

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
NOVEMBER 16, 2015**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, November 16, 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 November 2, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nauser.

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

Mr. Thomas asked that B320-15 be moved from the consent agenda to old business and R180-15 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B320-15 moved to old business and R180-15 moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Thomas.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

Mr. Skala commented that he would like to extend the deadline for applications to the Planning and Zoning Commission for another month to allow more choices due to the importance of the Commission.

Mr. Skala made a motion to extend the deadline for applications for the Planning and Zoning Commission vacancy for another month. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin.

Mayor McDavid stated he would vote against the motion since the vacancy had already been advertised. He agreed it was nice to have multiple applicants, but noted the applicant was qualified. As a result, he stated he would vote against delaying the appointment.

Mr. Trapp noted he agreed with Mayor McDavid in that they had a good candidate that had applied. He pointed out each of them had the opportunity to reach out to people throughout the City they felt would do a good job when no one had applied last month, which he had done with Mr. Toohey.

Mr. Skala explained he was not attempting to take anything away from Mr. Toohey as he believed Mr. Toohey was a qualified applicant. In the past, it had been competitive in that they had 8-9 candidates and had conducted interviews. As a result, he was surprised there had not been any candidates the previous month and only one this time. He stated he had

hard time understanding the reason for the lack of interest. He thought and extension would allow the opportunity for people that had not heard of the opening to offer themselves up for nomination.

Ms. Nauser commented that she would not support extending the application period because she believed they had a qualified candidate. She understood the lack of applicants was due to the Council continually voting in opposition to the recommendations of the Commission, which was frustrating to the members.

Mr. Skala stated he believed the City Council had an obligation to the Planning and Zoning Commission to explain any differences of opinion, but they did not have to accept the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Ruffin to extend the deadline for applications for the Planning and Zoning Commission vacancy for another month was defeated by voice vote with only Ms. Peters, Mr. Ruffin, and Mr. Skala voting in favor of the motion.

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

**BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION**

Patrie, Jason, 2800 Pepper Tree Lane, Ward 6, Term to expire July 31, 2016

**COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION**

LeMieux, Madeleine, 623 Bluffdale Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2018

**PERSONNEL ADVISORY BOARD**

Barth, Jennifer, 2803 Pine Tree Lane, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2018

Williams, Mike, 5001 Betty Jean Way, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2018

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

Toohy, Brian, 3306 Snow Leopard Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire May 31, 2017

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Glyn Laverick - Avenue of the Columns streetscape improvements.**

Mayor McDavid noted Mr. Laverick had withdrawn his request to speak.

**Mark Farnen - High voltage transmission line project - route, pole placement and impacts.**

Mr. Farnen, 103 E. Brandon Road, stated he was representing residents at the Village at Bedford Walk, Gentry Estates, Bethel Ridge Estates, and JES Holdings, and listed the issues associated with the timing and process of the high voltage transmission line project. He believed the report, which would be discussed later in the meeting, did a fairly good job of showing how the project had progressed, but it did not show the nature of the public input at the meetings. There was not a general description of the comments, a list of sample verbatim statements, copies of comment cards, etc. As early as 2011, enough questions had been posed that additional options were considered. He understood the survey showed support for the multiple Option B routes, and that those routes were less expensive. In

addition, other details had not been presented to the public until September 30, 2015, which was well after the Council had adopted the conceptual route of Option A. He stated they did not feel they had come into this process late as comment cards were being passed around at the September 30, 2015 meeting for input, and they were hoping their concerns would be considered only 1-2 months later. He explained there had not been a lot of details available with regard to many aspects of the project when the conceptual ideas had been brought forward. Decision making had been incremental and conceptual, and many people were now not in favor of the project as more details were made available. They believed criteria, such as proximity to residential structures, schools, and churches, aesthetic and environmental impacts, and the impact to property values, needed to be taken into consideration. He noted these concerns had been raised early in the process and were being raised again, and they hoped the Council would consider those concerns. The report later on the agenda indicated that it might be too late, but they disagreed. He understood there was concern that a change could affect the City's bond rating, and did not feel that was possible unless they exceeded the budget, did not charge appropriate rates for the cost of the project, or defaulted on the bond payment. He pointed out Options B and B-2 were also less expensive so he not believe the other two management issues would likely occur. He understood there was a concern that too much money had already been spent on Option A. Per the report, \$7.1 million had already been spent, but \$1.5 million was for site acquisitions and could be used in any scenario. Another \$2.3 million was for substation equipment, and \$3.3 million was for engineering, but those costs were not exclusive to Option A. He commented that they would likely break even with Option B or Option B-2 if a change was made now. He noted Option A was the most expensive without considering property values, health and safety concerns, etc.

**Detelina Marinova - High voltage transmission line project.**

Ms. Marinova commented that she represented citizens concerned about the evolution of the transmission line project, and asked Council to reconsider the route selected. She stated she did not believe the Council had been presented with complete information on the project at the time of the vote as there was now new information due to the evolving plans. She pointed out the look of the power lines had not been made clear to the community until the end of September, and that had not been presented to Council when they voted on the route. The poles would be 6-8 feet in diameter creating a very different visual impact. She understood an interested parties meeting had been held, but noted it had not been advertised to the public at-large as only people within 250 feet of the lines were invited. She understood a survey had been provided to Columbia Water and Light customers, but pointed out the survey did not explicitly indicate high voltage lines that were normally seen along highways would be involved. A layperson, like her, would assume transmission lines meant the lines associated with wooden telephone poles seen throughout the community. In addition, the response rate was low at only 1.3 percent of residents, and underrepresented the most impacted residents. A large portion of impacted residents were actually Boone Electric Cooperative customers, and they had not received the survey. She commented that she had concerns about the community impact decision matrix as location near a school was given the same or a lower weight than the lines crossing through a wooded area. She felt this had

distorted the final score of the decision matrix. She understood staff had recommended Option A only because no particular option had significantly less of a public impact, and did not believe that was true due to the weighing of issues in the matrix. She pointed out Option A would pass by five schools, nursing homes, pre-schools, and hospitals as well as residential areas. Option B involved more farmland and fewer residences. In addition, no schools, nursing homes, or hospitals would be impacted. Option B-2 had a much lower impact on the community since it went further out. She stated Option A also ignored a resolution passed by every parent-teacher association in the Columbia Public School District to keep lines at least 300 feet from schools. She understood all options provided for the same capacity, but Option A was significantly more expensive. In addition, Option A would have to be revisited in 10-20 years because the segment from Mill Creek to McBaine would not be built at this time. Options B and B-2 were the least expensive and would be completed in their entirety. She provided a petition representing 1,200 citizens opposing Option A. She also asked those in support of the petition to stand, and approximately 55 people stood. She asked the Council to adopt an adequate solution with the least negative impact on the community. She commented that although the routes were in Wards 4, 5, and 6, every ratepayer in Columbia would be impacted by the decision, so it was an issue for all of Columbia.

**Mary Hussmann - Information and options instead of red light cameras.**

Ms. Hussmann, 201 Ridgeway Avenue, provided a handout and stated she appreciated the decision of Council to not renew a red light camera contract as she believed the majority of people across the United States and Columbia did not trust red light or speed cameras to be fairly timed. She also believed the intrusive cameras were more about revenues than public safety. In fact, when citizens had been allowed to vote on those devices, automated red light and speed cameras had failed by as much as 86 percent with only a few exceptions. She stated she was happy the City chose not to proceed with the old method of taking a picture of the driver and the license plate because it would place police officers at desks in an attempt to match red light driver photos to license photos and because it was not an equal system either. If she ran a red light in her car, the photos would likely match and she would be issued a ticket, but if she ran a red light in a friend's car, the photos would not match and she would not be issued a ticket even though she should be issued a ticket. She believed laws should apply equally and fairly to all drivers, which only occurred when a police officer saw the violation and immediately ticketed the driver. She pointed out the City had ticketed based on title from August 2013 through December 2013, and asked the Council to wrap up the red light camera discussion by refunding the 159 people that paid a title ticket fine. She explained the Supreme Court decided red light penalties by title ticketing, which involved only taking a photo of the license plate, was illegal. She noted the City had dismissed the 374 title tickets that had not been paid, and thought the people that had paid their fines should be refunded. She understood the City was working on a refund policy, which she hoped the Council would support if it refunded the full \$120 to those ticketed by title. She suggested the City also explore ways to lessen red light violations and make intersections safer as she understood most people that ran red lights tended to do so within a

half-second of the traffic light turning red, and increasing the length of a short yellow light to meet proposed standards could reduce the running of red lights by 30-50 percent. She thought they should also consider a two-second red light from both directions so intersections were safely cleared.

**Suzan Franck - Structural racism and how it manifests in our city.**

Ms. Franck, 627 Bluffdale Drive, explained she was a college algebra instructor at the University of Missouri and a licensed clinical social worker with a small private practice in counseling. She had lived in Columbia since age one, and the health and well-being of the town mattered greatly to her. She believed recent events at the University of Missouri had earned attention in the national media due in large part to a failure of University leadership to acknowledge, understand, and address the structural racism in existence on the University of Missouri campus. She stated students had been forced to take extreme steps to gain attention when they felt unheard in their attempts to address those urgent needs. She felt acknowledging, understanding, and addressing structural racism in the larger City of Columbia was needed just as urgently as on the University of Missouri campus. The ability of City leadership to listen and respond avoided the need for drastic attempts to be heard and expensive litigation in the future. At this juncture, an understanding of structural racism as a concept, how it played out in the present, and the history of its development in City institutions, was needed. The ability to have discussions using a common vocabulary and knowledge base was also needed. She agreed with the Interim President of the University of Missouri Systems in that education was needed. She stated structural racism was used to describe the ways in which history, ideology, public policies, institutional practices, and culture interacted to maintain a racial hierarchy that allowed the privileges associated with whiteness and disadvantages associated with color to endure and adapt over time. While only a minority of Americans today would openly say they sanction racism or consciously engage in practices that maintain structural racism, many benefited from its existence and helped to maintain it as they followed the conventions of society and participated in its normal routines. In hundreds of ways, Americans in their everyday lives and roles sustained racial hierarchy. She believed they all needed to understand the racialized cultural and historical context in which institutions and individuals were unavoidably imbedded, and realize that structural racism differed from overt discrimination in that no individual intent was necessary. She suggested looking at the history of Columbia, which included the impact of bulldozing of the black business district in the name of urban renewal as that act only served to segregate an already segregated community, creating an enduring breach of trust for many in the black community in a power structure that did not appear to have their best interest at heart. When groups did not interact, their knowledge of one another was less likely to be based on personal experience and more likely to be informed by hearsay, media portrayals, and cultural stereotypes. The lack of genuine interpersonal contact contributed to a psychological distancing to those that were perceived as “other,” and the power and resources in one segment of the community were less likely to flow in an equitable fashion. She commented that current decisions perceived by some as race neutral could be seen as examples of structural racism, and provided as an example the decision to build a new basketball facility

near the private Catholic High School where kids often owned cars or had parents that could get them to facilities rather than in Ward 1 where kids who might have difficulty accessing transportation could walk to it. Another example was the failure of the City to place as priority the implementation of the recommendations of the Mayor’s Task Force on Community Violence as this could be seen as the continued marginalization of the needs of African-Americans that had occurred throughout history. She stated the Government Alliance on Race and Equity told a story of cities and counties that had begun using the concept of structural racism to create solutions for social equity, and a guide published by them earlier this year detailed wonderful examples of how communities, similar in size to Columbia, had prioritized these issues by using the lens of structural racism to create a tailored approach to address inequities in the City. She hoped Columbia was at a teachable moment, and that the City would work in conjunction with leaders of the University of Missouri to begin a conversation that could lead to fundamental change.

**Jennifer Erickson, Columbia Access Television - Updates on current activities/outreach.**

Ms. Erickson stated she was the Executive Director of Columbia Access Television (CAT), and thanked the City for approving a budget that included support for CAT and community media within Columbia. She updated the Council on the happenings at CAT, which included a new show called *Arts Focus* that would be done in collaboration with the Office of Cultural Affairs and the arts groups that received funding from the City, a new program on grief awareness involving digital storytelling for at-risk youth in collaboration with the University of Missouri, and the *Making a Difference* show that focuses on local non-profit organizations. She explained CAT was a 501(c)(3) and City funding for CAT had decreased from \$200,000 to \$50,000 over the last few years, so monetary support from the public would help keep community media strong in Columbia and build upon what had been created. She noted CAT would hold a red carpet screening of new, locally produced public service announcements on Wednesday, December 16 at 5:30 p.m. at their studios at Stephens College, and would hold a CAT-telethon on Thursday, December 17, 2015 from 4:00 – 8:00 p.m. in reference to CoMo Gives. She stated they could be found on Mediacom Channel 85 or 80.3, Centurylink Channel 98, and Charter Channel 983, and explained they also streamed content on their website. In addition, programs could be seen on their YouTube channel. She commented that CAT was an independent community media center that empowered community members and local non-profits to share their diverse voices and learn new and innovative media skills using high-tech equipment and other media technology.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**(A) Replacement and upgrade of water mains along a portion of Sixth Street between Elm Street and Broadway, and transferring all fire hydrants and customer services along a portion of Broadway between Fourth Street and Seventh Street. B321-15 Authorizing the replacement and upgrade of water mains along a portion of Sixth Street between Elm Street and Broadway, and transferring all fire hydrants and customer services along a portion of Broadway between Fourth Street and Seventh Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

Item A was read by the Clerk, and B321-15 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the need for the project was due to the deterioration of the existing water main and because the existing water main was not large enough to serve the current customer base. Mr. Williams stated this project, which had been identified in the 2008 time frame, would increase fire flow and water availability, and would be constructed now in order to coordinate with the sewer project in the same area. Mr. Thomas asked if this main would serve a larger number of customers than the original main. Mr. Williams replied that at the time of installation, it would serve the same number of customers. It would have the ability for a greater capacity in the area, but they would only be transferring the existing customers to the new main at this time.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Tamara Stam stated she lived in southwest Columbia and noted she was concerned about aesthetics as she believed they should work to beautify that part of town since a lot of time had not been spent on beautifying the area. She did not feel ugly poles would be beautiful.

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

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought a four-inch pipe was insufficient for modern firefighting and understood a six-inch minimum was preferred. He also liked that this project was tied to the existing sewer work because that was difficult to coordinate. Tearing up the street only once would minimize impact on the citizenry and was a good use of City resources. He noted he was happy to support this project.

B321-15 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:

**(B) Renovation of the Lake of the Woods Clubhouse to include ADA upgrades and energy-efficient improvements.**

**B323-15 Authorizing the renovation of the Lake of the Woods Clubhouse to include ADA upgrades and energy-efficient improvements; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.**

Item B was read by the Clerk, and B323-15 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood the golf courses were self-sustaining on user fees and did not require a public subsidy. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Thomas commented that he felt investments in energy efficiency and universal design were good and sustainable investments, and noted he would support this project.

B323-15 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:

**(C) Construction of security upgrades to the Columbia Police Department building located at 600 E. Walnut Street.**

Mayor McDavid understood this public hearing would not be held. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and noted staff was recommending this public hearing be canceled as it was premature.

## OLD BUSINESS

### **B316-15 Authorizing the issuance of Special Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2015.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Blattel provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B316-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Peters congratulated staff for the result of the bond sale.

Mayor McDavid stated he liked a \$2 million savings.

Mr. Skala agreed and noted it spoke well of staff for the City to be able to save this kind of money with prudent fiscal management.

Mr. Trapp thought the comments of Fitch in terms of the City's budgeting and fiscal practices pointed out the disconnect with certain elements of the citizenry, and noted he wished the comments of Fitch were the public perception. He explained Fitch was an objective bond rating enterprise with a high degree of credibility and a lot of money resting on their analyses. He hoped people took note of the fact the City practiced conservative financial management, which allowed them to do more with the people's money.

B316-15, as amended, 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:

### **B320-15 Authorizing construction of the Upper Hinkson Creek Outfall Sewer Extension Phase I Project located along Hinkson Creek from just south of Vandiver Drive to near the northern boundary of the City of Columbia landfill; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood a lot had happened in the area since 2010, to include the Ewing property, which still had the potential for economic development, and asked if there were any other considerations that would affect the extent to which this capacity was necessary, such as Kraft. Mr. Glascock replied Kraft was constructing a building addition, but he was uncertain as to how that addition would impact the sewer. He explained the landfill had been fined due to issues with its pump station in the recent past, and part of the driving force around this project was that some of the pump stations needed to be replaced with gravity sewer. In addition, this area had been annexed in 1969 at which time the City had indicated infrastructure would be provided, but the City was only getting to it now.

Mr. Skala understood there were questions regarding the number of crossings of the Hinkson Creek and the amount of space that needed to be cleared so the trenches did not fall on the workers, and asked for clarification. Mr. Glascock replied those issues had been



addressed with the property owners. The City had the easements and was ready to build the line.

B320-15 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.

- B317-15**     Rezoning property located on the northeast corner of John Garry Drive and North Cedar Lake Drive (4804 John Garry Drive) from Districts O-1 and C-1 to District R-3.
- B318-15**     Rezoning property located on the west side of Rangeline Street, between Business Loop 70 and Interstate 70 (1413 Rangeline Street), from District C-3 to District M-1.
- B319-15**     Authorizing construction of sidewalks on the east and south sides of Green Meadows Circle, north of the Fire Station #7 entrance to Greenbriar Drive, and storm water improvements at the corner of Green Meadows Road and Green Meadows Circle; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B322-15**     Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B324-15**     Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with Columbia Public Schools for the Healthy Eating and Active Living (HEAL) program.
- B325-15**     Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for maternal child health services.
- B326-15**     Appropriating asset forfeiture funds for an additional staffing optimization study in the Columbia Police Department for the Investigative Division.
- R179-15**     Reappointing Robert Aulgur to the position of municipal judge.
- R181-15**     Accepting the donation of Paratech<sup>®</sup> technical rescue equipment from Firehouse Subs Public Safety Foundation to be used by the Fire Department.
- R182-15**     Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Carollo Engineers, Inc. for a water quality and antidegradation study of water treatment residual discharges at the McBaine Water Treatment Plant.
- R183-15**     Authorizing an agreement for professional services with Simon Oswald Associates, Inc. for architectural and engineering services for the preparation of designs and specifications for the Mill Creek Substation Control Enclosure.
- R184-15**     Approving the Preliminary Plat of Steeplechase Estates located on the east side of Howard Orchard Road and north of Steeplechase Drive.
- R185-15**     Declaring the results of the election held in the City of Columbia, Missouri on November 3, 2015 on the question whether to extend the one-eighth of one percent local parks sales tax.

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**

### **R180-15 Authorizing the purchase of one (1) CNG frontloading refuse collection truck from Midway Truck Center.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked for the kinds of containers that would work with this vehicle. Mr. Johnsen replied this would be utilized by the commercial refuse program, so they were the frontloading containers that were usually in the alleys. Mr. Thomas asked if the containers were two cubic yards. Mr. Sorrell replied they were either two or four cubic yard containers. Mr. Thomas understood these were located at apartment complexes. Mr. Sorrell stated they were located at apartment complexes, gas stations, businesses, etc.

Mr. Skala understood this had nothing to do with the roll cart issue. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. Mr. Johnsen explained this was for the existing commercial refuse program. It had nothing to do with the residential side of business.

The vote on R180-15 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.

- B327-15 Reimposing a sales tax of one-eighth of one percent for the purpose of providing funding for local parks.**
- B328-15 Adopting the West Central Columbia Neighborhood Action Plan.**
- B329-15 Rezoning property located on the north side of Lynn Street, approximately 200 feet west of Garth Avenue, from District PUD 4.3 to District PUD 6; approving the PUD Plan of Lynn Street Cottages; approving less stringent setback requirements.**
- B330-15 Rezoning property located on the north side of Old Plank Road, approximately 700 feet west of Abbotsbury Lane, from District R-1 to District PUD-2; approving the Barcus Ridge PUD Plan.**
- B331-15 Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Old Plank Road and State Route K from District R-1 to District O-P; approving the Barcus Ridge O-P plan.**
- B332-15 Vacating a portion of Fourth Street between Turner Avenue and Conley Avenue; accepting conveyances for access purposes.**
- B333-15 Authorizing an electric distribution line relocation agreement with Boone Electric Cooperative as part of the Scott Boulevard Phase III, Vawter School Road to Route KK, reconstruction project.**

- B334-15 Repealing Ordinance No. 022554 which authorized 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; authorizing a revised right of use permit with McAlester Park, LLC.
- B335-15 Authorizing a right of use permit with The Curators of the University of Missouri for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a private storm sewer system in a portion of the Ninth Street and alleyway located between Eighth Street and Ninth Street (south of Locust Street and north of Elm Street) rights-of-way.
- B336-15 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for development of a bridge maintenance program for the City of Columbia.
- B337-15 Accepting conveyances for street, sewer, storm sewer, temporary construction and sidewalk purposes.
- B338-15 Accepting conveyances for Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants purposes.
- B339-15 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to residential electric meters.
- B340-15 Accepting conveyances for sewer, temporary construction and utility purposes.
- B341-15 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B342-15 Authorizing a grant agreement with the State of Missouri – Missouri Arts Council for the Parks and Recreation Department Heritage Festival and Craft Show; appropriating funds.
- B343-15 Authorizing an amendment to the employment agreement with Michael Matthes as City Manager for the City of Columbia.
- B344-15 Amending the FY 2016 Classification and Pay Plan relating to positions in the Finance Department – Accounting Division and City Manager’s Office; appropriating funds.
- B345-15 Authorizing renewal of provisions pertaining to the operation of the Columbia Fire Department and conditions of employment of the Columbia Fire Department personnel; and fixing the time when this ordinance shall become effective.
- B346-15 Establishing plan year 2016 active employee medical and dental premium rates, non-Medicare medical rates, and retiree dental premium rates; providing for payroll withholdings; adopting the Choice Plus \$750 Plan, the Choice Plus \$1,500 Plan and the Choice Plus \$2,600 High Deductible Health Plan for the City of Columbia.

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

**REP108-15 Smart Growth Parking Audit Workshop, Consultant Recommendations.**

Ms. Christian provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the new zoning code might address some of the issues, and asked if that would preclude any action the Council might take in terms of the reporting requirements to Smart Growth with respect to this workshop. He thought those would be additional layers. Ms. Christian replied that was correct, and explained any zoning changes

could be reported back to Smart Growth. They were separate in the sense that they were two different efforts.

Mayor McDavid commented that he was reluctant to support a commission on this issue at this point. He believed parking in the downtown was for commerce. Parking in the downtown was regulated so citizens could go downtown with the expectation of finding a place to park next to the site they wanted to do commerce. In the absence of regulations, students would store their cars downtown. He felt students were extraordinarily low on the priority list in terms of downtown parking. He also believed they had a responsibility to be sensitive to the neighborhoods that were pressured by students parking close to campus, and understood that issue was being worked on with each neighborhood since they were all unique. Instead of creating a commission, he felt each neighborhood should come up with its own solution and the downtown commercial interests should make recommendations to the City so people were willing to go to a downtown restaurant or other establishment. He noted technology would change the face of parking over the next 20 years. He envisioned an app that would tell people where spots were available, allow people to pay for parking, and notify people when their time was close to being up. He stated it was a dynamic subject and thought the Council needed to be the expert on downtown parking.

Mr. Thomas stated he strongly supported the creation of a citywide parking commission as a lot of people were knowledgeable and had a stake in the citywide parking policies. It was not just the downtown, even though the most tension in terms of parking was located there. The parking policies outside of the downtown provided for too much parking, which had its own downsides. He stated he also supported the other recommendations of the use of mode share and public transportation to reduce parking demand, which they were working toward, and public information, marketing, and education. He believed they needed to reach out to the University of Missouri as it was a driver in the transportation system in Columbia and could help reduce the need for parking with 35,000 students and 5,000-10,000 employees. He asked for clarification regarding the recommendation for a downtown access and circulation plan. Ms. Christian replied she thought the recommendations had been kept vague, and staff had suggested not moving forward with that recommendation since Columbia's population density was not extremely high. If Council was interested in pursuing an access and circulation plan, it would be important to define what needed to be addressed. Mr. Thomas stated he would support moving forward as aggressively as possible with the other three recommendations, especially with the formation of a permanent parking commission or 12-month parking task force to review what they had learned at the workshop and to make a recommendation as to whether to form a permanent commission.

Mr. Trapp commented that Jim Charlier, who was an expert in his field, believed the downtown in general was doing great. He noted everyone that had been involved in the process had loved the idea of a parking commission except for him. He explained the City had around 64 boards and commission, which each had to be staffed and required resources. He initially thought the Downtown CID would be the entity to take the lead with regard to parking, but as he heard from the various stakeholders, he agreed the City might be in the best position to broker a solution with appropriate stakeholders, especially if demand management, transit, etc. was included. He proposed the consolidation or elimination of

other commissions if they chose to create a new commission. He pointed out the City paid for the cost of advertising board and commission vacancies for which no one applied every month. He commented that he did not want to make light of the work of any board or commission as the volunteer effort was a direct expression of democracy and a wonderful and important process. The Council had reviewed a report from the City Manager with regard to boards and commission when he was new to the Council, but they had only gotten rid of the commissions that had not met for 20 years. If there was a community impetus to have a parking commission, he thought it needed to be a part of a larger process of reviewing existing boards and commissions as they could not continue to add on to the work of a decreasing number of staff per person in terms of population. In the absence of this larger process, he noted he would not vote in favor of the parking commission. With regard to the other recommendations, he pointed out they were working on transit and some demand management activities. He agreed they were not ready for an access and circulation plan.

Mr. Skala asked if some of the overflow parking was designed to go beyond only the downtown. He understood they were in the process of considering pilot parking projects for some surrounding neighborhoods, and asked if that information would go back to Smart Growth as part of the reporting requirements. Ms. Christian replied the idea of an ordinance for a residential parking permit program that would apply to all neighborhoods had been discussed, but they had been unable to come to a consensus on the issue so it did not result in a definitive recommendation. She stated it was something that could be further discussed, and understood City staff would continue to work with the identified neighborhoods on those issues.

Mayor McDavid asked the Council if they would consider asking for a response from the Downtown CID. Mr. Thomas stated he was agreeable.

Mr. Skala commented that he was supportive of addressing the downtown parking issues, and suggested an interim step of a task force looking into the issue of parking. He agreed the Council had reviewed boards and commissions in the past, and that only those that had not met were eliminated. He pointed out, in the old days, many boards and commissions functioned semi-autonomously. They did not have a lot of staff input, except administratively in terms of minutes, etc. It was more complicated now with more staff time dedicated to some of the commissions. He noted the number of staff positions had increased in terms of dealing with complexities and other responsibilities. He was not wed to having an infinite number of commissions, but believed it provided citizens the opportunity to participate in the process. He stated he was generally supportive of the recommendations in the report, and reiterated consideration of a task force as an interim measure.

Mayor McDavid noted the City had a Downtown Parking Task Force a few years ago, and suggested the report of that Task Force be recirculated in addition to obtaining input from the Downtown CID. They could then further discuss the issue.

**REP109-15 Downtown Community Improvement District Board of Directors - Annual Membership.**

Mayor McDavid made a motion to appoint Mike Wagner, Marti Waigandt, Adam Dushoff, Tom Mendenhall, and Ben Wade to the Downtown CID for terms ending February 2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP110-15 Downtown Community Improvement District - End of Fiscal Year Report.**

Mayor McDavid commented that the Downtown CID did not know how much money it would have when it was formed as the initial budget was about \$350,000 with \$50,000 budgeted for public safety. The public safety budget this past year was \$74,000 out of a total annual budget of about \$900,000. He understood \$32,000 had been allocated to a hospitality zone assessment, but did not feel that was a public safety related item. He thought of police officers on the streets when thinking about public safety. He noted 15 percent of the current budget would fund a police officer during peak hours in the downtown. He understood he did not have any authority to demand this be done, and that he could only whine about it.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with Mayor McDavid. He recalled the Downtown CID explaining that most of the improvements should be restricted to aesthetic improvements, and noted infrastructure, which included public safety, could be beautiful. He thought it might be good in terms of public relations for the Downtown CID to fund infrastructure due to some of the exigencies experienced in the downtown. He reiterated he agreed with Mayor McDavid in that it would be nice for the Downtown CID to help with real public safety in terms of additional police officers.

Mr. Thomas agreed more of the budget for the Downtown CID should go to public safety. The success of downtown had been reflected in the additional revenues the CID received, but a side effect of that success was the public safety burden to the Police Department. He noted he had witnessed this first hand when participating in a ride-a-long with a patrol officer from 6:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. on a Friday night. It was quite amazing to see the scenes at the Tenth Street and Cherry Street intersection, and the number of officers tied up in that area dealing with crowd unrest. He suggested the initial budget proportion of one-seventh to public safety be maintained as revenues increased.

Ms. Nauser commented that she agreed. She noted she had not been supportive of the City funding downtown cameras, and believed the public sector should take more responsibility for their own public safety. She thought the Downtown CID should ensure all downtown businesses had security cameras to protect their own property. She reiterated she believed this was a responsibility of the private sector and not the City of Columbia. She suggested the Downtown CID consider a program to assist businesses with installing security cameras or by operating cameras for the Downtown CID themselves. She noted she was bothered by graffiti and other types of vandalism, and felt that type of program could assist in catching vandals. She asked the Downtown CID to consider devoting more money toward security cameras in the next budget as it would help police officers do their work.

**REP111-15 Business Loop Community Improvement District - End of Fiscal Year Report.**

Mayor McDavid understood the Business Loop CID was only starting up and did not have any revenues or assets. He hoped this changed quickly.

**REP112-15 Snow Priority Routes.**

Ms. Nauser asked staff to explain the snow policy in terms of when the City plowed, no parking on the priority routes, etc., so the public was aware of it. Mr. Nichols replied the two-inch designation for priority routes would be pushed out through the media, and it required all vehicles to be removed from priority routes if there were two-inches or more of snow. This allowed the City to clear streets more quickly so they could then move to the neighborhoods. He pointed out any accumulation of less than four-inches would be cleared, but it would be handled through normal work hours. Overtime would only be involved to clear streets if the accumulation was over four-inches.

Ms. Nauser understood streets were not necessarily cleared in the same order, and they sometimes started from the central city and worked out towards the outskirts of town while they did the opposite at other times. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. They tried to alternate methods. He pointed out CoMo Snow was a very informational website, and the City used social media to try to get information out to the public as well.

Mr. Skala suggested releasing the snow policy along with the CoMo Snow web address soon and through the newsletter that was included with the utility bill. He did not believe they could provide this information often enough and felt it would help with communicating with the public.

Mr. Nichols pointed out the City would conduct a dry run on Wednesday in preparation for a future snow event as there was always turnover in terms of drivers. This allowed the drivers to become familiar with routes and their zones.

Mr. Trapp asked for the time line for the salt dome on the south side of the City. Mr. Matthes replied it was in an out year, and thought it was either in year nine or ten. Mr. Nichols thought it was in 2019 or 2020. Mr. Matthes noted the north station would be completed prior to the south station.

Mr. Thomas stated he had made a special request for a second priority street to be added because a constituent residing on that street had a very serious medical condition that required nursing 24-hour per day and hourly medical services. The family faced severe risks if the street was not plowed in a timely fashion because they had nurses coming and going 24-hours a day. He believed there were likely only a few individuals in Columbia with this type of life and death situation.

Mr. Trapp pointed out the City had added resources to snow removal every year since he had been on the City Council, and this year they added trained staff to be able to utilize all of the vehicles they had. He noted they continued to recognize this as a priority and tried to do a good job with it.

**REP113-15 Electric Substation and Transmission Line - Project History, Costs, Impact of Changing Routes and Real Estate.**

Mr. Johnsen and Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood Mr. Johnsen had indicated the City would lose some of the 161 kV equipment purchased if there was a route change, and asked if Option B included 161 kV lines. Mr. Johnsen replied the 161 kV equipment mentioned was for the substation.

Option B powered the new substation at 69 kV, and that was the reason the time frame was less with Option B. He noted the City would not be too far away from needing more work if only the 69 kV system was constructed. He explained they could add conductors to the 69 kV system, but the result would be very large structures to carry the steel, and the structures could end up being larger than the structures needed to carry the 161 kV line. In addition, more power would be at risk down the same corridor, so physical damage would mean more energy would be taken out of service. Ms. Nauser understood there were 161 kV lines along Option B. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct, and noted it traveled way southward, and then up and around again.

Mr. Johnsen pointed out there were two problems. One problem involved load serving and the other involved transmission. Option B separated out the two problems as one line would solve the transmission issue at 161 kV going around the outside and another line would power the new substation at 69 kV. The 69 kV would not allow them to get as much energy through as 161 kV in terms of load serving. Ms. Nauser understood that was the piece that went from McBaine to the substation off of High Point. Mr. Johnsen described the Option B route utilizing a map.

Mr. Thomas understood the \$2.3 million for the 161 kV equipment was for equipment that would be sited at the new substation. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood it was not for the equipment for the line connection. Mr. Johnsen stated it was for items going at the substation. Mr. Thomas understood that equipment was not needed for the McBaine or Perche substations. Mr. Johnsen stated the equipment was needed but it would have to operate at a different voltage. Equipment needed to be purchased for the voltage at which the system would run. Mr. Thomas asked for the voltage at the McBaine and Perche substations. Mr. Johnsen replied 161 kV. Mr. Thomas asked if the equipment already purchased for the new substation could be used for one of these substations. Mr. Johnsen replied most of the money was for transformation at the new substation. They did not need much for transformation at the other substations. The other substations needed more interconnection related items. Mr. Thomas understood the money invested in equipment for the new substation would not be usefully applied at the other substations if Option B was chosen. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct, but pointed out they could sell the new equipment and buy other new equipment, but there would be some monetary loss.

Mr. Thomas understood the \$3.3 million was for surveying and design. Mr. Johnsen stated it was for the design work for two legs of Option A. Mr. Thomas asked if that work was being done in-house or if a consultant had been hired. Mr. Johnsen replied it was for a hired consultant. Mr. Thomas asked for the time frame. Mr. Johnsen replied the consultant had been working for the City for around the 18 months to two years on this project. They had handled the surveying, soil testing, line design, structure design, pole placement, etc.

Ms. Nauser understood the information provided was based upon current data in terms of the number of subdivisions, etc. Mr. Johnsen replied yes.

Mr. Thomas understood 24,000 linear feet, which was about five miles of line, would go through existing residential neighborhoods for Option B. Mr. Johnsen stated the line would either be by, through, or in front of the neighborhoods.



Ms. Nauser asked if staff knew the number of home that would fall within the 100 foot range. Mr. Johnsen replied no, and explained they could put something together to provide that information. He noted they would be able to add clarity once they finished the pole placement portion of this project.

Ms. Nauser asked if soil samples were completed for both sides of the road or if they were only done where the City had pre-existing easements. Mr. Johnsen replied the samples were done on both sides of the road, and noted the City had some easements on both sides of the road. Ms. Nauser asked if the City had easements on the property within the County. Mr. Johnsen replied they had road rights-of-way as there were not many easements. Ms. Nauser asked if soil samples were conducted on County zoned property. Mr. Johnsen replied no, and explained they did not do any design work on the route for Option B because it was very expensive. They did this work after the route was selected so it was only done for Option A. Ms. Nauser clarified she was referring to Option A and the properties from Mill Creek Road to Scott Boulevard as she believed they were County residents. Mr. Johnsen stated they would have done samples for those properties as it was done for the entire Option A path.

Mr. Ruffin asked if there was a typical distance between each pole. Mr. Johnsen replied it was dependent on line sag and blow out clearances, which was impacted by weather. Mr. Williams stated he believed the ruling span for the single circuit portion was 600 feet and the double circuit portion was 300 feet. Mr. Johnsen noted the metal pole design allowed for a greater distance between each pole. He explained there were some 161 kV lines on wooden poles around town, which meant a lower height and less span distance, which in turn meant a lot more poles.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification regarding whether the line needed to be placed on the north or south side of Nifong Boulevard and the size and height of the poles. He also wondered how this would be impacted by the future improvement to Nifong Boulevard. Mr. Johnsen replied staff had spent a lot of time and effort with road planners to ensure they did not have to incur a cost to move the poles in the foreseeable future. The recent open house was the first meeting with regard to what looked like a good design in terms of pole placement. They tried to minimize crossing any road because that would make it more expensive. He noted they had some flexibility in terms of pole placement, and explained they were looking at involved with pole placement now.

Ms. Nauser understood the survey had not indicated this project would involve high voltage transmission lines. Mr. Johnsen stated he thought they had been very public in terms of the voltages associated with the routes, and the survey had been one of the last steps in the route selection process. He believed they had the voltages labeled for each of the routes on the survey. Ms. Nauser understood there had not been a visual of what the poles would look like on the survey.

Ms. Nauser understood the same weight had been given for a school within one hundred feet and a location near a stream in terms of the matrix and asked for clarification. Mr. Johnsen replied he would need to look into that a bit further as that had been handled by the consultant. He noted the matrix and its point system was the method the consultant had used to try to show the Council which paths might be less desirable, etc. Ms. Nauser asked if

that consultant was different than the one the City was currently using for the project. Mr. Johnsen replied it was the same consulting firm, but a different group of people.

Ms. Nauser asked if the survey had been provided to Boone Electric Cooperative customers and people residing in the County. Mr. Johnsen replied he understood it was provided to everyone within a certain distance of any line routing option, and to all City utility customers. Mr. Thomas asked how they would have pulled the addresses of non-City utility customers. Mr. Johnsen replied the County records had addresses.

Ms. Peters asked how many surveys were returned. Mr. Johnsen replied 1,500.

**REP114-15 Vision Commission Media Mentions for September 2015.**  
**REP115-15 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

Mayor McDavid understood these reports had been provided for informational purposes.

### **COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Brian Neuner stated he was a Trustee for Boone Hospital, and explained the Board of Trustees were concerned about the transmission line project as Boone Hospital had invested millions of dollars in a south campus to facilitate a need on that side of town. He asked the Council to reconsider the options, and to explore the other options more deeply. He noted they had concerns from a business standpoint in terms of the appearance of the power lines, etc. since the facility would include pediatrics, x-rays, etc. He reiterated their request to reconsider the options for the transmission line project.

Jon Larson, 4303 Esther Lee Court, stated he was opposed to Option A. He explained he had met with a manager in the Water and Light Department who was absolutely fantastic in terms of his kindness in listening to him. He commented that he and his neighbor watched the test holes that were bored and noted the consultants had realized there was not enough room to place the pole where it was marked due to all of the utilities, and as a result had to move it further to west. He had spoken with someone involved with the project that was concerned about trying to place the size of hole needed for a 140 foot pole at that location who had indicated he would express his concerns to his supervisors. He noted many utilities were located along the path of where the poles would be placed.

Tamara Stam explained she lived on the southwest side of Columbia and agreed everyone wanted and needed electricity. She asked the Council to consider the wants and needs of the citizens. She commented that she did not always vote with her pocketbook in mind and would vote against this if it were being placed on Stewart Road as well because she believed it would be aesthetically harmful there as well. She thought the aesthetics of this project needed to be heavily weighted in terms of quality of life, and asked the Council to consider this area of the town.

Drue Duncan stated he lived along Vawter School Road and noted he was concerned about the health of his children. He explained he had worked for an investor owned utility and had participated in community hearings in the past, and pointed out communication was

the key for everyone along the line in those situations. He noted he did not recall receiving a survey, even though he might have received it. He explained he was a Boone Electric Cooperative customer and likely would not have reviewed any documentation from the City of Columbia regarding a transmission line since he was not a City of Columbia electric customer. As a result, he thought the Boone Electric Cooperative customers might not have participated, which in turn would have skewed the feedback from those most affected.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he believed it was obvious the presentation had been packaged so the Council had to choose Option A. He pointed out staff was trying to do a good job, but they were 20-30 percent under-staffed, under-resourced, under-trained, or poorly managed, and this was not good enough. He did not have any confidence that staff had provided the Council or public with real apples to apples comparisons. He stated he believed the matrix provided by the consultant was a disservice due to the weighting, etc. He commented that he was also disturbed by the fact there had been any mention of sunken costs as that was due to the inadequacy of the planning, presentation, and education processes, and did not believe it should factor into the Council's decision to reconsider the route or in choosing another route.

Kent Hendrix, 3604 Ridgeview Drive, stated the proposed line would be less than 75 feet from where his eight year old son slept every night, and noted his son also attend Mill Creek Elementary School during the day. He thought the route should be reconsidered if there was any chance at all it could cause childhood leukemia as his son would be exposed day and night. He understood the lines could sway when windy, so they could actually be closer to his home. He thought there were a lot of health concerns that had not been properly addressed, and that there was a better route. He asked the Council to reconsider the route in terms of the people impacted. He did not believe the lines should be located near schools, nursing homes, etc.

Melissa Ailor, 3903 Creekfront Way, appreciated the Council taking the time to reconsider this project. She explained she had been a long time Columbia resident that had moved away and returned to discover she now resided in a neighborhood that would be impacted by this transmission line project, and that she had also missed the opportunity to participate in the early conversations. She commented that she did not feel communication had been the best in terms of the information provided to the community at-large and the Council. She pointed out the lines with Options B and B-2 that impacted residential areas like the Cascades neighborhood would not involve the same size of poles. Those areas would be impacted by 69 kV poles, and not 161 kV poles. Mayor McDavid stated that was not correct. Ms. Ailor asked for clarification with regard to whether they were talking about the same size of poles for Option B, and noted this had been a point of miscommunication. She commented that what was being discussed was not clear, and that more than line placements on map drawings were needed. She suggested pictures of what was meant be provided for clarification purposes as they had concerns with the high voltage 161 kV lines.

Mr. Thomas thought it was important note that not all 161 kV lines were the same because the ones along Paris Road were not designed the same as the eight-foot diameter

metal poles for this project. Mr. Johnsen pointed out the lines themselves would be very similar, and only the structures holding the lines would be different. The ones along Paris Road were mainly wooden structures, which would put the lines closer to the ground and the pole placements closer together. Mr. Thomas asked if the diameter of the wood poles was about two feet. Mr. Johnsen replied yes, and pointed out this meant more poles would be needed for the same distance and the lines would be closer to the ground, which meant people would be closer to the lines.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that he agreed education and communication was important, and asked if the electromagnetic fields (EMFs) increased due to metal generation. Mr. Johnsen replied he understood the pole design did not impact EMFs, and that it was based upon intensity and distance. Mr. Elkin stated he thought EMFs needed to be considered as lifetime exposure could add to cancer concerns.

Craig Stichter, 3709 Cross Timber Court, echoed the previous comments and asked for a reconsideration of the alignment of this project as some processes could have been handled better.

Cory Ridenhauer stated he represented several homeowners associations, to include the Cascades Homes Association, Thornbrook Homeowners Association, and Oak Park Homeowners Association, and noted he had participated in all 18 meetings held by the City with regard to the power lines. He commented that he had a copy of the survey, which had a full color map of the routes, and passed it around for the Council to view. He noted it did mention high voltage power lines. He pointed out the power line process had been poorly structured when it had started, and it had improved at the direction of Council in 2010 and had been a detailed process with multiple meetings. He commented that even if the weighted results were discounted, 76 percent of the population chose Option A. He explained all of the neighborhoods and the Mill Creek Elementary Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) had been invited to participate in the process, and stated he had spoken with members of the Mill Creek Elementary PTA. He pointed out there were numerous articles in the newspapers as well, and displayed one article that had an illustration of how the power lines would look. He commented that he did not know how anyone in the City could not know there was a power line debate, and noted proximity to churches and schools and the environmental effects had been discussed in the process. He stated property values were a huge concern to the people he had represented, and believed the route chosen had been chosen because it included areas where power lines already existed. He noted Option A was a long term solution for the City, and felt it would also be cheaper in the long term. He pointed out the City had approved a preliminary plat for a neighborhood that would go under these power lines so developers and others had planned for it. He believed Boone Hospital knew about the power lines before building its facility as well. He encouraged the Council not to reopen the process because it had been fully debated.

Mandy Llewellyn commented that she had been the PTA President at Mill Creek Elementary for the two years prior to this year and was a current PTA Board Member, and

noted she had personally never had a conversation with Mr. Ridenhauer and did not believe anyone else on the Board had either.

Nicole Bormann, 1209 Dunbar Drive, explained the transmission lines would not be placed in her backyard and she would only view them when driving back and forth from Mill Creek Elementary School. She stated she did not want to have to move to avoid her children being exposed to the transmission lines, and did not want to have to worry about her home being devalued as a result of this project. She believed this was an aesthetic issue and did not feel this was a good decision. She thought it was important to protect the core of the City, which included this area since the City was moving southward. She asked the Council to reconsider this transmission line project. She understood some money had been spent, but thought if they moved forward they might regret the project after a lot more money was spent.

Dennis McDermott, 3812 Barrington Drive, commented that he had lived in Columbia for three decades and appreciated all of the attention given to aesthetics and health in the community. He felt this project was incongruent with those items. He could not imagine the City wanting to put a picture of these poles on the annual pamphlet sent to the community as it would not reflect well on Columbia. He asked the Council to consider that they might learn later that they had exposed children to something unhealthy, which he believed was unconscionable. He suggested they do no harm in terms of this project.

Ms. Nauser explained she recalled staff telling her this transmission line project would soon be needed when she was first on the Council in 2005, and understood the discussion really began in 2007 with the substation. She noted she had some major concerns with pole placements. She did not feel someone on the top floor of a retirement home should be able to touch the pole or view it, or that the pole should be within 75 feet of someone's home. She thought the other side of the street in areas with larger lots should be considered as it would impact fewer people. In addition, the homes would be much further away from the poles. She noted she had not supported the Option A route previously, and asked that the issue be reconsidered due to aesthetics and pole placement.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to reconsider the transmission line project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas stated he was agreeable to reconsidering this issue because he felt the public process in 2013 had not been adequate. He explained he had voted in favor of Option A previously, but he had not understood the parameters of the poles at that time. He now understood the 161 kV poles could be made of wood with dimensions of two feet in diameter and 90 feet in height, or of metal with dimensions of 6-8 feet in diameter and 150 feet in height. He did not feel it had been clear as to how the poles would look. In addition, he understood there were questions with regard to who had received the survey and how the community impact decision matrix had been developed. He noted the matrix included a normalizing factor, which he had not realized, until recently. He commented that based upon the proximity to the different types of buildings and uses, Option A was worse than Options B and B-2. He felt the numbers were misleading in terms of reliability and longevity as Options

B and B-2 received zero points and Option A received an extremely high number of points. He believed another public process was needed before making a final decision.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not opposed to a reconsideration of this issue. He stated he almost immediately discounted the survey instrument and only viewed it as information because it only suggested those impacted did not find it acceptable. He understood the concerns were with regard to aesthetics, the potential impact on home values, etc. He pointed out the issue of the poles provided for a conundrum in that 90 foot wooden poles, which might be less conspicuous, would be much closer to the area in which people might be affected by EMFs than the 150 foot metal poles, which required larger bases. He thought they needed to review any new information they might have missed previously. He believed the prior decision had a 5-2 vote because undergrounding was too expensive and they were generally supportive of Option A, but pointed out pole placement had not been discussed then. He understood there were likely gaps in terms of some people being left out of the process or being late to the process, so he did not oppose a reconsideration of the issue. He noted he would not guarantee the outcome would not be the same, but believed it was incumbent on them to make the most informed decision possible.

Mr. Trapp stated he believed they had made a well-informed and thoughtful decision based upon all of the information previously. He agreed some specifics with regard to pole placement and the types and sizes of the poles had not been previously addressed, and that there were pluses and minuses to both the wood and metal poles. He believed the compelling fact with regard to Option A was the additional capacity as it would preserve their ability to not have to go through this painful process for a longer period of time. They received a lot more with Option A while only spending a bit more. He noted any savings in the short terms for Option B had been impacted by the stranded cost of the investments made in Option A after the vote of the Council through a public process. He understood arguments had been made in terms of the health and safety of people versus costs, and explained affordability had health implications as well. He commented that the *Health Impact Assessment on Transit* was a compelling research document that impacted his decision-making. It involved funding transit on a utility basis with the idea that everyone benefited from transit even if they did not utilize it as it took cars off the streets, increased police and fire response times due to less traffic, allowed people to get to work, etc. They ran a test situation of a \$5 increase on the utility bill for transit, which would have specific benefits to those most struggling in the community, and found that this \$60 per year pushed some marginal families into issues of food insecurity, etc. This had taught him that costs had health implications as well. He thought they needed to be wise with what they asked ratepayers to invest in the system, and Option A was far and away the best investment for the ratepayers of the City of Columbia because they received a lot more value from the 161 kV system. He noted he had also reviewed the load recommendation for the Perche Creek substation, and it had been exceeded at 61.8 percent in 2001 and was at 72 percent in 2015. He feared further delaying this process by reconsidering a decision that had already been made would get them into the issues of federal fines and not having a reliable electrical system, which impacted health, safety, and the vitality of the community. He commented that the Council

sometimes had to make difficult decision, which they had done in 2013, and he thought they needed to stick with that decision.

Mayor McDavid understood south Columbia needed additional electrical transmission capacity and the Water and Light Department had identified the best engineering solution as Option A in 2010, and they had stood by that analysis for the sake of efficiency. He pointed out he had asked staff to propose an alternative of only 69 kV lines due to the resistance to Option A in October of 2010, and they were really unable to come up with that alternative. From 2009-2013, there had been six open houses and interested parties meetings to discuss the options. In addition, information had been included in the utility bills, the issue had been heavily covered by the media, and a survey had been distributed. He noted he had participated in twelve public discussions on this topic. He commented that he had been surprised at the lack of support for Option B when they had held the final public hearing on this topic in July of 2013. He understood the engineers felt it was an inferior solution, but it appeared to create less intrusiveness. He noted 17 people testified at the public hearing, and 6 had testified in favor of Option A and 6 had testified in favor of Option B. He explained he was not sure how much money the City would be out if there was a change and wanted clarification based on comments made by staff and Mr. Farnen. If the City was \$5 million into Option A, it would be hard to overcome. He stated he did not have a problem with holding another public hearing on this topic, which was in essence a reconsideration, but wanted to warn those in the audience tonight that there would likely people from Cascades and Thornbrook at the next public hearing arguing against Option B. He reiterated he was willing to reconsider the previous decision, but pointed out he wanted a solution. He commented that he could live with something that might not be the best engineering solution if it was substantially less intrusive, and the burden for those in the audience tonight involved the time and money already invested along with the interests of other members of the public.

Mr. Johnsen asked for clarification regarding the reconsideration of this project as he thought there might be two separate issues with one being the line design and the other being the route selection. The City was currently in the process of line design. Issues involving steel poles, wood poles, height, spacing between poles, pole placement, etc. were currently being discussed. If the route was changed, these same issues would need to be addressed with the new route. He reiterated they were currently discussing pole placement for Option A, and it could include a wood pole design.

Mayor McDavid stated he thought the citizens wanted to know the options. He believed they wanted a route change, but if the route could not be redesigned, he felt they wanted to know what influence they had irrespective of it, such as what control they had with regard to pole placement in order to mitigate the impact. He thought staff needed to outline as much as they could in this respect. He reiterated he was supportive of holding one more public hearing in a month or so.

Mr. Thomas understood smaller wooden poles might be a possibility for this route, and asked that information regarding that concept be provided. He thought the taller metal poles were needed because buildings were close to the right-of-way line. Mr. Johnsen reiterated there were two separate issues. A line redesign with wooden poles would likely take longer than a month to design. He noted the redesigning of a line was an intensive and separate

process than redesigning the route. The typical process was to choose a route and to then design the line to that route so money was only invested in the selected route. He wanted clarification as to how far back in the process they would be going. Mr. Thomas stated he wanted to know the parameters and options of the poles for the routes. Mr. Johnsen explained it would take several months to do a wood pole line design.

Mr. Skala pointed out the EMF exposure would be increased by significantly reducing the height of the poles and creating the need for more poles so that needed to be taken into consideration. He understood really tall poles impacted aesthetics, etc., and noted it was a difficult choice.

Mr. Johnsen explained they could not bring forward a lot of different line designs with different line routing because it cost a lot of money to design a line on a proposed route.

Mr. Thomas stated he was not asking for an entire design. He wanted to understand the options for the poles in terms of height, etc. Mr. Johnsen thought they could address what Mr. Thomas wanted with the current process by providing different designs for the line when coming forward with the acquisition of easements. They would then have more information on pole placement as well. Mr. Thomas stated he was not thinking about pole placement, and only wanted to know more about the pole parameters. Mr. Johnsen explained pole placement was based upon pole parameters, i.e. the type of pole, how high, spacing, etc. These were all line design issues, which was different than a line routing decision.

Mayor McDavid asked if staff could provide a photo of what the poles would look like and compare it to existing poles on Vawter School Road if this issue was reconsidered as there were twelve lines on the poles there now. Mr. Johnsen replied they had animated videos of what it looked like now compared to what it would look like in the future. Mayor McDavid asked that it be shown at the hearing.

Mr. Ruffin stated he did not feel he had sufficient information to make an intelligent decision since he had only been on Council for a few months, and noted he would appreciate hearing the information previously shared even if it was redundant. He explained he felt compelled to respect the presence of the concerned citizens and would be in favor of reconsidering this issue as long as they could move quickly. He asked staff to do what they could to simplify the process so they could reach a decision quickly, and noted he did not currently have a clear understanding of what was envisioned.

Mr. Johnsen understood the Council wanted to reconsider the line routing process and not the line design process. Mr. Matthes recommended holding a hearing on the route in two months due to the holidays, and to send notification of the reconsideration by certified mail to those on all three routes.

Ms. Nauser adjusted her motion so that the public hearing on the reconsideration of the transmission line project would be held on January 19, 2016. Mr. Thomas, who had seconded the previous motion, was agreeable.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser and seconded by Mr. Thomas to reconsider the transmission line project, and to hold the public hearing on January 19, 2016 was approved unanimously by voice vote.



Mr. Trapp commented that he had been approached by a constituent that had wondered if a safe zone could be created for Craig's List types of transactions, and pointed out it was a service the City already offered in the lobby of the police station. He asked people to help get the word out with regard to this service.

Mr. Trapp noted he had been trying to get some cement forms off of Providence Road for four years, and thanked staff for working with the property owner to get them removed. He appreciated the property owner's willingness to spend the money to move them since the development had never occurred.

Mayor McDavid made a motion for the City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri, to hold a closed meeting on Monday, November 23, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1A/1B of City Hall, 701 E. Broadway, Columbia, Missouri, to discuss legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives and its attorneys, as authorized by Section 610.021(1) of the Revised Statutes of Missouri. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

Ms. Peters explained one member of the fifteen member Rock Quarry Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group had resigned. The Group had anticipated completing its work in April, and had hoped to discuss the possibility creating a smaller group in January for ongoing responsibilities.

Ms. Amin explained her office generally advertises vacancies so she needed direction from the Council indicating it was okay not to advertise this position until they heard back from the Rock Quarry Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group in late January.

Ms. Peters made a motion directing the City Clerk to not advertise the vacancy on the Rock Quarry Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group until after the Council heard back from the Group in late January as they might recommend something different. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas stated an Affordable Housing Symposium would be held December 3 and 4 and encouraged people to participate in the Thursday evening public event, which would take place in City Hall from 6:00 to 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Trapp noted he and Ms. Nauser would lead a meeting with regard to an overview and update of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence on Friday, November 18 from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m., and would hold a second meeting on Friday, December 11 from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. in hopes to complete their work.

Mr. Skala asked for an update to a previous request for an evaluation of traffic calming for an area that included Rice Road and Kelsey Drive as Kelsey Drive was a wide and very long straight street. He wondered if a mobile speed limit monitoring device could be placed on Kelsey Drive to slow people down until an evaluation could be completed. He understood an interested parties meeting would be held regarding traffic calming on Rice Road, which he planned to attend.

Mr. Skala stated he spent time with a group called the REAL, which stood for race, equity, and leadership, at the National League of Cities (NLC) Conference, and noted information regarding the group could be found at [nlc.org/real](http://nlc.org/real). He explained they were taking the lead in advising the NLC about racial equity in terms of tool kits, resources, discussion, etc. It was a valuable resource the public might want to investigate. He commented that he would share the information he collected with the Council, and would share it with anyone from the public as well if they contacted him by e-mail.

The meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk