross during the vehicle phase and vehicles would be required to stop during the pedestrian phase. Vehicles would not be able to turn right in the pedestrian phase, so pedestrians would be able to go straight across the intersection or diagonally across the intersection.

Mayor McDavid understood it would not take much to change the signals if necessary. Mr. Bitterman stated the equipment at that intersection was rather old so it would need to be replaced, and pedestrian heads for the diagonal movement would need to be added. It could be changed back rather easily if the pedestrian scramble did not work.

Mr. Skala commented that he was a bit uncomfortable with this concept, and felt signage and education would be needed for all of those involved. He believed the work would have to be remediated if that education was not done.

Ms. Nauser stated she had some of the same concerns. She asked what they were trying to accomplish with this pilot project, whether other intersections would be targeted for a pedestrian scramble, and for the associated costs. She noted the back-in parking pilot project had not been successful due to the lack of education. She was concerned with this being the only location of a scramble, and it causing confusion. Mr. Glascock stated the goal was to determine if pedestrians felt safer when crossing the street during a scramble, and whether the drivers liked and disliked the scramble. He agreed they needed to know the users of the intersection were educated and needed to obtain feedback from them as well. He noted it could turn out like the back-in parking or like the round-a-bout, which was more popular.

Ms. Nauser asked what engineering study showed this was a better pattern. Mr. Glascock replied this was used in many places where there were a lot of pedestrians, and provided Boston, Massachusetts as an example.

Ms. Peters asked why the pedestrian scramble was chosen for particular intersection. She asked if there had been problems with people being hit. Mr. Glascock replied staff was asked by Council to find a location to conduct this pilot project, and this intersection was chosen because it had the most pedestrians. Mr. Thomas explained it was his suggestion, and noted the scramble had a better safety record in terms of pedestrians not being hit by

cars as often. Ms. Peters understood they would not be hit by someone turning right. Mr. Thomas stated that was correct because that conflict would be eliminated. It would eliminate left and right vehicle turns when pedestrian had the permission to walk. They were most effective where there were high volumes of pedestrians. He noted it was easy to change it back to a normal configuration if it did not work. Mr. Glascock pointed out his biggest concern was whether pedestrians would hold.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Syed Ejaz stated he was representing the Missouri Students Association and commented that he was in favor of trying this pilot project. He noted pedestrian safety on campus and in the downtown was one of the biggest issues faced by students. He thought this idea had merit, and would push for it at other intersections around campus if it was shown to be successful.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition and noted she wanted to lend their support to the pedestrian scramble intersection. Those intersections had been implemented in cities across the United States and in other countries for decades, and had generally shown good results. The Ninth Street and Elm Street intersection had both high pedestrian traffic and steady vehicle traffic, so it was an ideal candidate for this intersection redesign. She commented that they would like for this intersection to be studied so they had data for people walking, biking, and driving in order to justify this type of intersection configuration and its use in other areas of the community with high pedestrian traffic. She stated they wanted to the City to ultimately adopt a vision zero policy, which was a goal of zero traffic fatalities or serious injuries across all forms of transportation, and this type of intersection could be a way to achieve that goal. She asked if the sidewalks would be rebuilt to provide pedestrians more space to gather, and whether there had been any consideration to ensuring people on bicycles followed the signals for drivers and did not cross with pedestrians.

Mayor McDavid asked staff to address the questions of Ms. Triplett. Mr. Bitterman replied the corner that had the least amount of space was the Shakespeare's corner, and they thought there would be more space after the redevelopment of that area. He felt there would be room for pedestrians to wait while vehicles traveled through the traffic signal. He thought enforcement would be needed to ensure bicycles followed the same rules as vehicles, and believed they would work with the Police Department in terms of education and enforcement to ensure everyone using that intersection complied.

Mr. Skala asked if there was a possibility of this habit transferring to other intersections that were not designed as a scramble. Mr. Bitterman replied he believed the pavement markings would be so different that people would realize they were at a different configuration of an intersection. He anticipated diagonal markings on the ground, which would not be located at other intersections. He agreed with Mr. Glascock in that the key was to ensure pedestrians would wait while the vehicles went through the intersection. It was difficult at intersections for vehicles turning right or left to make that turn when there were a lot of pedestrians, and this would assist in that situation as long as everyone followed the rules.

Michael Szewczyk commented that he was speaking as an emergency physician at Boone Hospital and noted there had been twelve pedestrian-car accidents at intersections

from October 2014 to June 2015. Eight of those twelve were on campus or on the edge of campus, and seven of the eight were situations where drivers failed to yield to the pedestrian crossing in a crosswalk. He believed this was an ideal location for the scramble and that there was good data to support its benefits. He stated Beverly Hills had utilized these intersections for years, and the ten-year study showed there had been a 66 percent reduction of pedestrian-car accidents over that ten year period. He noted there had been instances where it did not work, and in those cases, that type of intersection configuration was removed. He reiterated he believed this was a good intersection for this pilot project.

Mary Hussmann, 210 Ridgeway Avenue, stated she thought this would be confusing, and even more confusing for the blind, and asked if the sound signals would be utilized at this intersection. Mr. Bitterman replied the project was not yet designed, but they could look into the use of signals with sound. He pointed out most of the new signal installations included audible messages, which would tell a blind person to wait or when it was safe to cross.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, explained he was generally in favor of this pilot project, but was concerned about the amount of sidewalk available to pedestrians. He noted the northeast corner by the Methodist Church had a fairly narrow sidewalk, and wondered if a large group of pedestrians and people in wheelchairs would have room to wait and still be able to get across. He commented that these types of intersections had been located in St. Louis in the late 1950s, but they were removed later when there were fewer pedestrians in the area. He reiterated he thought this was a good idea for this intersection and asked that the northeast corner be revisited to ensure there was room.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, asked if they should consider a walkway over the street instead of a scramble, or change the timing of the lights. He wondered if there would be an increase in the delay in downtown traffic and if there were any statistics. Mr. Bitterman replied staff had existing traffic counts and existing signal timing information. He explained they anticipated a bit more of a delay as a trade-off to safety, but would have to wait to see how it would work once implemented.

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

Mr. Skala believed this was probably worth a try at this location since it was near campus and pedestrians tended to be respected in the area. He thought proper evaluation of this pilot project would be needed as well.

Mr. Trapp understood reconfiguring this intersection in conjunction with the other projects in the area would save \$107,000, so it would only be half of the cost. In addition, this seemed to be a good intersection for the project.

Ms. Nauser commented that she believed pedestrian safety was important, and noted she had fewer concerns after hearing the testimony and staff comments. She stated the City would gain from economies of scale by completing this project along with a few other projects. She was happy this was not permanent and could be reverted back to a normal intersection design if necessary. She pointed out she still received comments regarding round-a-bouts so she thought many citizens would not be happy with this change.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the coordination of the sewer, the stormwater, and intersection redesign projects. He commented that conflicts were currently designed into pedestrian crossings as pedestrians were encouraged to walk when vehicles were turning

right or left. Those turning left were required to look for a gap in traffic while ensuring they did not hit a pedestrian walking parallel at the crosswalk. He felt that was a risky design, and one that had accounted for seven of the eight pedestrian-car accidents at intersections within the past several months. He commented that this was a pilot project and this configuration was in place in at least a dozen locations in the United States and many communities overseas. In addition, research had shown at least a 50 percent reduction in pedestrian-car accidents. He noted the pedestrian scramble design worked better in terms of efficiency in high volume areas, and explained vehicles were sometimes not able to turn left or right when there were a lot of pedestrians creating a backup of vehicles behind them in a normal configuration, so it was possible this would improve the level of service for both pedestrians and vehicles. He asked that audible messaging signals be installed at this location as a part of this project, and stated he looked forward to seeing the data from the project.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the Ninth and Elm Pedestrian Scramble Project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(E) 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.**

Item E was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood the University of Missouri would share in the cost of the sewer line, and asked if the general public would be able to connect to the sewer as future development occurred beyond Discovery Park. Mr. Glascock replied a pump station had been constructed when Discover Park had been developed, so the University would tie into their own pump station. The City's cost was essentially going towards the roadway. Ms. Nauser asked about future development outside of Discover Park. Mr. Glascock replied he thought a private developer could potentially upgrade the pump station at their own cost.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, commented that the funding of the Discovery Drive project at this time was a clear example of misplaced priorities. This was heavily weighted toward economic development even when there was a need to address the issues of regular homeowners as had been heard earlier in the evening. The policies and practices unequally advantaged new development while disadvantaging those in older neighborhoods. Such priorities had impacted Hinkson Creek in a manner that the City, Boone County, and University of Missouri were subject to federal and state mandate by way of the Hinkson Creek Collaborative Adaptive Management Plan. He described the flow of the County House Branch and stated neglect of the Again Street sewer and stormwater pipes had put the health of many more citizens at risk than those just on Again Street. He commented that Twin Lakes had been closed due to excessive levels of e-coli in the past, and wondered if it was a result of the sanitary sewer problems along Again Street. He stated he believed the first priority of the Council should be the protection of public health and welfare, and the \$260,000

City contribution to this project would be more wisely spent on the Again Street sanitary sewer leak and stormwater overflow problems.

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

Mr. Trapp commented that the total project cost was over \$1.2 million while the City's contribution was only \$260,000. In addition, those were road funds that could not be spent for the Again Street sewer. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and explained the money for this project came from the Gans Road interchange project. Mr. Trapp felt this was a good deal for Columbia since the City's contribution was only 20 percent.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with the observations of Mr. Cullimore in that the City had neglected the existing infrastructure in the older parts of the community where homeowners had paid into the utility for decades, but pointed out that was being incrementally addressed. He noted they had raised the one-time impact fee new development had to pay to tie into the system from \$800 to \$1,200 a year ago, and that fee would continue to increase each year to a new total of \$2,400 per home. The \$2,400 would cover about 75 percent of the cost of adding a new home to the sewer system whereas the current amount collected only covered about 25 percent. He thought they were addressing the imbalance and hoped they would implement the changes they had previously discussed.

Mr. Skala agreed the City was incrementally addressing some of the sewer issues and understood the point of Mr. Trapp of sewer funds versus road funds, but stated he would not support this because he did not feel there was enough contribution by the private sector for this kind of economic development when they had people waiting for years to get their issues resolved. He echoed the concerns of Mr. Cullimore in that the City needed to shift its priorities in terms of remediating the problems that affected residences for many years before spending money on new projects.

Mayor McDavid stated he felt this was an opportunity to improve infrastructure at a substantial savings. He noted this was a burgeoning area of high-tech development for the City of Columbia and the University of Missouri, and believed this technology center was community asset. He commented that he would support it.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the construction of the Discovery Drive Roadway and Sewer Extension Project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Ms. Peters stated she planned to support this because she believed it was a good use of dollars and would increase development in that area, which would bring in more money for the City of Columbia.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser and seconded by Mr. Trapp directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the construction of the Discovery Drive Roadway and Sewer Extension Project was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Skala voting no.

**(F) Replacement and upgrade of a water main along Manor Drive, between Broadway and Rollins Road.**  
**B210-15 Authorizing the replacement and upgrade of a water main along Manor Drive, between Broadway and Rollins Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

Item F was read by the Clerk and B210-15 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, understood PVC pipes would be used and noted that could contribute to more leaching of petroleum products in the system. He wondered if the pipe would bust if the land ever shifted. Mr. Johnsen explained the City utilized PVC piping because it was a better in terms of flexibility and noted they were certified for potable water use. He stated he was not aware of it leaching into the water supply. Mr. Elkin stated he knew the smaller ones were flexible, but was unsure of the larger ones.

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

Mayor McDavid stated he was supportive of this project. He noted he had heard comments from people asking why they should support the sales tax to pay to fix roads in the Fifth Ward, and pointed out other people wondered why they should pay sewer fees for areas in the First and Fourth Wards. He explained the reason to pay these taxes and fees was because they were all a part of the community, and they each had an obligation to fix the aging infrastructure affecting others. He stated in this instance he believed they had an obligation to repair the water main as a community.

Mr. Trapp pointed out this was the third or fourth project tonight that involved multiple City entities combining their work to limit disruption and save costs. He thought it made sense to put in the water line, sidewalk, etc. when tearing up a street. He believed this was unique as he had lived in other communities where this did not happen. He also felt it was important because it did not happen by accident.

Ms. Peters asked if City staff had looked at the sewer system on this street. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not know. Mr. Glascock stated sewers did not normally run down a street. They were normally behind houses or in low areas. He commented that he did not know if sewers had been looked into as part of this project, but believed they should be looked into in the future.

B210-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

## **OLD BUSINESS**

**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.**

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked how many poles were on the property. Mr. Teddy replied he thought there were two poles on the property, but noted the applicant's engineer had indicated there was only one. Ms. Nauser asked if they would have to build the sidewalk behind the pole. Mr. Teddy replied it could be curved around the pole and a part of the parking lot could be impacted. He noted they could also ask for the pole to moved, but that would have the same impact on the parking lot. Ms. Nauser understood the cost to move the

pole would be borne by the applicant. Mr. Teddy stated he assumed it would be the responsibility of the applicant.

Mr. Trapp asked if there was a time frame for the undergrounding of the electric utilities. Mr. Teddy replied it was estimated to be a 2020 unfunded project. The sidewalk and undergrounding were in the draft 2016 Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan. Mr. Trapp understood it would be at least five years then.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to propose an amendment that might address some of questions and concerns. He noted the applicant had offered to make a payment in lieu of the sidewalk, and suggested they grant the variance on the condition the payment was made prior to granting the permit. He explained this area would redevelop so they needed to enforce the ordinances that had been put in place to ensure the sidewalk program was adequately funded.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend B180-15 by changing Section 1 so it read “The City Council grants a variance from the sidewalk construction requirements of Section 25-48.1 and Section 24-35 of the City Code as it relates to the construction of sidewalks along a portion of the north side of Business Loop 70 East and east of Providence Road, adjacent to Lot 7 of Barkwell’s Subdivision (405 Business Loop 70 East) on the condition that the property owner pay the City an amount equivalent to the cost of construction of a standard sidewalk at such location in an amount determined by the Director of Public Works. Such payment shall be made by the property owner prior to issuance of any building permit for the property. In the event the property owner disagrees with the cost of construction determined by the Director of Public Works, the property owner may appeal such determination to the City Council, in writing, within thirty (30) days.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mayor McDavid asked if the easements would still be required. Ms. Thompson replied yes.

Ms. Nauser stated she was concerned with fairness because in six years every property owner along that corridor would benefit from taxpayer funded sidewalks and undergrounded utilities. Since this property owner was redeveloping his property earlier, he had to pay for the sidewalk and provide easements. She noted they would also likely purchase easements from other property owners. She commented that she thought this was unfair unless they decided to tax bill the other property owners on that corridor.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed this would set a precedent for any property that redeveloped between now and the time electric lines were placed underground and the sidewalk was constructed. Ms. Nauser commented that she still believed it was inherently unfair since some would get the benefits of taxpayer funded sidewalks.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed it was fair because the policy called for the property owner to build the sidewalk. It was a courtesy to them since their preference to not construct the sidewalks now. He explained he was torn with regard to even granting the variance because he believed there would be some benefit of a sidewalk in that location. Instead of walking in the street, he believed the sidewalk might be utilized there because it was safer. The other question was whether this limited use was worthwhile as he did not want to waste resources either. He viewed this as whether the applicant paid for the

sidewalk now or later because he thought it was fair to require the sidewalk to be built when the property was redeveloped.

Mr. Skala understood the property owner was already agreeable to providing a payment in lieu of building the sidewalk so he would support the amendment.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend B180-15 by changing Section 1 so it read “The City Council grants a variance from the sidewalk construction requirements of Section 25-48.1 and Section 24-35 of the City Code as it relates to the construction of sidewalks along a portion of the north side of Business Loop 70 East and east of Providence Road, adjacent to Lot 7 of Barkwell’s Subdivision (405 Business Loop 70 East) on the condition that the property owner pay the City an amount equivalent to the cost of construction of a standard sidewalk at such location in an amount determined by the Director of Public Works. Such payment shall be made by the property owner prior to issuance of any building permit for the property. In the event the property owner disagrees with the cost of construction determined by the Director of Public Works, the property owner may appeal such determination to the City Council, in writing, within thirty (30) days.” was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting no.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition and explained they were generally not in favor of sidewalk variances, but understood the business owner’s concern with investing a substantial amount of money into a sidewalk that would likely be torn up in the relatively near future. They wanted the sidewalk built but understood the reality of the timing of the situation. They also understood the business owner had been very reasonable in offering to make a payment in lieu of building the sidewalk immediately, such that the funding could be retained by the City and the sidewalk could be built after the electric lines were placed underground. The owner would be in compliance with City ordinances, resources for a sidewalk in this location would not have to be invested twice, and the sidewalk would be built. She suggested the City establish a process for accepting these types of payments for unusual cases like this in the future as it would allow compliance with the sidewalk ordinance, be responsive to individual situations, and allow the sidewalk network to be continually built out, which was intent of the ordinance.

Cody Darr, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court, stated he was an engineer with A Civil Group and was present on behalf of the applicant. He believed Ms. Nauser raised a valid point in that the applicant would prefer not to make a payment, especially when his neighbors would not have to contribute, but he also did not want to build it now for it to only be torn out a few years later. He noted his client would prefer to move forward with this project as soon as possible and was generally in agreement with the amendment.

Mr. Thomas stated he appreciated the willingness of the applicant to work with the City on this issue, and noted it was a part of a greater vision for that part of the Business Loop. He believed this would set a precedent for similar situations, and hoped the City could establish neighborhood districts in the future whereby money collected in cases where a sidewalk was not constructed because of a dead end street, etc. could be used for sidewalks in that same district along an arterial street or other highly used street. He stated he supported the variance with the condition for the payment in lieu of the sidewalk.

The vote on B180-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B217-15 Authorizing a school resource officer agreement with the Columbia Public School District.**

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp understood the memorandum of understanding referred to diversity training provided by the schools for the school resource officers and asked what it involved and how it worked. Officer Edwards replied the training provided by the school was required of school staff members as well. The training was a combination of diversity, equality, and social awareness issues. They discussed ways to relate to students, knowing the goal was educate and help students become better learners. Factors involved in learning were socio-economics, sexual identity, home life, etc. She stated they had to relate to different groups even with personal biases.

Mr. Trapp asked if each school resource officer would attend the diversity and cultural competency trainings of each school. He understood they were held school-wide and not district-wide. Officer Edwards replied she attended all of the meetings at her school because she wanted to educate herself so she was better able to relate to the students and staff. Her school had faculty trainers who trained school staff and teachers on a quarterly basis. In addition, someone from the Board office trained the faculty trainers every quarter.

Mr. Trapp asked if any lessons were learned that could be considered for the training received by the Columbia Police Department. Officer Edwards replied she believed continued education was needed.

Ms. Nauser understood the agreement now consisted of a 50-50 cost share, but since the officers worked at the schools for nine months, she believed the schools should pay more. She noted she would support this agreement, but thought that should be considered for the future.

Mayor McDavid stated he would support this as well. He understood the argument of Ms. Nauser, but pointed out it was an example of proactive policing. It was an opportunity for police officers to interact with youth with the hope of stopping fights before they happened and in developing relationships to keep the youth out of the criminal justice system. He viewed this as a good investment in terms of proactive policing.

Mr. Thomas commented that constituents had brought to his attention the implicit biases everyone had in approaching certain types of people in certain situations. It was under the surface and many people did not realize they had biases prior to taking certain tests. He thought this type of training was valuable in a range of professions to include law enforcement. He understood the Police Department was exploring training opportunities involving cultural competency and implicit bias, which would only strengthen and improve the Police Department.

Ms. Nauser congratulated Officer Edwards on being named Officer of the Year.

Mr. Trapp also congratulated Officer Edwards. He stated he had attended the Police Awards Banquet at which Officer Edwards had been selected and noted it had been a very touching moment. He suggested those with the opportunity attend the banquet in the future. He commented that the City was proud of the work of Officer Edwards and the relationships she was building at Rock Bridge High School. Her importance to that school spoke volumes of the City's relationship with the schools.

Mr. Skala congratulated Officer Edwards for the award as well. He commented that he understood Ms. Nauser's concerns, but pointed out the taxpayers would pay regardless of whether the money came from the City or the schools since both were taxpayer funded entities. He believed proactive policing was a responsibility of the City and School District, and it started in the schools and was well worth the investment.

Mr. Ruffin also congratulated Officer Edwards. He commented that the schools represented a cross section of the community and the teachers and faculty involved in the education of students came from all over the community as well. This was a direct access to respond to the public outcry for more community policing, more police engagement, and building more positive relationships throughout the City. He noted he would support this with great enthusiasm.

Deputy Chief Schlude pointed out the Police Department had recently been chosen by the Department of Justice – COPS program to be one of the first organizations to receive the new procedural justice training, and they hoped to have all supervisors available for that training. Ms. Nauser asked if staff could send more information to the Council with regard to this training. Deputy Chief Schlude replied yes. She noted officers would receive post-hours for this training as well, and believed the Police Department was on a good track in terms of the subject of bias-based policing, procedural justice, unconditional respect, implicit biases, etc.

Mr. Skala commented that they needed to ensure the public was aware of these activities and suggested a formal presentation in the future.

B217-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

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

**B203-15 Approving a major revision to the C-P Plan for Boone County Fire Protection District Station #14 located on the northeast corner of Scott Boulevard and Vawter School Road.**

**B204-15 Approving the Replat and Final Plat of Vesser's Subdivision Plat No. 2 located on the west side of Fifth Street, between Turner Avenue and Conley Avenue; authorizing a performance contract.**

**B205-15 Vacating a utility easement on Lot 201 within Heritage Village, Plat No. 2 located on the southeast corner of Sinclair Road and Southampton Drive.**

- B206-15 Vacating a utility easement on Lot 105 within The Gates, Plat No. 1 located on the east side of Hepscott Court (7302 Hepscott Court).
- B207-15 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to establish a 10-hour parking zone on a portion of the south side of Conley Avenue, between Fourth Street and Fifth Street.
- B208-15 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to transportation fares.
- B209-15 Accepting a donation from the Downtown Community Improvement District for construction of a suspended pavement tree planter and stormwater treatment cell in the downtown area; appropriating and transferring funds.
- B211-15 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B212-15 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B213-15 Authorizing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the development and maintenance of a registry of volunteer health professionals as it relates to the Medical Reserve Corps.
- B214-15 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- B215-15 Appropriating funds for the provision of Title X family planning services as part of the agreement with North East Community Action Corporation.
- B216-15 Appropriating funds for Share the Light Program.
- R121-15 Setting a public hearing: setting property tax rates for 2015 for the City of Columbia.
- R122-15 Setting a public hearing: FY 2016 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- R123-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of a sidewalk along the north side of Clark Lane between Paris Road (Route B) and east of the U.S. Highway 63 Connector, construction of a trail connection on the west side of the Clark Lane bridge continuing south under Clark Lane and Interstate 70 and connecting to the east side of Mehl Road, and reconstruction of driveways to meet ADA requirements, more specifically described as the Clark Lane West Sidewalk and Hinkson Creek Trail Connection project.
- R124-15 Authorizing an agreement with Ultramax Sports, LLC for festivals and events funding under the Tourism Development Program.
- R125-15 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with HDR Engineering, Inc. for surveying and civil engineering services for the Henderson Branch Sewer Extension project.
- R126-15 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for construction phase services for the realignment of Rangeline Road as part of the reconstruction of Runway 13-31 and Taxiway B at the Columbia Regional Airport.

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

## NEW BUSINESS

**R127-15 Authorizing the temporary closure of the westbound vehicular lane on Elm Street between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, the alley between Elm Street and Locust Street, the sidewalk on the north side of Elm Street between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, and shifting sidewalk access from the west side to the east side of Ninth Street between Elm Street and the alley to facilitate the construction of a mixed use building at 225 South Ninth Street.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if there was any precedent of denying a request such as this. Mr. Glascock replied not that he could recall.

Syed Ejaz stated he was with the Missouri Students Association (MSA) and noted he was conflicted on this request. He explained he had been told the bulk of construction would happen at the front end of the project. He commented that he could only be supportive of the request if it was inevitable and necessary, and if the bulk of construction would occur at the front end. If that was the case, he believed it would be best to get it over with before the start of the fall semester, which was August 24. If that was not the case, he requested this issue be tabled until the students were back in town and MSA had the opportunity to further study this situation. He noted many pedestrians traveled that area and pedestrian safety was one of their biggest concerns.

Mr. Trapp asked for clarification. Mr. Ejaz replied he wanted to be assured the closure was necessary for the development, and that the bulk of the construction that would cause safety or logistical concerns would be at the front end of the project. He wanted that work completed prior to the students coming to town. If it did not have to happen now, he would prefer this issue be tabled.

Ms. Peters understood they wanted to close Elm Street in both directions for ten days, so that would be before the students returned. She was not sure there was any way for the majority of the building to be constructed before the students returned, but understood one lane would be opened by then. She agreed they needed to ensure nothing would fall on the heads of students or others in the area, but did not believe this could be done without closing a lane. Mr. Ejaz agreed and noted that was where the inevitability assumption was a factor. If it had to happen, they would deal with it and provide some education.

Mr. Skala commented that structures could be built to protect pedestrians and asked if that was a possibility. Mr. Glascock replied it had been required on Broadway in order to keep the sidewalk open. Mr. Skala suggested that be a condition. Mr. Glascock stated they might have to locate it in some parking areas. Mr. Ejaz stated he would be in favor of a protected walkway.

Mr. Trapp asked if it was necessary to close the lanes for this development. Mr. Glascock replied yes. He believed protection from falling debris was needed since the building would be 5-6 stories tall. He noted Elm Street was narrow in that area as there was no parking along the street, so they would be out in the street. He pointed out they could require a covered pedestrian way on Ninth Street.

Mayor McDavid stated he would support the closures. He understood Elm Street, between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, would be a mess for a year, but noted it would be

better once the work was done. He agreed they should get the two lane closure work completed before the students were back in town. He was confident the builder would likely ensure the work was done within the year because they would want to rent it out next year.

Jack Cardetti, 2865 S. Gopher Drive, explained he was representing McAlester Park LLC and noted this street closure was about public safety. They wanted to protect the public while minimizing the impact on the surrounding community. From August 5-15, they had to cap three old sewer lines in the middle of the road and had to open up a new sewer line, and closing both of those lanes for those ten days would be helpful. The goal was to have that done before the students moved back to Columbia and to then go to only closing one lane. He stated their initial request was to close a half-block off Elm Street completely, but City staff was not agreeable as they felt one lane should remain open. He noted he believed this was a good plan in terms of timing and keeping one lane open. With regard to Ninth Street, there would be a lane shift and parking spots on the west side of Ninth Street would be impacted. In addition, walkable scaffolding would be provided on Ninth Street. Mr. Thomas understood a solid roof would be included as part of the scaffolding. Mr. Cardetti replied yes, and explained it would be similar to what was at Broadway and Tenth Street now.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend R127-15 by changing Section 1 so it read “The City Council hereby authorizes McAlester Park, LLC and Trittenbach Development to temporarily close a portion of the westbound vehicular lane on Elm Street between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, the alley between Elm Street and Locust Street, the sidewalk on the north side of Elm Street between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, and providing covered protected sidewalk access on the west side of Ninth Street between Elm Street and the alley, as shown on “Exhibit A,” from August 5, 2015 to August 1, 2016 to facilitate the construction of a mixed use building at 225 South Ninth Street.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed this was a good example of people working together. He noted Ms. Chadwick, a former Council Member, had e-mailed the Council last night suggesting they be careful in making a decision impacting the students while they were out of town. He commented that he also appreciated Mr. Ejaz and Mr. Cardetti being available to meet to discuss this issue earlier today. He thought they had the support of the MSA to allow the closures, and did not believe these closures would create new congestion as people tended to adapt quickly.

The vote on R127-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R128-15 Authorizing battery bus evaluation program agreements with BYD Coach and Bus Inc. relating to the lease of one (1) 40-foot electric bus and three (3) 30-foot electric buses; transferring funds.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood this lease had a ten year option. Mr. Glascock replied it had a twelve year option on it.

Mr. Skala understood the timing of this lease would allow them to evaluate it in comparison to the CNG buses. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. He explained they only had two large CNG buses in the fleet and that was since April, so they did not yet have comparative data like they did with the diesel fleet.

Mayor McDavid understood the City was obligated to utilize a CNG equivalent to 150,000 gallons, and asked if that would be compromised. Mr. Glascock replied no.

Ms. Nauser asked if there was an estimate of cost savings in terms of fuel and maintenance. Mr. Brooks replied the City could potentially save \$361,000 per year if what they had been told was accurate in terms of the electric buses and if they were to park the four worst performing buses in the fleet, which were not the necessarily the oldest buses in the fleet.

Mr. Thomas thought this was a good opportunity to experiment with this technology and gather data. He understood buses were a good vehicle for electric-fuel technology because the battery could be recharged when breaking. He was excited to be able to obtain accurate data to see how they compared to the diesel and CNG buses.

The vote on R128-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. 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.

- B218-15 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to conflicts of interest and financial disclosure procedures.**
- B219-15 Setting property tax rates for 2015.**
- B220-15 Adopting the FY 2016 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.**
- B221-15 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code as it relates to trade permit fees.**
- B222-15 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.**
- B223-15 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to parking fees for unmetered off-street municipal parking lots and facilities and parking meter hoods.**
- B224-15 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.**
- B225-15 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility connection fees.**
- B226-15 Calling a special election on the question whether to extend the one-eighth of one percent local parks sales tax.**
- B227-15 Approving the Administrative Plat of Creek Ridge, Plat No. 1-A, a Replat of Lots 1-14, 27-31, 34-49 and 76-77 of Creek Ridge Plat No. 1, located on the south side of Old Plank Road and west of Bethel Church Road; authorizing a performance contract; granting continued approval of a variance from the**

Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction subject to conditions.

- B228-15 Approving the Final Plat of On The Ninth At Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 1, a Replat of Lot 3-A of Old Hawthorne Plat No. 1-A, located east of the intersection of Old Hawthorne Drive West and Pergola Drive; authorizing a performance contract.
- B229-15 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Columbia Community Development Corporation II for the purchase of property located at 109, 111 and 113 Lynn Street.
- B230-15 Declaring the need to acquire easements for construction of the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard Project.
- B231-15 Authorizing a right of use permit with McAlester Park, LLC for the construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a private storm sewer and retaining wall in a portion of the Ninth Street and Elm Street rights-of-way.
- B232-15 Authorizing Amendment 3 to the general cooperative agreement with the Boone County Regional Sewer District relating to sewer service within the Midway area and financial participation in the construction of the Henderson Branch Sewer Extension project.
- B233-15 Accepting a conveyance for utility purposes.
- B234-15 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for tobacco control coalition services; appropriating funds.
- B235-15 Appropriating funds received from donations and miscellaneous revenue to the Parks and Recreation Department.
- B236-15 Appropriating funds received from the Columbia Chamber of Commerce relating to the construction of repairs and upgrades to the Thomas G. Walton Building.
- B237-15 Accepting a donation from Boone Electric Cooperative to be used by the Fire Department for the purchase of public education supplies relating to fire prevention; appropriating funds.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP76-15 Substance Abuse Advisory Commission - Recommendations regarding Proposed Amendments to Chapter 4 of the City Code.

REP77-15 Underage Drinking Enforcement.

Mayor McDavid commented that he was not sure some of the violations, such as dancing on bars, were enforceable. Mr. Hollis explained those were already included in the ordinances on the books. Ms. Thompson clarified the ordinances were included, but the chart with the penalties and points violations was new.

Mr. Thomas understood the chart was being proposed and was not currently in effect. Ms. Thompson replied it was proposed by the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission (SAAC), and had not necessarily been vetted by staff. Mr. Thomas understood the general change would be from a somewhat subjective decision by officers to a more quantitative points-based system whereby a particular establishment with multiple violations might receive a more severe penalty.

Chris Hawf, Chair of the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission, stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid suggested they propose this as an ordinance to allow for public comment as they would hear from constituents if there were any unintended consequences.

Mr. Skala understood it had not been vetted by staff, and suggested they obtain an opinion and recommendation from staff as well.

Ms. Thompson stated the Law Department and the Police Department would likely want the opportunity to review this as it could create some difficulties with enforcement.

Mayor McDavid asked for a report from staff about the advisability of these recommendations. Mr. Matthes replied he thought a review by staff would be the best way to move forward at this time.

Mayor McDavid noted the City had a small Police Department, and he was not sure they could increase alcohol enforcement at this time. He wondered if there was a role for the University of Missouri Police Department since a lot of violations involved University of Missouri students. He thought they may want to discuss this with the University of Missouri to see if they might want to participate.

Ms. Nauser commented that the City had trouble with nuisance bars around 2006-2007, and had not had a mechanism to shut down those bars at that time. She noted she recalled reviewing ordinances in Kansas City and asking staff for a report to see if Columbia could do something similar. Although there had not been many problems recently, she thought they might to consider this type of system. She commented that one point for a nuisance seemed to be low.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed the proposed chart was a quantitative way to assess the level of problems certain establishments created. He noted he participated in a 10:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. police ride-a-long on a Friday night about a year ago, and for the last couple hours, they essentially went back and forth from the Tenth Street and Cherry Street intersection and the Police Station trying to break up fights and address bad behavior. He thought someone needed to be responsible, and felt the bars could do better in not selling alcohol to someone that was already drunk and not encouraging that type of behavior.

Mayor McDavid noted REP77-15 was related to this discussion and had illustrated the difficulty and costs associated with compliance checks. He pointed out students were pretty resourceful in creating fake IDs so it was a challenge.

Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the work of the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission as this was very thoughtful and comprehensive, and noted he was looking forward to the input from staff. He pointed out there were benefits to growth in the downtown, but there were also costs, to include behavioral costs in terms of intoxicated students and infrastructure costs in terms of the availability of officers to deal with bad behavior. He understood the City had to grow in terms of vitality, but explained they also needed to consider the associated costs.

Ms. Nauser commented that she wished law enforcement would place more efforts on tracking down the people making fake IDs because it was difficult for business owners to differentiate a real ID from a fake ID many times. She noted students were providing personal information to these people, which could lead to identity fraud as well. She stated

she would support more enforcement at the federal, state, and local level to go after those that created the fake IDs.

Ms. Peters asked how the downtown business owners felt and whether they would assist with the bad behavior within the downtown area. Mayor McDavid replied he thought it was dependent on the point of view. He did not believe landlords were happy about this behavior, but bar owners made their profits from selling alcohol. He thought bar owners felt they did enough already, but others did not necessarily agree. Ms. Peters understood bartenders were taught to spot people that had already had enough to drink.

Deputy Chief Schlude stated the biggest contributing factor was the amount of people that were still being served when they were clearly intoxicated. A significant assault occurred a few weeks ago, and more recently a police officer was assaulted. They needed to figure out how to get people to stop serving intoxicated individuals. She pointed out a difficulty was that many people came to the bars already intoxicated.

Ms. Peters did not feel this would be good for the reputation of the City if it continued.

Mr. Skala asked if other benchmark cities with universities had been reviewed in creating this report. Mr. Hawf replied the SAAC had looked at Kansas City, Missouri and Oxford, Mississippi.

Mayor McDavid noted binge drinking was substantially more frequent now than it was a generation ago, so he believed the culture needed to be changed. He thanked the Police Department for their efforts and the SAAC for their recommendations, and thought they would need to move forward and try to obtain assistance from the University of Missouri and downtown businesses.

Mr. Thomas understood a point score would be assigned to any establishment selling alcohol to those already drunk under the proposed system, and asked if it was an infraction at this time. Deputy Chief Schlude replied it was difficult because the officer would have to physically see the bartender selling alcohol to someone that was already intoxicated. Mr. Thomas asked if a testimonial from a member of the public would be adequate. Deputy Chief Schlude replied possibly, but explained that person might not be trained to tell if someone was intoxicated. A police officer would be trained.

Ms. Nauser suggested more outreach to the business and bar owners. She did not believe bar owners would want to take on the liability, and it was likely more of an issue of training staff. She noted there was a peer issue as well since those serving the alcohol were generally in the same age group as those being served, so it would require them to stand up to their peers.

Mayor McDavid commented that another issue was that if enforcement increased downtown, it would drive underage drinking elsewhere, and he did not think they wanted these kids to drive while under the influence.

Mr. Trapp noted both reports showed what the City was up against as there were declining resources in enforcement along with a culture that was moving toward more extreme forms of substance abuse. He appreciated the work of SAAC and agreed with Mayor McDavid in that this would take the assistance of everyone in terms of prevention efforts, treatment efforts, ordinance changes, limiting drink specials, etc. He pointed out there were best practices backed by science, and felt they should do something as they put

the City's reputation at risk by not doing anything. He understood the University of Missouri felt there was connection between alcohol consumption and sexual assault, and since they were an economic driver, this was a threat to the economy. He thought they should continue to chip away at the problem in an effort to eventually change the culture.

**REP78-15 Barberry Park Neighborhood Connectivity Plan.**

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas stated he had asked for this report because he wanted to ensure the City was adhering to its own ordinances, and believed this showed the sidewalks through the park would provide the service the area needed. He thought they would be agreeable to a private individual that was required to build a sidewalk to build it through their property instead due to topological difficulties, etc. He reiterated the sidewalk through the park would provide all of the service that was needed in the area.

Mr. Skala commented that there were provisions in the ordinances that would accommodate other solutions besides sidewalks next to the street, and this would fit within that situation.

Mr. Griggs pointed out this had been done at Stephens Lake Park as the sidewalk went into the park because Walnut Street was an unimproved street.

**REP79-15 Water and Light Advisory Board - Water and Electric Rate Impacts on Middle Class Families.**

Mayor McDavid commented that the way the City billed for electricity pre-dated them all. He appreciated the report, but still did not feel his question was answered and understood it might not be possible to answer. The City had a tiered system, which appeared to include an incentive to encourage conservation, but he was not sure it really encouraged conservation. He explained the presentation for the electric ballot issue had indicated a summer rate of 822 kWh, which he did not believe was correct for a middle class family in a 2000 square foot home with air conditioning. The City was saying its rates were essentially the same as Boone Electric because they were for the first 822 kWh, but it was \$175 for a Columbia customer and \$148 for a Boone Electric customer if at 1500 kWh. This system made it difficult to say the cost of electricity in Columbia. He commented that he believed the students were being subsidized with the increase after a certain kilowatt hour because they would pay less per kilowatt hour than middle class families since they lived in smaller spaces.

Mr. Thomas agreed it was difficult to know how much electricity cost because there were so many confounding factors with regard to how to equitably build for electricity. It was a very complex problem to solve.

Ms. Peters asked if the City billed the same as Boone Electric for the first 822 kWh. Mayor McDavid replied yes, and explained the rates diverged soon after. Mr. Johnsen stated the City was cheaper than Boone Electric until the 750-800 kWh point and was higher after that because the City's tiered rate structure charged more for higher usage levels.

Mayor McDavid commented that City charged the same as Boone Electric for 822 kWh, but that was irrelevant for the average family because more electricity was used in the

summer at higher rates. Mr. Johnsen agreed. Mayor McDavid understood no one was leaving Columbia due to its electric rates, and the rates on the east coast were higher.

Mr. Matthes pointed out the utility was at significant financial risk due to the current system. It was a cost-based utility, so the costs needed to be recouped, and because less was charged at the beginning, it had to be made up at the end at the higher usage levels, which tended to occur in the summer. If it was a beautiful summer, the utility lost millions. Mayor McDavid pointed out it was not known how much was lost until the end of the fiscal year either. Mr. Matthes reiterated the current rate structure put the City at a financial risk.

Ms. Peters asked if staff was recommending they charge more for the first 822 kWh. Mr. Matthes replied it had been adjusted slightly this past year. Mayor McDavid explained the base charge was increased. Mr. Matthes noted they would soon be able to see the impact that adjustment had, and stated the issue might have a lot to do with the City's fiscal year as well.

Ms. Nauser understood this fluctuation was difficult in terms of bond ratings since the City relied on peak usage months. Mr. Matthes stated the City had to explain its structure since it was not the industry standard.

Ms. Nauser asked how much of an impact the renewable energy mandate had on the rates. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought it was a little over one percent now. Mayor McDavid noted the mandate would increase, so it would be at three percent when they had to purchase more wind.

Mr. Johnsen reiterated the comments of Mr. Matthes in that the rate structure made the City's revenues more weather dependent, and noted the City was an outlier within the State of Missouri in terms of its rate structure. Springfield, Missouri had an inverted rate structure in the summer as well, but Columbia was the only utility that had it in the winter.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed people changed their behavior based upon a rational analysis of their bills. He noted he knew a lot of people that delayed using the air conditioning and adjusted the temperatures to make their utility bills more manageable in the summer. He explained that when he decided to add a solar array, he had calculated the paybacks so he knew he would get his money back. He thought more people would do these things if they maintained their inverted rate structure, and believed it was a badge of honor to be an outlier in Missouri in terms of energy conservation issues.

Mayor McDavid commented that they would still have peak demand even when moving to solar as it would still be warm in times the sun was not out, which was why the base charge needed to increase.

Mr. Skala noted this was also an issue of building codes, and explained many people wanted to purchase or rent energy efficient homes. He thought those were more permanent roles for this issue than even renewable energy.

Mayor McDavid understood they did not have a metric for energy efficiency in rental properties. Mr. Thomas thought they published the addresses and bills of rental properties so it could be researched. Mayor McDavid wondered how often that information was reviewed and utilized.

Mr. Johnsen pointed out the City had a program called the Energy Score and it was starting to become popular in the realty and renter communities. He thought that might address some of these issues.

Mr. Thomas suggested the University of Missouri educate students during their first year as they usually stayed in dorms and moved out during their second year of school. Mayor McDavid thought the Missouri Students Association should consider that as an education program.

Ms. Nauser pointed out that was one of the jobs of the University-City liaison in Fort Collins.

**REP80-15 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 Street, stated he believed empathy could have a big impact on violence.

Mr. Elkin commented that in addition to alcohol, they needed to look into the use of legal and illegal drugs. He suggested they educate high school and college students in terms of the need to eat if one was drinking, how many drinks it took before someone was drunk, etc.

Mr. Elkin asked the Council to continue to try to help get the homeless off of the streets.

Mr. Elkin understood Lowe's would soon have a 1250 watt solar powered generator. He also understood clear solar panels had been developed, which would help convince more people to use them.

Mayor McDavid commented that it made sense to him to not require sprinkler systems to be erected in buildings that would be torn down in the near future, and asked if a statement of intent, waiver, or other document was needed to grant a variance to that requirement.

Mr. Matthes asked Council to let staff review what was allowed by ordinance and to provide ideas. He pointed out the fraternities and sororities had received at least five years of notice, and they were now asking for another 3-4 years.

Mr. Trapp stated there had been a number of shots fired incidents on Bodie Drive, and he had received two interesting e-mails regarding the issue. He understood 18 shots had been heard since last August, and 12 of those occurred this year. In addition, 10 of those 12 had occurred since mid-June. He also understood the only entry access point was at the intersection of Edenton Boulevard and Bodie Drive, which turned into International Drive to connect to Route 763. A question of a constituent was whether it would be possible for the City to install a traffic camera at the intersection of Edenton Boulevard and International Drive at the southwest corner that would look northeast and capture all vehicles coming in and out of the subdivision. He commented that his intern, Zach Weston, had spoken with the residents, who were very supportive. He explained there was a divide in the area between those in single-family housing and those in rental housing, and these incidents affected

property values and the supply of affordable housing. He pointed out he was not a fan of camera solutions, but it had been proposed by a resident in the area and had widespread support. He asked for a staff report as to the feasibility and cost of cameras at this access point.

Mayor McDavid noted security cameras were not very expensive and thought the neighborhood association could place a sign up indicating video surveillance was underway without any cameras. Mr. Trapp explained the neighborhood was not organized, but he and his intern were trying to determine if a neighborhood watch or something similar was possible.

Mr. Trapp commented that tomorrow was Election Day for the continuation of a sales tax to fund the City's Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan. He understood a local blogger had indicated the City was flush with cash and did not need this infusion of funds. He explained the City needed sizable reserves to manage the progressive electric rate structure so they were able to lose \$5 million while still being financially health. In addition, they had unfunded liabilities, such as pensions. He noted that when the City had surpluses, they targeted projects in the strategic plan. He thought they did a good job with the people's money, and the use of these sales tax funds would reflect the priorities of citizens. He encouraged Columbia citizens to vote tomorrow.

Mr. Ruffin stated he was encouraged by the e-mail received from Mr. Glascock informing Council that staff would place a short liner in the sewer pipe, which would fix the hole, and asked when that would be done. Mr. Glascock replied it would happen this week. He pointed out this would not completely fix the problem because the sewer ran underneath the house and the tap went to the basement floor, and there was no way to get to it without chiseling out the concrete floor. Staff was looking into moving the sewer line away from the house next year, but the tap would be her responsibility unless Council directed otherwise.

Mr. Glascock pointed out the photos in the video shown earlier in the meeting were due to a five inch rain.

Ms. Peters understood the hole would be fixed, and asked about the entire drainage issue in the area. Mr. Glascock replied that was where the drainage naturally flowed, and it was one of the reasons the City had purchased one house. He had been told the water had flowed through the basement windows of that home. Ms. Peters asked if that house had been at 1107 Again Street and was the one that had been torn down. Mr. Glascock replied yes, and explained that made room for the stream to go through. Ms. Peters understood it did not resolve the problems for the house next door. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mayor McDavid understood it really was a stream. Mr. Glascock stated it was where the drainage flowed. Ms. Peters understood the sewer was under the house. Mr. Glascock stated the sanitary sewer was under the house. Ms. Peters understood it was not under the house that had been torn down. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and noted it was underneath 1105 Again Street. He explained the City had addressed a stormwater problem with the purchase of 1107 Again Street. Ms. Peters asked if the City had a plan for fixing the sewer problem. Mr. Glascock replied the City had a plan, but pointed out he could not guarantee it would completely resolve the problem because it was too close to the floodplain.

He noted the tank basement was actually below the floodplain, so the home would likely still have flooding problems.

Ms. Nauser understood the problems were effectively due to the flooding issues. Mr. Glascock replied that was correct. He explained the water came from the old Nowell's property in that direction.

Ms. Peters understood there was not a plan to resolve the problem. Mr. Glascock stated they would try to fix what they could, but he reiterated he could not guarantee it would be 100 percent resolved. It might flood again during another five inch rain. Ms. Peters understood there were more drainage issues than only fixing the hole in the sewer pipe. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He noted they could construct more detention basins, and explained money was coming to the stormwater utility now so they would have to prioritize projects and get to this when possible based on that priority. He questioned whether they needed to plan for a five-inch rain, seven-inch rain, etc., and noted it was likely more rain would come than had been planned for in the design of the project. The area would always flood.

Mr. Matthes explained the fundamental problem was that the neighborhood was built in a creek bed, and would not be allowed to be built today, especially with basements.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been concerned when accommodating the downtown area due to recent growth trends that they were pushing projects involving back-ups down the list. He asked if there was any type of remediation for the back-ups as it was a public health issue. Mr. Glascock thought the property owner could install a grinder pump to force the water out, but the issue was that the basement floor would need to be jack-hammered out to get to the lateral. It was not a good situation. Mr. Skala asked who was potentially liable for this situation. Mr. Glascock replied the City was liable for the main, which would be lined, and the property owner was liable for the tap per ordinances. He noted another issue would be how they would get the lateral to a new main if the main was moved.

Mr. Skala asked who would be liable if someone became seriously ill due to back-ups. Mr. Matthes replied that was tough to answer as it was dependent on where personal responsibility met the good of the community, and everyone had differing abilities when it came to personal responsibility.

Mr. Skala suggested they consider these issues as a budget item in the upcoming budget for public safety purposes. Mr. Glascock pointed out they would line the sewers in the County House Branch area next year, which would help with inflow and infiltration issues. He reiterated the issue was that the sewer was underneath the house so it would be a tough fix for both the City and property owner.

Ms. Peters understood the lateral needed to be moved from underneath the house, and they needed to address the issue of raw sewage coming from the pipes. Mr. Glascock stated he assumed the foundation drain was hooked to the sewer, so when it rained, the foundation drain filled the lateral and the main creating the back-up into her home. There were multiple problems for all of the homes along Again Street.

Mr. Skala asked if the City had data on reported back-ups for individual residential homes. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mr. Skala asked for a report showing the properties that had repeated problems so they could identify areas in the City that needed attention. Mr.

Glascock replied staff had previously provided that information. It was on a map and showed basement back-ups, overflows, etc. Mr. Skala asked for another copy. Mr. Glascock replied staff would provide it.

Mr. Matthes reiterated it was frustrating as many variables were involved, and they had all inherited the problem due to the way the building was designed and constructed. They attempted to resolve the issue previously, but they now had a next level problem with the amount of rain that tended to now fall. He noted the City had invested \$70 million into the sewer treatment facility so they were now able to try to move the water through the pipes faster. In addition, they were replacing ancient pipes where possible and continuing with inflow and infiltration work. He believed these three actions would result in major improvements throughout the City, but noted he was not sure it would completely resolve the issues on Again Street since the area was in a floodplain.

Mr. Thomas explained HOME funding was under great threat in the United States Senate. He understood one bill would cut those funds by 93 percent, which would reduce the allocation to Columbia from \$369,000 to \$23,000. He understood staff had already met with Senator McCaskill's office, but thought the Council should send a letter to its delegates explaining how this cut would impact the City in terms of affordable housing.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to draft a letter urging the delegation to oppose these cuts for Council to sign. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas commented that he wanted the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure to reconsider its scope of work. The Council amended its scope of work when the Task Force was established so they would only look at sewer, stormwater, and downtown electricity. He understood the concern was due to the fact the City already had a Water and Light Advisory Board, which was involved with the policies and operations of the electric and water utilities, and they did not want overlap, but he believed the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure operated at a different level. He also felt the City should have a sewer and stormwater board similar to the Water and Light Advisory Board, which might be recommended by the Task Force. He thought the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure should look at all four utilities equally in terms of long term plans and funding options.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the system being created by the Community Development Department to track the implementation progress of the Comprehensive Plan, and asked when that would be live on the website. Mr. Matthes replied he was not certain. Mr. Thomas suggested similar systems be created for task forces. He pointed out the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had 9-10 recommendations, and some had implemented, but there was a concern that the others would just languish. He recommended this system be developed for the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, the Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety, and the Mayor's Task for on Infrastructure so the public could view how Council and staff moved forward with those recommendations. He thought it would also help in the creation of specific recommendations by the task forces that could be implemented as they did not want vague or general recommendations.

Mr. Skala commented that it had been a custom of Mayor McDavid to appoint council members as ex-officio members to task forces, and asked if he would be amenable to thinking about that for the Mayor’s Task Force on Infrastructure. Mayor McDavid replied the Task Force had a strong chair and the meetings were public so any of them could attend. He noted the first part of their work would be analysis, and they could determine how to proceed afterwards. He explained it would all lead to policy decisions by the Council, and reiterated that he believed the Blue Ribbon Commission needed to be the Council. He stated he expected the Task Force to be strongly supported by staff, and wanted the Task Force to help put all of the information together as it was all located in different reports.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk