MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
SEPTEMBER 4, 2007

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 4, 2007, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER and HOPPE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 20, 2007 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Wade and a second by Ms. Crayton.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Hindman stated B315-07 and B316-07 relating to the Stadium TDD would be added to the agenda under Introduction and First Reading. The agenda, to include the Consent Agenda and the addition of B315-07 and B316-07 to Introduction and First Reading, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Janku and a second by Mr. Skala.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B273-07A **Adopting the FY 2008 Budget for the Special Business District.**
B274-07 **Adopting the FY 2008 Budget.**
B289-07 **Amending Chapters 13 and 22 of the City Code relating to sanitary sewer utility rates.**

The bills were read by the Clerk.

Mayor Hindman explained the three bills were read together because they all dealt with the budget.

Spencer Turner, 5701 E. Mexico Gravel Road, stated he served on the Convention and Visitors Bureau Advisory Board and was presenting the Board's funding recommendations to the Tourism Development Fund (TDF) for fiscal year 2008. He explained the TDF was established in 2000 after the voters passed a two percent increase in the lodging tax and with this year's funding, they would have provided more than $1.8 million in funding for area events and festivals. This year they had received 17 requests totaling $234,534 and were recommending $189,948 be provided. He noted this process began in January when the previous year's guidelines were reviewed by the Board. The guidelines

and applications were made available to the public in April. On April 10, 2007, the Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB) held two educational sessions to review the guidelines and avenues for festival promotions and to answer applicant questions. Completed applications were received on July 2, 2007 and each application was assigned a first and second reader. The first readers prepared a written summary of the assigned application and the second readers reviewed their assigned applications in depth in order to present the application in the absence of the first reader. The Board met twice to review and score the applications. The Board then revisited each application and voted on funding recommendations. The applicants were allowed to comment on the recommendations on August 27, 2007. He pointed out the quality of TDF applications continued to improve each year and this year's applications were excellent in regard to content, addressing the TDF requirements and incorporating marketing and promotional ideas. He noted one goal of the TDF was to help the community get new events off of the ground. He commented that 2008 would bring the opportunity to spur the growth of Outrageous Fridays, an art event held on the first Friday of each quarter. The first Outrageous Friday event had already been held and the Board believed TDF funds would help this event reach a broader market. He noted this event complimented the CVB's art tourism initiative of making Columbia an artist's destination. He explained the TDF had been instrumental in the growth of many of Columbia's best loved events and festivals. The Twilight Festivals, Art in the Park, First Night, Heritage Festival, Blind Boone Ragtime Festival and the True and False Film Festival were all examples of events that had experienced substantial increases in attendance due to the continued financial and promotional support provided by the TDF. He pointed out two applications did not receive funding because they did not meet the TDF criteria. He noted the Fem Film Festival was recommended for full funding by the Board, however, after a lengthy discussion between the CVB and festival organizers, there was a mutual agreement that the film festival would have a greater chance for success with a longer lead time for preparation, so the event organizers were planning to resubmit their application in fiscal year 2009. On behalf of the Board, he thanked the applicants for their submissions and the wonderful events they brought to the community. He also thanked the Council.

Mayor Hindman noted the Council appreciated their service.

Ken Greene, 6005 Gregory Drive, stated he was the immediate past Chair of the Cultural Affairs Commission and was presenting the Commission's recommendations for funding of local arts organizations for fiscal year 2008. He explained that each year the arts funding process was evaluated to better guide applicants and assist agencies in accurately reflecting resources and meeting program needs in the community. The basic guidelines required applicants to be an art organization with a 501(c)(3) status and to submit one application not over $10,000. He noted they used a formula to figure the funding levels and felt the procedure made the process equitable for all. Deadlines and changes to the process were presented at a January workshop, the application was available on the City's website and an early deadline for staff review of the applications was also provided. The Commission held a public work session in June to review the 18 applications received and to make preliminary recommendations. Each Commissioner read and scored the applications on their own in advance of the June meeting and had to provide at least one written comment per

criteria per application. Once completed, those reviews were provided to City staff for compilation of the comments and scores. During their June meeting, the Commission finalized the reviews and scores, so staff could establish rankings and determine preliminary funding based on the approved formula. He pointed out the applications were rated according to set criteria, such as artistic and educational quality, community outreach, administrative ability and applicants seeking revenue outside of City sources. They allocated $95,000, which was a combination of the amount budgeted by the City and some restricted funds for the Office of Cultural Affairs. In addition, $5,000 was set aside for quarterly funding opportunities known as "small requests." He commented that a public hearing was held in July to obtain feedback from applicants and other individuals and to approve funding recommendations. He noted these recommendations were based solely on project applications. Their charge was not to judge the quality of the agency. He pointed they voted not to fund two applications and explained that while both involved valuable concepts, the actual applications were incomplete and did not meet the basic guidelines. Both agencies were encouraged to attend the "how to" workshop and to submit a draft. They were also provided information about the "small requests" funding process. He commented that they understood they were lucky that the City arts funding budget had increased, especially since State funding had been in a steady decline over the years. He pointed out the restricted arts funds had made a difference in their funding process and explained for years, the Commission had hoped for a greater pool of funds for its allocations to local agencies. They understood the topic was difficult and recognized how truly unique it was for the City to provide any funding of this nature. For the first time, the relationship between what was requested and what could be allocated was narrowed. This pleased them because it meant more money being provided to local organizations to provide more arts programs and services to the community and was a result of the restricted fund balance established when the Office of Cultural Affairs' budget was moved to the general fund. The boost was to the $100,000 mark, which they thought was ideal and could be maintained for sometime. He commented that many studies showed the arts were a sound investment for increasing tourism, contributing to community livability and encouraging economic activity. In fiscal year 2006, nearly 115,000 people participated in City funded arts activities and events making the City investment per audience member only seventy-one cents. He commended the Council for recognizing the overall importance of actively supporting the arts locally and stated it was programs like this that truly made Columbia a creative community.

Mayor Hindman thanked the Commission for their service.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing for these budget items.

Beth Pike, 1112 Pheasant Run, stated she was a member of the Cable Television Task Force in support of Columbia Access Television (CAT). In regard to the question of why Columbians should care about funding a public access channel, she believed they wanted to maintain local access to the airwaves as it was increasingly becoming endangered due to lobbying at State and Federal levels. She noted the FCC was currently considering whether to revise media ownership rules and there was pressure to let media conglomerates get even bigger. Earlier this year at the State Capital, the cable and phone lobby bought out the public's interest by taking away local control for cities and leaving public education and

government channels without a permanent funding source. In regard to the question of why local access to the media was important, she commented that the issues important to their lives were filtered through media. It was how most people learned about the issue and what set the parameters of debate. She believed media built a community by providing a way to communicate with local residents they had never met or never understood. She explained, currently, local citizens were producing on average fifteen hours of local programming each week on CAT. She stated they had done what she thought was nearly impossible when they were asked by the Council to start up the channel without adequate funding. For nearly three years, they had met the City's request, but could not go on without a commitment by the City to fund the channel in its annual budget. Supporters of CAT had a vision to build a community media center that reflected the diversity of Columbia, provide a forum for local issues and ideas and offer an affordable way to learn how to communicate in the multiple forms media technology would take. She commented that past surveys and town hall meetings showed a tremendous support for a community media center. She stated the groundwork had been laid and they were now asking for development of this plan to continue by supporting CAT. She noted Mediacom walked away from its public responsibilities when the State Legislature gave them an out and felt it was now up to the Council. She pointed out a new State law indicated that if any PEG access channel did not program a large number of programming each week, the telecom companies would be able to take away these channels and use them for profit. Once it was gone, they would not have a chance for local public access in Columbia again. She asked the people in the audience who were in support of CAT to stand and about 25-30 people stood.

Amy Gipson, the Vice President of Marketing and Public Relations at Stephens College, stated she was in support of CAT and explained since September 2004, Stephens had been the home base for CAT by providing office and studio space and utilities in the amount of about $16,000 per year. She commented that Stephens College was happy to support CAT as they saw a tremendous benefit in this partnership. It allowed the College and Columbia community to share resources and connect students with the community. She noted Stephens was an educational institution with the ability to train filmmakers and provide an environment where filmmakers and budding filmmakers were brought together in a mentoring-type relationship. It was also an opportunity for Stephens College students to work and volunteer at the station and to produce content as part of their academic program. She pointed out they saw public access television as a great venue for independent voices. She stated Stephens College would continue to support public access television in Columbia. She noted Stephens had seen and experienced first hand how difficult it had been for all involved to operate the station effectively with insufficient and unreliable funding. She understood CAT was dedicated to generating a portion of its own revenue, but needed assistance. She explained it had done a lot already with limited funding and believed it could be and do so much more. She stated the College was in support of increasing the franchise fee to five percent and for the Council to ensure adequate funding was available until the fee kicked in. She commented that Stephens College looked forward to this continued partnership.

Donna Abbey, 302 W. El Cortez, stated she was Co-Chair of the Columbia Volunteer Network, which was formed about three years ago, and explained one of their members had access to CAT and came up with the show, "Making a Difference," which showcased volunteer organizations throughout the City. She stated so many people were providing information about their organizations and volunteer opportunities. She noted it showcased about twelve times a month at different times and provided community members with information regarding what was available. She stated she recently began hosting the show and was thankful to be able to let people know what was available in Columbia. She thanked the Council for considering CAT in its budget to enable them to continue making volunteer opportunities known.

Melinda Hemmelgarn, 412 Thilly Avenue, stated she, her husband and a handful of volunteers produced a program on CAT called "Food Sleuth TV." She explained they brought a wide variety of experts on the show to speak about food, health and agriculture, which would never get that amount of time on television. She pointed out she was asked by a reporter if the producers would lose if CAT did not get funded and commented that it would be the citizens of Columbia who would lose because without having many voices in the media, they would lose the rich fabric of the community and democracy as media became more consolidated. She asked for Council to support CAT.

Sutu Forte stated she was new to watching CAT and was enjoying it. She commented that she watched news on the national channels and also watched Amy Goodman's "Democracy Now" on CAT and noted it provided a contrasting report, which she thought was wonderful. She dared anyone who thought things were good in the world to watch Amy Goodman's program for one month. She believed it was important to have contrasting and many voices. She stated she was an artist and enjoyed watching friends performing on CAT. She noted it was the first channel she went to and hoped the Council would find a way to keep it.

There being no further comment, Mayor Hindman continued the public hearing for these budget related items to the September 17, 2007 Council Meeting.

B275-07 <u>Voluntary annexation of property located 2,200 feet west of Brown Station Road, on the north side of Waco Road, extended; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.</u>

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this voluntary annexation involved about 11.26 acres in north Columbia. The requested permanent zoning was R-1 and equivalent to County R-S zoning. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval of R-1 as permanent zoning.

Mr. Teddy noted the annexation closed a gap of a few hundred feet in the City's boundary and R-1 zoning was consistent with zoning on three sides of the tract.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with Crockett Engineering, 2608 N. Stadium Boulevard, offered to answer questions.

Ms. Hoppe understood this property did not have water, sewer, roads or electricity and asked about their plans for providing that. Mr. Crockett replied this was a portion of other preliminary plats in the area, which included road and utility extensions, so it would be a

portion of those final plats as they came forward. He pointed out no final plat could be approved unless it had utilities to the site. This was a piece that had not been annexed in an overall larger development.

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

B275-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B276-07 Rezoning property located northeast of the intersection of Chapel Hill Road and Mills Drive from Districts R-1, O-P and PUD-6 to O-P and R-1.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a request to rezone two tracts of land totaling about six acres. Tract A was small and triangular and might develop as part of the larger O-P property immediately to the south. Tract B was a request to rezone some O-P and PUD-6 zoned property to R-1 so the property could develop as a conventional single-family residential subdivision.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Chad Hager, 411 Amazon Drive, stated he represented Chapel Mills and offered to answer any questions.

Ms. Hoppe asked if they had met with the neighbors. Mr. Hager replied they had and that there were not a lot of issues. They discussed keeping some trees along the property line and at this time they intended to keep all or as many as they possibly could. The neighbors also asked about access to the property and they indicated they would work with them as much as they could. Mayor Hindman asked if they discussed stubbing over to the Mills. Mr. Hager replied yes. Mayor Hindman understood if they approved this, they could go ahead and build it with or without the stub. Mr. Teddy stated a subdivision plat was pending review of the Planning & Zoning Commission and the access issue would be dealt with then. He explained Council would have some discretion on that particular regulation, but currently they were working with a plat that had a cul-de-sac street coming down from Mills Drive. He pointed out staff was not requiring the stubbing out to the east as a condition of the zoning. Mayor Hindman understood the neighborhood was requesting it be stubbed out, but they were not planning on doing that, and that this issue could be discussed when the plat came forward. Mr. Hager explained at this time they were not intending to stub out the cul-de-sac because they felt that issue should be worked out during the platting process.

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

Ms. Hoppe noted this had previously been a controversial item and it appeared the neighbors were happy with this.

B276-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B277-07 Rezoning property located southeast of the intersection of Range Line Street and Smiley Lane from A-1 to C-P; approving The North Woods C-P Development Plan.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this proposed ordinance would rezone about three-tenths of an acre that was formally a cemetery to C-P, which was the same as surrounding property. The proposal also requested a change in the C-P development plan to allow ten lots with a total gross floor area of about 127,500 square feet of uses, such as office, retail, restaurants and a grocery store. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval.

Mr. Teddy pointed out two lots had already been developed and there would be a separate plan for Lot 7A in the North Woods development.

Ms. Hoppe explained there was no traffic light when exiting the southern part of the property onto Range Line making it hard to get out and asked if there were plans for a light. Mr. Teddy replied the plan indicated there would be a somewhat modified design to that intersection as part of the Range Line construction project. Ms. Hoppe asked what that would be. Mr. Teddy replied there would be a different configuration to the island and believed there would not be a left out after the Range Line improvement project. It would have three quarter access, which involved only a left-in, right-in and right-out. Ms. Hoppe asked if that would be from American Parkway. Mr. Teddy replied yes. Mr. Janku stated there would not be a traffic light at that intersection. He thought there would be one at Smiley and Kennesaw.

Mr. Wade asked if when this was approved, if there would be a plat for ten lots creating twenty more public hearings because of the way the C-P ordinances read. Mr. Teddy replied this was the only public hearing necessary for the majority of these lots. The only one they needed a further public hearing for was Lot 7A. This action would approve site plans for all of the platted vacant lots in North Woods. He pointed out a major modification, such as a change in the design parameters, would be brought to Council. Mr. Wade understood they would not see C-P plans on each lot. Mr. Teddy stated they would not have multiple hearings.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jay Gebhardt, an engineer with A Civil Group, explained this was a proposal for a C-P plan on all of the remaining land owned by his client and provided a handout showing which lots were included and which lots were not. He stated the Taco Bell and Mizzou Credit Union were not included. In addition, a vacant corner at American Parkway and Range Line was not part of this. This proposal also included the rezoning of the cemetery site, which was not owned by this owner when the original C-P zoning was approved. He noted the Planning & Zoning Commission asked why they wanted car washes and other similar items on that tract and explained they were trying to keep the uses the same for the entire development.

Mayor Hindman asked if there was any substance to the grocery store use. Mr. Gebhardt replied there was substance in that there were one or two grocery store developers looking at a few different sites in north Columbia and this was one of those sites. The driving force with this C-P plan was to show how everything would fit together to attract the purchaser.

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

B277-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B278-07 Rezoning property located north of State Route KK and east of Scott Boulevard from R-1 to PUD-4.1; setting forth a condition for approval; approving The Village at Wyndham Ridge PUD Development Plan.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was a requested rezoning of about 9.25 acres in the south part of the community and the proposed development would consist of fourteen single-family attached, two-unit structures for a total of 28 dwelling units. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval of the proposed rezoning and PUD development plan with the condition of a $25 per linear foot of frontage payment along Scotts Boulevard to be paid at the time of the final plat.

Mr. Teddy noted staff felt the moderate density PUD was an appropriate transition to the C-P zoning that was established at the corner of Route KK and Scotts Boulevard. He pointed out the statement of intent had some architectural standards and landscape plan materials that went beyond what the ordinance required for the submittal.

Mr. Wade asked if the $25 per lineal foot did not apply to Route KK because it was a State road. Mr. Teddy replied yes and stated they only collected funds for locally maintained roads. Mr. Wade understood any development on a State jurisdiction road did not have the $25 assessment. Mr. Teddy replied that had not been their practice.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Dan Simon, an attorney with offices at 203 Executive Building, stated he was representing Mill Creek Manor and explained this was not a duplex development. He pointed out this had previously come before the Planning & Zoning Commission for R-2 and some felt that was not appropriate because the neighbors were entitled to the assurance it would be single-family attached villas. They incorporated design standards into the statement of intent in order to show it was not a duplex development, but a single-family development with units intended for individual ownership. There would be 28 units on the 14 lots. He described the development using the overhead and pointed out this was something they or any successor owner would be required to implement.

Mr. Skala understood the intent was for these to be owner occupied and asked if they would be available for rent if they were not sold. Mr. Simon replied that would be true of a house as well. He pointed out each of these units would cost in the $300,000 range with these design standards, so it was possible that someone would buy one and rent it, but the cost would be prohibitive of a rental development.

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

Ms. Nauser explained some residents of Thornbrook had contacted her regarding this development and she had assured them that in the overall scheme of that area of development, this type of PUD development would not be detrimental to Thornbrook. She noted Scott Boulevard was on the capital improvement program (CIP) project list and would eventually be widened in that section of town. She stated she was looking forward to this development. She commented that she was a resident of Thornbrook and did not believe

there would be a detrimental effect in value to their neighborhood. She did not believe Mr. Overton would build something that was not going to be of the utmost quality.

Mr. Wade stated he was on the Commission when this came forward and there was considerable discussion about the difference between R-2 and PUD under these conditions. He noted several of them felt it needed to be put in writing and thanked Mr. Overton and his representatives for doing that. He commented that if he had any problem with this, it was that it was not middle level density, but low level density and not much different than R-1 at an intersection of two arterials. His preference would have been middle level density. He stated there were only a few intersections of arterials and to use them for low density residential was missing the point on the investments made in the arterials. He commented that he was hoping to see a real separation between rezonings and plans because one was a legislative act and the other was a managerial act. He felt that would allow them to start giving serious attention to the statement of intent, which was part of the rezoning and what framed the nature of a development. He stated the applicant had done this in a way it should be done. It was a real statement of intent. It did not just meet the letter of the requirements of C-P zoning. It was a part of the legislative process and made it possible to reasonably separate the zoning from the plan as he believed they should be two separate agenda items with two separate votes.

Mr. Skala stated he concurred with Mr. Wade's analysis of separating some of these issues into a zoning process and a plan process. He thought they might want to discuss it at some future time. He commented that his mother bought into two of these types of developments in the Chicago area and he thought this type of development was a good fit for Columbia. He knew a report would be presented later and asked if there were any changes in the works in regard to the $25 per lineal foot issue. Mr. Watkins replied there were no changes in the works. Mayor Hindman pointed out the report could lead them to start looking at changes.

B278-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B279-07 <u>Approving the C-P Development Plan of Paris Road Plaza - Phase 2 located on the east side of State Route B (Paris Road), north of East Brown Station Road and south of the U.S. Highway 63/Paris Road overpass; approving a revision to the C-P Development Plan of Paris Road Plaza - Phase 1; approving a revised statement of intent.</u>

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this proposal would modify the existing Phase 1 C-P plan, which they saw a few weeks ago, approve a revised statement of intent for the area and approve the Phase 2 C-P plan. Phase 2 consisted of three restaurants and one convenience store with a gas station. It had a maximum of slightly less than 14,000 square feet. The revision to Phase 1 would allow the addition of a 5,400 square foot retail building, additional parking and a realignment of the frontage driveway. The proposed gross floor area for both phases was slightly less than 50,000 square feet. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval.

Mr. Teddy noted staff did not identify any issues and the Planning & Zoning Commission agreed with the revised statement of intent, which included an increase in the development allowance and the maximum height. The site still had a relatively high percent of landscape to floor area ratio and the development ratio to the overall site was relatively low.

Ms. Nauser asked if the neighbors were notified when a substantial change was requested. Mr. Teddy replied this was a public hearing, which included the mailing and a sign posting on the site.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jay Gebhardt, an engineer with A Civil Group, provided a handout to differentiate between Phase 1 and Phase 2 and explained one of the things they were changing was the building height. It was being changed from 30 to 35 feet, which was allowed in R-1. He understood some of the Commissioners did not believe it was good to make changes, but explained that because he had tried to make a restrictive statement of intent, he had to ask for permission when they had a client wanting to do something a little taller. He noted the outer road was now six feet off of the right-of-way instead of twenty feet. The reason it was done that way on the original plan was because they did not know what they would be doing and he did not want to commit to the landscaping that was required when the pavement was within twenty feet of the right-of-way. When some users became involved, he decided to continue it straight down. He understood they now had to put the landscaping in. He pointed out it was along State Route B where the right-of-way was quite wide, so he had 45 feet of grass to the sidewalk. He did not believe it was a detriment to move the road closer to the right-of-way and explained since Route B was already five lanes at this section, he did not believe any additional widening would happen in the near future.

Mr. Janku asked if the neighbors were aware of the changes. Mr. Gebhardt replied they worked with Mr. Schuster and other neighbors and their main concerns were addressed with the rezoning in that there were no convenience stores in a certain area. He received a call today in regard to working out the details involving a fence. He noted he might have to come back to Council due to the fence and explained the neighbors wanted a rod iron fence, which would not meet the 80 percent opacity requirement and would require a variance.

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

B279-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B280-07 <u>Approving the Auburn Hills South 32.8 Acres C-P Development Plan located on the north and south sides of Brown School Road, between Rangeline Street (State Route 763) and Edenton Boulevard; approving less stringent yard requirements.</u>

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was a proposed C-P development plan in north Columbia along Range Line Street. It would allow thirteen lots with a combined building floor area of about 235,000 square feet. The proposed uses included a mixture of retail, restaurant, office and convenience store/gas station. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval of the proposed C-P development plan along with requested variances.

Mr. Teddy explained staff was comfortable with the access system involving private roads and shared drives. They thought it would organize access and circulation through the site. He noted there was a green space easement along the north perimeter of the property and the trail easement that went back to the prior platting of the property. Those were shown as being integrated with some individual building site plans.

Mr. Janku understood there was a reference to a letter indicating the traffic study could temporarily be waved and wanted to know when that might occur. Mr. Glascock explained he suggested the traffic study was not warranted unless they brought in a big box store. The developer, when building Brown School Road, constructed the entire width of the five lane section, so a study would not identify any needs at this time. In addition, 763 was being widened to five lanes. Mr. Janku understood he might want something later if a big box store came in. Mr. Glascock stated they would want to review the traffic situation for a 50,000 square foot or larger store in order to determine if there was a need for auxiliary lanes. Mr. Janku asked how that would take place as it was not in the ordinance. Mr. Glascock replied the zoning identified a traffic study and they would be putting it off unless someone came in with a big store. Mr. Wade agreed with Mr. Janku and wondered what would trigger it.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jay Gebhardt, an engineer with A Civil Group, provided a handout of a colored map and restrictions the developer had worked out with the neighbors to the east and stated they would not object to an amendment to the ordinance indicating the traffic study would be waived unless the plan was amended to show a 50,000 or larger square foot building. He pointed out Mr. Wolverton and his partners paid for the traffic light at 763 and Brown School Road and had built the full width of the road when they developed the residential area. He stated the C-P portion had been thought about for a long time and explained some of the accesses and traffic patterns.

Mayor Hindman asked about the possibility of a grocery store. Mr. Gebhardt replied they were not prepared to announce anything.

Mr. Wade understood a 50,000 square foot store would trigger a traffic study and asked how many square feet the Hy-Vee on Broadway was. Mr. Janku replied it was between 70,000-80,000 square feet. Mr. Wade asked how it would work if they had two 50,000 plus square foot buildings. Mr. Gebhardt thought Mr. Glascock would identify the need when they modified the plan to include a building larger than 50,000 square feet.

Mr. Wade asked if this was the kind of C-P that would create twelve separate platted lots. Mr. Gebhardt replied some of the lots were platted in a different configuration than what they were seeing tonight. It would be replatted if it developed exactly like this. Mr. Wade understood each lot would require a separate planning and development process with two public hearings. Mr. Gebhardt stated no and explained this was the plan for all of the lots shown in color on the handout. If they had a change that did not meet the design parameters, they would be back in front of Council.

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

Mr. Janku stated he appreciated the infrastructure being constructed in conjunction with the residential subdivision to the east in anticipation of this development.

Mr. Janku made the motion to amend B280-07 by adding a new Section 4 reading "the traffic study required by ordinance no. 17005 shall not be required unless a C-P development plan is amended to provide for a retail store of 50,000 square feet or more" and changing the current Section 4 to Section 5. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade asked how it would work if one amendment came in with a 60,000 square foot building and another came in later with a 75,000 square foot building. Mr. Boeckmann replied that when the first one came in, a traffic study would be triggered. Mr. Wade asked if his example would trigger two traffic studies. Mr. Glascock stated Public Works would ask for an amended traffic study for the 75,000 square foot building in his example.

The motion made by Mr. Janku and seconded by Mr. Wade was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B280-07, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B281-07 <u>Approving The Colonies Lot 101 & 102 O-P Development Plan located on the east side of Colony Drive, east of Forum Boulevard.</u>

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was a request to rezone about 1.1 acres of property on the east side of Forum Boulevard. The current development plan proposed dividing the subject property into two lots and constructing a two-story 6,000 square foot gross floor area medical office on the eastern lot shown as Lot 101 on the overhead and leaving the west lot, Lot 102, for future development of an office building. The Planning & Zoning Commission was split in its vote.

Mr. Teddy understood there had been a meeting with the owners association since the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting.

Mr. Janku understood the applicant planned to use part of the other lot with the lot that adjoined Forum and asked why that did not trigger a sidewalk since it was being improved. Mayor Hindman replied he thought it did.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jay Gebhardt, an engineer with A Civil Group, stated he represented Albo Bah and his wife, who purchased this lot and wanted to subdivide it to build a 3,000 square foot office for themselves and lease another 3,000 square feet to a tenant. If they could build a 3,000 square foot building on this site, they would, but it had already been graded such that it would require a two story building on one side. He explained Mr. Bah was out of the Country and unable to meet with the neighbors prior to the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting. They did meet with the neighbors last Friday and some of their concerns were caused by a lack of communication. There was some concern that once this was approved they would be able to do whatever they wanted with Lot 102, but he assured them that was not the case. He provided a handout, which included photographs of the site, to illustrate the parking situation. He explained Mr. Bah's property line ran down the middle of the parking lot, so he owned some of the spaces. The other owner had become accustomed to using those spaces. He noted they would get with the neighbors to work out a parking situation when moving forward

with Lot 102. When this building was built, there would be some change in that the tenants would not be able to use some of the parking they had grown accustomed to since it was not on their property. They would see how the first building affected the situation and would then address issues on Lot 102. He noted a petition signed by about 100 people was provided as part of the packet.

Mr. Wade asked if there was a total possibility of about 75 parking spaces with the parking areas. Mr. Gebhardt replied if one summed both parking lots, it would be about 72 spaces. There were 18 on each now and there was a possibility of extending one area further depending on what the building looked like. He commented that he was advocating underground parking. He pointed out they told the neighbors they would not add any parking to Colonies Drive.

Mr. Janku understood they would be restricting the future development of Lot 102. Mr. Gebhardt replied two conditions were recommended by staff. One indicated no parking waiver would be granted in the future for Lot 102. Originally, there was a development plan showing a two-story 5,000 square foot building for a total 10,400 square feet, so staff had subtracted 6,000 from it and placed a ceiling of a 4,400 square foot building on this lot. He did not feel that was necessary. He explained that if he could come up with a creative way to solve a parking problem, he did not believe a ceiling was necessary. Ms. Hoppe stated she was envisioning something similar to the Flat Branch office building where there was parking underneath the building. Mr. Gebhardt agreed and pointed out he was not saying that would happen, but felt it was a better way to get a bigger building on the lot without exacerbating the parking problem.

Ms. Hoppe asked if this was on a bus line. Mayor Hindman replied he did not think it was on a bus line.

Mr. Janku understood the conditions suggested by staff were not placed in this ordinance. Mr. Gebhardt replied he did not think so.

Mayor Hindman asked if he had discussed the conditions with the property owners. Mr. Gebhardt replied he had. Mayor Hindman asked what their response was. Mr. Gebhardt thought they agreed with him in that the first condition covered everything that was needed because the building size would be limited by the amount of parking provided. He pointed out they had a different idea about the ratios of parking and thought the City's regulations should require more parking. Mr. Janku asked who he meant by property owners. Mr. Gebhardt replied the surrounding property owners. Mayor Hindman noted those property owners were not residential neighbors. Mr. Gebhardt explained he received nods both ways when he tried to explain the second condition.

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

Mr. Wade understood there were currently 62-64 spaces and room for 75 spaces if the upper parking area was fully developed. He stated he had never seen full parking lots at that location. Each time he drove by last week he checked the lot and never found more than 25 cars at any one time during the day. He did not think there was a parking problem and would be surprised if a parking problem emerged. He stated he was comfortable with this and did not believe the restrictions recommended by staff needed to be included. If there were

problems, they would emerge before the other lot was developed, so they could deal with those in the new plan that would come forth.

Mayor Hindman asked if he was opposing both of the conditions. Mr. Wade replied he did not oppose the conditions, but did not think they were necessary. He felt those problems would be dealt with, if they emerged, when they came forward with the C-P plan for the other lot. He did not see a reason for those restrictions at this time since they did not know there would be a problem.

Ms. Nauser agreed with Mr. Wade and stated she had taken her son to a pediatrician in that area for ten yeas and had never had an issue with parking. She did not know why they would want to restrict creativity into the future in overcoming the situation. She felt that would be a disservice to the community and the development. She noted she drove in that area quite frequently and was more concerned with the Forum bridge area as opposed to the parking situation here.

B281-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B282-07 <u>Approving the Auburn Hills 16 C-P and PUD Development Plan located on the west side of Edenton Boulevard, along both sides of Bodie Drive, extended; allowing reductions in the required perimeter setbacks.</u>

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was a C-P and PUD development plan involving thirteen multi-family residential buildings containing a total of 78 dwelling units. The maximum building height was 35 feet and the overall density was 14.5 units per acre. He noted the C-P zoned part of the property would be used as open space. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval of the plan and the variance to the perimeter setback.

Ms. Hoppe understood Mr. Wheeler raised a concern at the Planning & Zoning meeting about a spot only having 15 feet of green space with a paved trail that was 10 feet wide and asked for an explanation. She noted his comment was on page 47 and that he had referred to the Cow Branch and the trail taking up space between the creek and him. Mr. Janku stated he believed Mr. Wheeler lived in the residential subdivision to the east of this development and was talking about a trail in that general area, but not the trail in this plan. He thought he was pointing out the adjustment in the width of the setback was in part due to the green space located on the south, so they had to push everything to the north. Mr. Teddy stated he took it as a comment.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jay Gebhardt, an engineer with A Civil Group, explained Mr. Wheeler lived in the neighborhood and his property backed up to the green space that Mr. Wolverton set aside when they did that subdivision.

Rob Wolverton, 2504 St. Regis Court, noted there was a City park in the northeast corner of the property at the northern end of Derby Ridge and the Parks & Recreation Department had asked them to leave a trail easement along the dedicated green space that ran through the middle of the property as part of the City's Parks and Trail Plan. This was done in 2001 when the property was originally zoned. The trail Mr. Wheeler was discussing

ran in the green space behind his house. Mr. Janku understood it was not part of this plan. Mr. Gebhardt replied that was correct.

Mr. Gebhardt provided a handout and stated this was a C-P and PUD plan because they had a piece of C-P on the southern portion of the tract, which they did not feel needed to be rezoned since it would be green space. He pointed out the density calculation did not include the C-P land, so the density was less than a PUD-15. He stated Bodie Drive was shown going out to 763. It would have apartment style housing units and each unit would have a garage, which would be similar to Spencer's Crest. They were requesting two setback variances. One was for the garage on the southern portion, south of Bodie, on the west side as there was a spot that was closer than 25 feet. The other area was on the north side by an area zoned M-1. They believed they had adequate screening since it would be a wall without windows. He commented that he was not sure that area would develop as M-1, although it was M-1 now. The trend was not industrial.

Mayor Hindman asked for his thoughts on industrial use as there was pressure to have industrial property. Mr. Gebhardt explained the revisions of the Major Thoroughfare Plan and thought the owners would believe there were higher and better uses than large M-1 for the property. He noted REDI recently showed this site to someone who felt it was too close to residential and, as a result, the site was self-limiting.

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

Mr. Janku stated he was initially concerned about providing the setback variance as he did not want to set a precedent of the setback of one property being used to reduce the setback of another property. He understood Mr. Wheeler, a Commissioner on the Planning & Zoning Commission, lived close to the area and was comfortable with the variance being granted in this situation. He noted he would support this, but as a general rule, he would not want this established as a precedent for the future.

B282-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B287-07 <u>Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Public School District for renovation of the Hickman High School swimming pool.</u>

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was a required public hearing for a public improvement and explained the City jointly owned Hickman Pool with the Columbia Public School District (CPSD). There was a significant need to improve the air handling at the pool. The CPSD was acting as the lead and had done a fairly extensive needs analysis. The estimated cost for the Phase I improvements was $342,000. They City's share was $171,000 and the CPSD was agreeable in allowing the City to pay them back over three years. Ms. Hoppe understood the ARC used ultraviolet light to help with cleaning water and asked if this process would be used here later. She wondered why they were focusing on chlorine. Mr. Hood replied the City was currently in the process of adding ultraviolet light to the ARC as it was not put in when it was built. It was now the most current technology for treating water quality problems. They talked with the CPSD about the possibility of adding an ultraviolet unit

to the pool and they were considering it. It might be added as add alternate to the bid, but that decision had not been finalized yet.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

B287-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B288-07 Accepting and appropriating funds to be used by the Police Department in a proactive auto theft program (Bait Car Program).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Chief Boehm noted that almost 100 percent of this program was financed through private donations and thanked Shelter Insurance Group, State Farm Insurance, The National Crime Insurance Bureau, Perry Chevrolet, the Stafford Family Trust, The Insurance Group, American Family, Joe Machens, Wal-Mart, the Boone County Sheriff's Department, Norman Lenhardt and the Crime Stoppers Program for their support. He commented that the donations involved approximately $42,000.

Mayor Hindman asked for and explanation of how the program would work. Chief Boehm explained they had noticed an increase in the number of auto thefts in Columbia and were looking for innovative ways in dealing with the issue. One program that was working successfully in a number of communities was the Bait Car Program. They would have a few vehicles in the community that were equipped with surveillance and lock down equipment. If the vehicle was stolen, it would set off an alarm. They were able to monitor the situation and could lock down the ignition and doors as well. It was meant to catch the perpetrator and to be preventive in nature by making it known there were some bait cars out there.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the cars would be placed in problem areas. Chief Boehm replied yes and explained they had identified a number of locations where there had been an issue with vehicle theft. He pointed out there were not too many places in Columbia where they had not had an issue, so the vehicles would be moved around.

B288-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. 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.

B283-07 Vacating an electric utility easement located south of Stadium Boulevard, between East Pointe Drive and U.S. Highway 63.

B284-07 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sewers and sewage disposal; amending the City of Columbia Food Code.

B285-07 Accepting conveyances for drainage and temporary construction purposes.

B286-07 **Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.**

R188-07 **Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the northeast side of Masonic Drive, west of Oakland Gravel Road.**

R189-07 **Setting a public hearing: construction of the Sugar Tree Hills Lagoon Interceptor, an 80-acre point sanitary sewer serving Sugar Tree Hills Subdivision.**

R190-07 **Setting a public hearing: construction of water mains serving Wyndham Ridge, Plat 1.**

R191-07 **Setting a public hearing: development of the Auburn Hills Park.**

R192-07 **Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for police assistance.**

R193-07 **Authorizing an Adopt a Spot agreement.**

R194-07 **Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri relating to construction of the H-13A Trunk Sewer - Southeast Gateway Sewer.**

R195-07 **Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Basketball Coaches Association for Sports Development Funding under the Tourism Development Program for the MBCA 2007 Clinic.**

R196-07 **Reappointing Robert Aulgur to the position of municipal judge.**

R197-07 **Authorizing an airport restaurant agreement with Brenda J. Ravenscraft, d/b/a Skyline Café at the Columbia Regional Airport.**

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

R198-07 **Authorizing a grant application to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for assistance with an architectural and historical survey of a portion of the downtown area.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would authorize a grant application to DNR for 60-40 matching funds for an architectural survey for downtown Columbia. The area recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission would be roughly 40 acres bounded by Ninth, University, College and Locust Streets on the east side of Columbia's downtown and included approximately 59 parcels.

Mr. Teddy pointed out the survey would not create any kind of overlay district or regulatory structure. It was a cultural resource, which could lead to nominations of significant properties for the National Register and/or as local landmark. The Commission felt it was important to document existing structures if redevelopment was being considered.

Mr. Wade asked if there was an implication if they extended Elm Street to College. Mr. Janku thought there would be if they found something there. Mr. Teddy noted if there

were federal funds involved in the extension of Elm Street, an environmental review to include the assessment of historic value would be required because a State Historic Preservation Officer sign off was required if federal funds were used for any structure over 50 years old. If federal funds were not used, it would depend on the significant findings of the survey.

Mr. Watkins understood the match for this was in the local Historic Preservation Commission's budget. Mr. Teddy stated the $4,000 local share would be covered in the budget. It was based on their assessment of the number of buildings and amount of time it would take a consultant to survey each building.

Mr. Janku understood this was the third or fourth area they had studied. He thought they had previously done studies in the areas of the First Ward and the Old Southwest.

The vote on R198-07 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R199-07 <u>Authorizing a subgrant assistance agreement with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources relating to the Home Performance with Energy Star Program.</u>

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated the Water & Light Department had received a $35,000 subgrant from DNR to work with the Energy Star program, particularly in terms of contractor training.

Mr. Dasho explained they were working with DNR, as an expanded subregion, to improve the retrofitting and remodeling of homes toward home efficiency performance with Energy Star products. He noted they were interested in improving the housing stock in Columbia for a more efficient product. This program had nationwide significance as DNR was involved with the federal government and Columbia was invited to join in the effort.

Mr. Wade asked if there would be measures to know what kind of improvements were actually being made. Mr. Dasho replied yes and noted there were stringent reporting requirements because the federal government and DNR wanted to know which products really worked. They would be working with contractors to describe the kind of measures incorporated into homes.

Mayor Hindman believed this was a major step forward with the potential for strong implications. He hoped they would be able to expand this effort as they experimented and learned. He noted conservation was the best way to deal with issues of global warming.

Mr. Skala commented that when he was a member of the Environment & Energy Commission, they had looked into this. He commended Mr. Dasho for working with that group and for moving forward with this effort.

The vote on R199-07 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R200-07 <u>Approving the Preliminary Plat of Arbor Ridge located approximately 2,000 feet west of the intersection of Brown Station Road and Waco Road.</u>

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a preliminary plat for north Columbia that would create one R-1 zoned lot. The applicant indicated the lot would be used for an elementary school. There was no existing street access to the site, however, Waco Road was planned to be extended westward from Brown Station Road, across the southern part of the subject site. A development agreement would be required to address responsibilities for the construction of Waco Road prior to final plat approval. The Public Works staff was in negotiations with several property owners in the area. He noted the City, with a 50 acre park in the area, was one of the property owners involved. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval.

Mr. Teddy pointed out this 20 acre tract contained parts of three properties. It involved the Tuscany Ridge Plat 2 on the west side, the Bretthorst tract in the middle, which was annexed and zoned earlier tonight, and Arbor Pointe on the east side.

Ms. Hoppe asked who would pay for water, electric, sewer, etc. She wondered if the developers would pay for it to go to the school and how much money would be involved. Mr. Teddy replied they only made the comment that water, sewer and electric would have to be extended to the site. They had not yet reviewed building plans for a school. Ms. Hoppe asked who paid for it. Mr. Teddy replied it was a subdivider's expense. He did not know if a differential payment would be involved on the water as that would depend on the sizing of the facilities that were brought to the site. He pointed out there was a development agreement being prepared for Waco.

Ms. Hoppe asked if they had received anything from the School District in regard to whether they had made a decision indicating this was a good place for an elementary school and what area it would serve. She understood there were new developments being constructed for the future, but besides that, it was far away from everything. Mr. Teddy thought they had confirmed this was a choice for an elementary school site and noted there was a lot of planned development within one mile of it. He believed 1,300 homes would be within a mile of the school. Ms. Hoppe understood the School District had not provided the City with what they anticipated would be the attendance area for this. Mr. Teddy replied the School District had a committee process to determine what the school attendance areas should be. The introduction of a new school would require some reassignment of school attendance areas.

Mr. Watkins stated he spoke with Superintendent Chase who confirmed this was the site they had selected as an elementary school. They saw it as a relief for Derby Ridge, which was overcrowded and had a potential of getting worse due to the additional development expected in the north.

Mr. Janku commented that the other residential subdivisions in that area that were already platted would bring a lot of that infrastructure adjacent to the school, so it would not necessarily require a long sewer line being run to just the school site. He stated this would be in an area that was already platted for residential development with approximately 1,300 homes. He believed it would develop quickly because people wanted to be close to the school.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was surprised they did not have information from the School District as part of the packet. Mr. Watkins noted that Superintendent Chase confirmed that if

this did not get approved and they did not get agreements for Waco Road to meet their timeframes, they had a back up site located on the other side of 763.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with Crockett Engineering, 2608 N. Stadium Boulevard, stated he was representing the developers of Tuscany Ridge and Arbor Pointe, who would be supplying the land being platted for the school. He commented that the main reason information was not supplied by the School District because all of the utilities and road infrastructure would be provided for by the developers. He noted they were working with the Public Works Department to come up with a development agreement for the extension of Waco Road to serve the school. The utilities would be provided as any other typical development in the City of Columbia would. The developers were extending those services to the site. He pointed out there was a relatively large sewer extension, which would fall as an expense of the developer. It went through all of his property and would be developed in the future as residential lots.

Mr. Janku understood the residential subdivisions had been platted, but hoped they would provide good pedestrian access to the school through pedestrian access points from the residential subdivisions.

The vote on R200-07 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R201-07 <u>Determining the roof design of the renovated Daniel Boone Building and the new City Hall addition.</u>

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained they were to a point in the design of the addition to City Hall where they needed direction as to the type of roof and amenities that should be included.

Mr. St. Romaine noted, a couple of weeks ago, staff had provided Council information based on tentative numbers and Council asked them to provide a cost-benefits analysis on some of the quantifiable benefits they could easily identify. He stated this product was registered with the United States Green Building Council (USGBC) and at looking at the LEED checklist, they were projecting the building would meet the silver level certified building, which required between 33-38 points. They were projecting at least 35 points at this time. He stated he reviewed the checklist with the Environment & Energy Commission in great detail and they saw no problem with at least achieving the silver level using a reflective roof. This project, along with most of the downtown projects over the last few years, had been overseen by the Public Buildings & Finance Committee and items A, B, C and D reflected their recommendations. They recommended the highly reflective roof, which provided a LEED point for meeting the heat island effect. They also recommended the solar hot water system and at least installing the necessary infrastructure for a photovoltaic (PV) system, to include conduits, cables and generic roof mats, so if the price of solar came down within the next few years or as grants were obtained, they could easily install a photovoltaic array on the roof of either building.

Mr. St. Romaine commented that the solar hot water heater made good financial sense as it would cost about $25,000 and was anticipated to be paid back over a 25 year life span. It could be installed in a small area of the roof of either building.

Mr. St. Romaine explained the roof mounted solar photovoltaic system would have to use both areas, i.e. the Daniel Boone Building and the new addition. It would provide approximately five percent of the building's energy usage over one year. They initially thought the cost was about $480,000-$800,000 or thirty-two cents per kilowatt hour, which was about three times the cost they were currently obtaining electricity for. The Water & Light Department had reviewed the numbers and revised it to be about $640,000 for an 80 kilowatt system. They were estimating it would provide about $571,000 in electrical value and would take about twenty-nine years of production to pay itself off in terms. The short fall within the twenty-five year period would be about $69,000, however, it was anticipated the system could last longer than 25 years, which meant the difference would be small. They were recommending the installation of the infrastructure and looking for grants and talking to manufacturers that were trying to make inroads into the Midwest. He noted the reflective thermoplastic polyolefin (TPO) was the base for comparison of the vegetative/green roof options discussed and showed a spreadsheet on the overhead. The Environmental Protection Agency indicated TPO roofs could last potentially 30 years, but roof manufacturers were suggesting the use of a more conservative number of 20 years, so it would take two of these roofs to last 40 years. Using a two percent inflation factor with the inclusion of maintenance, they thought the TPO roof would cost about $247,000 or $20.25 per square foot over 40 years. He explained that in order to effectively compare the figures, they had to convert those numbers to net present, which was the amount of money needed today to pay for future costs given an anticipated discount rate, so the cost in today's dollars would be between $155,000-$178,000 for this system over the entire roof area of the new addition, which was approximately 12,223 square feet.

Mayor Hindman asked if that was both buildings. Mr. St. Romaine replied it was just the addition. They were only recommending the reflective TPO roof on the Daniel Boone Building because the underlying structure would not support a vegetative roof without considerable improvements to the understructure of the roof.

Ms. Hoppe asked if net present value included inflation and other rate factor costs for the future. Mr. St. Romaine replied it was basically looking into the future to determine how much money would be needed in today's dollars to plan for a 40 year roof.

Mr. St. Romaine illustrated a spreadsheet showing the four inch vegetative option on the overhead. It included pre-contained soil packs in trays that were placed over a waterproofing membrane. They divided the roof into two sections. A 5,300 square foot area or the top portion would be the vegetative roof and would consist of four inch soil packs, building reinforcement, a waterproofing membrane and energy savings. They calculated the energy savings at about $318 per year or $12,720 over the life of the roof. They felt maintenance would be fairly intensive for the first couple years, but self-sustaining for the remainder of the life of the roof. They were recommending the other 6,923 square feet, which was the area encompassing the mechanical equipment, to be in the white reflective material, so 43 percent of the roof would be vegetative and the remaining 57 percent would

accommodate the mechanical equipment. He pointed out these numbers did not include accessibility to the roof and explained these types of roofs were typically not accessible. He commented that the fully saturated weight was about 10-35 pounds per square foot and could be close to 200,000 pounds.

Mr. St. Romaine explained the twelve inch soil option or the intensive vegetative roof would cost about $35 per square foot. He noted the four inch option was estimated to cost approximately $12 per square foot. He stated that although these numbers did not include accessibility, these types of roofs were typically accessible.

Mr. St. Romaine provided a comparison slide and indicated the reflective roof was the base used to compare the two vegetative roof options. Depending on the discount rate, the four inch vegetative option would run $31,000-$41,000 higher than the TPO roof and the twelve inch vegetative roof would run $202,000-$212,000 higher than a TPO roof. The architects thought a roof observation, which included an extension of the elevator and stairwell and an observation deck, could cost approximately $98,000. This was typically used in conjunction with a twelve inch vegetative roof due to the variety of plants that could be grown. The four inch would be limited to sedums, which did not provide for variety.

Mr. St. Romaine pointed out these were the costs they felt they could quantify in terms of longevity, energy savings and maintenance. He noted other benefits to building green or vegetative roof systems were stormwater reduction, improvements in air quality, improvements in water quality, reductions in the heat island effect, wildlife habitat and having public amenity space.

Ms. Nauser understood for the twelve inch vegetation, the idea was to spend $300,000 to save $954 in energy per year. Mr. St. Romaine replied that was correct. Ms. Nauser asked if there were any energy savings for the reflective roof. Mr. St. Romaine replied there would be some savings, but it would probably not be much different than the vegetative roof. He explained one of the main values of the reflective roof was the extension of life of the roofing membrane. Ms. Nauser asked if that played into LEED certification. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes and noted they would receive a single LEED point because of the benefit attributed to the heat island effect. Ms. Nauser understood it did not convert into energy savings, but extended the life of the roof. Mr. St. Romaine replied that was correct.

Mr. Janku noted the memo looked at the present cost of electricity and factored in rate increases for the next four years with the anticipation of rates leveling off in the future. He asked what “leveling off” meant and was told the anticipated rate increases after the ones they were considering was one percent per year. He asked if future rate increases were more than one percent per year, if the payback would come sooner. Mr. St. Romaine replied he believed it would, but noted the rate along with the energy savings would parallel each other. Mr. Janku explained he was focusing on the payback of solar panels. If they were producing electricity at a rate greater than one percent, he understood the payback period would be less. Mr. St. Romaine replied it would.

Mr. Janku understood the $640,000 estimate for the solar panels was based on the anticipated actual cost to the City and that it did not take public/private partnerships into account. Mr. Dasho stated that was correct. It did not take into consideration any grants or funding by a vendor. It was the straight cost of putting in the photovoltaic system. Mr. Janku

understood a business would be able to take advantage of tax credits. Mr. Dasho stated that was correct and explained a private entity could receive a thirty percent tax credit, but the City could not.

Mr. Wade asked if there were any reflective white roofs on commercial buildings within Columbia. Mr. St. Romaine replied he was sure there were. He commented that they were not necessarily white. He noted there were many silver roofs in the downtown area, but they did the same thing. Mayor Hindman thought the Wal-Mart stores were built that way. Mr. Wade understood that carried no value in terms of demonstrating technology feasibility in the commercial sector. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct and noted that technology had been around for a long time.

Ms. Nauser asked if they knew what the energy savings would be due to building to LEED specifications. Mr. St. Romaine replied they did not know at this time, but would have those numbers in the future.

Mr. Skala stated these comparisons were helpful and he was appreciative of receiving them. He commented that he was on the record suggesting they take a closer look at the green roof options. He was also on the record in saying if they were too expensive, he would vote against them. He thought the four inch soil comparison could almost be looked at favorably in comparison to the white reflective roof given the fact the roof had twice the lifetime. He also thought it would be impressive to set the standard. He commented that Chicago led the standard in terms of the green roofs. He noted it was a much larger heat island. He did not think they were talking about a lot more money for the middle course. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct. He noted he received an e-mail from Engineering Surveys and Services, who was working as a subconsultant to Chiodini and had reviewed the amount of retention that would be attributable to a green roof. They thought the size of the detention area could be reduced if a green roof was placed on the building. They believed it would about a $12,000 cost savings, so the difference of $31,000-$41,000 was really around $19,000.

Mr. Skala asked if the effectiveness of the reflective roof deteriorated over time causing a reduced savings. Mr. St. Romaine replied anything would deteriorate over time, but a black asphalt roof would decompose faster because it did not reflect ultraviolet rays. Over time, a white reflective roof would deteriorate due to weather and dirt causing it to lose some of its reflectivity.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the Environment & Energy Commission had any input. Mr. St. Romaine replied they reviewed the information, but did not provide a recommendation. They were essentially just provided an update. They provided some input and wanted to be kept informed of the project, particularly in regard to energy savings related to mechanical systems.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the Public Buildings & Finance Committee had received all of the information the Council was provided. Mr. St. Romaine replied they did not have the dollar figures. They only had the estimated numbers and descriptions of the different types of roofs proposed.

Mr. Wade understood one of the trade-offs between the green roof and TPO was the potential of a later retrofit with a photovoltaic system. Mr. St. Romaine replied that was

correct. They could put the photovoltaic system on a TPO roof at anytime, especially if they installed the necessary infrastructure now. Mr. Wade asked if that potential was eliminated if they went with one of the green roof options. Mr. St. Romaine replied he did not think it ruled it out all together. He believed the Water & Light Department's analysis looked at an 80 kilowatt system that would encompass both roofs. They would still have a TPO roof on this existing building, which was not as large of an area. He noted the addition was around 12,000 square feet and this building was slightly smaller. He thought it could probably still be done depending upon the weight and the structure of the building. They would have to do an analysis to determine if it would support the photovoltaic system.

Mayor Hindman asked if they were talking about units on both roofs if they did the photovoltaic system. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes in terms of this analysis. Mayor Hindman understood they would not have to do that. Mr. St. Romaine replied that was correct. He noted they could do a vegetative roof on the addition and a photovoltaic system on the existing building. Mayor Hindman asked if they could put the skylights in on this roof with the photovoltaic system. Mr. St. Romaine replied the skylights would involve the reinstallation of the original nine skylights that were part of this building. If they put the nine skylights in, it would take up the largest portion of the existing roof, so it would be difficult to install a vegetative roof along with the skylights. Mayor Hindman asked how that would affect the photovoltaic system. Mr. St. Romaine replied the photovoltaic system could be done on the roof of the existing building. At this time, they were anticipating the installation of a TPO roof, but the photovoltaic system could be installed over that in the future. Mayor Hindman asked if that would be on the part of the roof that was not over the lobby. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes. Mayor Hindman asked when they were calculating the cost of the photovoltaic system if they were thinking of one that would be on the roof of this building, but not including the roof over the lobby. Mr. St. Romaine explained the analysis with the estimated cost of $640,000 included the installation of the photovoltaic system of the roof of the new addition and the existing building, but not over the lobby.

Mr. Janku asked if the hot water solar system and the two banks of the photovoltaic system could all be placed on the roof. Mr. St. Romaine replied that was just a photo to show what a PV system looked like. It was not necessarily what they were proposing. The photovoltaic system would include more than two panels. Mr. Janku understood the hot water solar panel would take up a certain amount of space and wondered how much space would be available for the solar panels. Mr. St. Romaine replied there would not be enough space for the entire 80 kilowatts anticipated under this study. Because this building's roof area was considerably less than the new addition, they might be talking about 35-40 percent of that. Mr. Janku asked if the cost per unit would change if fewer panels were needed. Mr. Dasho replied the common costs of a 80 and 40 kilowatt system would be about the same. He thought it would be better to have a larger system in terms of keeping costs down, but noted the real cost of the solar panels would be similar for a 40 and 80 kilowatt system.

Mr. Skala asked if there was the possibility of a hybrid system. He wondered if there was enough space on the new addition to have a vegetative roof, a TPO section and some photovoltaic as well. Mr. St. Romaine understood he was asking about a combination and explained he thought they would have more flexibility by putting a TPO roof on the new

addition. It was not only lower in cost, but also provided a greater flexibility in terms of what could be done in the future. He believed the solar array would work well in conjunction with a TPO as it would help shade the TPO roof for more of a benefit. He noted that once a vegetative roof was built, they would be stuck with it to a certain extent. The four inch would provide more flexibility than the twelve inch because the soil packs were in self-contained trays and easier to remove in order to fix or replace the liner. With the twelve inch option, they would be putting twelve inches of soil on top of a liner. He was not sure what would happen if there was a leak or if the liner needed to be replaced. Mr. Skala understood the vegetative roof was the only one that provided an option for stormwater relief. Mr. St. Romaine replied that was correct and noted most communities that installed that type of roof did it to address a stormwater problem.

Mr. Wade asked if the economic analysis that supported the green roof factored the demand for expensive stormwater remediation. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes in other communities. Mr. Wade understood that was not a consideration in front of them. Mr. St. Romaine stated it would involve benefits, such as stormwater reductions, an improvement in air quality, etc., but it was hard to put dollars to those benefits because they were talking about a limited area of about 5,300 square feet. They would receive benefits by encouraging future expansion of this system in a specific area. He noted Chicago had offered incentives for others in the downtown area so they could achieve benefits in terms of stormwater treatment and reduction.

Ms. Nauser asked if they had a cost for the installation of the photovoltaic system. Mr. St. Romaine replied it would cost about $640,000 to install it today. Ms. Nauser clarified she wanted to know the cost of just putting in the infrastructure for a future system. Mr. St. Romaine replied he did not know that cost, but guessed it would be a few thousand dollars.

Ms. Nauser asked what the cost to restore the nine skylights was. Mr. St. Romaine replied $130,000.

Ms. Nauser noted the resolution had the installation of the TPO broken down into two parts and asked if the total cost was $85,000. Mr. St. Romaine replied item D was installation of the reflective TPO membrane on the Daniel Boone Building. They thought it should be installed because the existing roof structure could not support anything else and they wanted to achieve a LEED point. He explained there were four items under item E and option A involved a TPO membrane on the City Hall addition. Ms. Nauser asked if that was the $85,000. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes.

Mr. Wade stated the argument for the TPO was the ability to accommodate a photovoltaic system at a later time and an anticipation of reduced costs for that system. He noted the huge drop in photovoltaic costs occurred in the 1970's and the curve had leveled out substantially. He asked if they could tell him what kind of additional cost advances they could anticipate on photovoltaic systems over the next ten years or if the cost of electricity increasing was what made them more appealing. Mr. Dasho replied he thought the technology would improve with the new types of material they were trying to come up with. He believed they might see a 30-40 percent reduction in the cost of a photovoltaic system per kilowatt installed due to material advances in the next three to four years. Mr. Wade asked for a further explanation. Mr. Dasho replied at this time they were using expensive silicon for

the system and the efficiency of the system had not improved. He believed a combination of improving and lowering the cost of materials and increasing the efficiency of the solar cells would bring the cost down. He noted a problem was that people had been talking about this happening for the last twenty years. He thought it was worthwhile to wait to see if the product got any better. Mr. Wade commented that the cost drops were substantial from the 1970's to the 1980's, but slim, in spite of predictions, over the last 20-25 years.

Mayor Hindman stated this was not a commercial building. They were building a City Hall, which represented the government of the City and was a monument to democracy. He noted it was an important building with many important features not in an ordinary commercial building. He believed they, as a Council, needed to be in a position of leadership. He pointed out the community had demonstrated it believed in doing the right thing with respect to the environment and in being a leader even if it cost more. He used the wastewater bond issue as an example and noted they could have met all of the EPA requirements by running a pipe to the Missouri River. The citizens came together because they did not like the idea of running a pipe to the river even though it was treated effluent. They preferred the untested idea of wetlands, which would cost more and require a bond issue causing higher taxes. The issue passed by 92 percent. He pointed out the people of Columbia were willing to pay for it even though they did not have to because they were leaders in environmental activity. In addition, the citizens of Columbia voted for an increasing percentage of electricity to be generated by a sustainable method of generation even though that might cost more. He noted they limited the increase in those costs. He did not think they could just look at the bottom line numbers in constructing this building. He commented that currently there was a national concern with regard to sustainability and global warming. In addition, the cost of power was going up and they were facing a generation issue, which would require them to ask the public to pay for a huge amount of generating capacity. He thought when they built the building, it needed to be a leader in a lot of ways to include setting an example with respect to stewardship of the environment. He believed there were only two possibilities to accomplish that. One was with the green roof and its advantages involved stormwater, power generation and being a demonstration. The other was the photovoltaic system, which also had appealing features. He noted he liked the twelve inch green roof option because it would be a demonstration and would make Columbia famous as a leader. The photovoltaic system also had benefits to include the possibility of generating electricity and setting an example that might be followed by other commercial buildings. While he liked the twelve inch green roof the best, he believed the photovoltaic array deserved serious consideration. He did not believe it was enough to put in a reflective roof and the pipes to someday have a photovoltaic array as he did not think that was being a leader. If they were going to do it, he thought they should put in the photovoltaic system, which was expensive, or put in the pipes and fittings with a statement indicating they would put in the entire system within two to three years. This would allow them time to look at the market and into partnerships and grants, while understanding it would be done within a certain length of time. He thought they had a responsibility to be leaders.

Mr. Janku stated he was in agreement with Mayor Hindman and believed the photovoltaic system had the reasonable opportunity to be paid back during the life of the

building based on conservative estimates of the cost of electricity. He thought it could be justified economically. He commented that he also liked this option because they could demonstrate that an older building could be retrofitted to utilize this system. He noted it also tied into what they were doing at the Career Center and explained the Water & Light Department had an agreement with the Career Center to test solar panels in order to determine their economic viability in Columbia. They would, in effect, be training and developing the workforce to help implement this locally and would also be providing a jump start. He commented that the project would be finished in about two to three years and the Council could look at costs at that time to determine whether to implement it with the completion of the project. He believed they could show taxpayers this was a wise choice due to the payback period over the life of the building.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with most of what was said, but noted he saw this as trying to get the most bang for their buck without precluding other options. He thought they might be able to get the leadership notoriety without leaning just toward the photovoltaic option and suggested they construct the building to at least support the compromise green roof option. He pointed out he would love to see the twelve inch green roof, but understood that was probably cost prohibitive. If they built the roof to green roof specifications, they would have other options to include the photovoltaic system. He noted the photovoltaic system could be placed on the existing portion of the roof. He agreed it was unimaginative with just the reflective roof. With a little more expense, he thought they could probably have both a green roof and photovoltaic system. He agreed the leadership component was huge and should not be underestimated. He did not want to eliminate some of the possible choices.

Mr. Wade stated he believed the leadership component for this was the need to demonstrate the quality of their decision making on several different dimensions. He thought they had two questions before them. One involved the decision on the roof design and he noted he would support the recommendation of the Public Building & Finance Committee, which were items A, B, C and D and option A under item E on the resolution before them. The other question involved dictating the photovoltaic system or leaving the option open. He did not agree with Mayor Hindman's suggestion of requiring it within two to three years. He thought they needed to allow the Council the option to make that decision at the point at which they wanted to move with the technology. He did not think they should preclude the flexibility of a future Council to make that decision. He noted he had a clear expectation that they would move toward a photovoltaic array, but wanted to leave that decision for the future as technology and financing options were worked through.

Ms. Nauser thought it was easy to say they wanted to be leaders when they were spending other people's money. When totaling items A through E, the cost was well over $250,000, which could be used toward a couple of police officers, funding for social services or additional City staff. She felt leadership started with the individual and did not believe any of them had installed a solar water heater or placed a green roof or photovoltaic system on their personal homes due to the cost. She commented that as a business owner, she would not be in business if it took her twenty years to recoup the return on her investment. She stated it was hard for her to justify spending this kind of money for a potential return 15-20 years from now. She referred to a Columbia Daily Tribune article, which stated the

Department of Natural Resources spent about four percent more to become LEED certified and it would be 2023 before they could recoup their extra investment based on current energy costs. She stated she was finding it difficult to justify this expense when they were in a budget crunch. She noted many in the community were not happy that they went ahead with the building. At this time, she was also not in favor of installing the skylights because that was $130,000. She thought they needed to build City Hall for the benefits of the employees. She commented that they were a leader in many energy areas and at this point, she believed this was a frivolous expenditure of taxpayer dollars.

Ms. Hoppe stated they were increasing the police force and thought they needed to look at the whole picture versus comparing one thing at the expense of another. She believed leadership was looking further down the road than twenty years and felt they needed to look at rate increases and the environmental impact. She noted, ideally, she liked the green roof for all of its benefits, but agreed it was expensive. She thought if it had an observation tower and the public was allowed up there, it could be considered a park and wondered if they could use park funds to assist with the cost. She believed the fact no one spoke tonight meant the public was not concerned about it one way or the other. She wanted to see the skylights restored because it was historic preservation. She commented that she would have liked the Historic Preservation Commission to have been consulted on that issue. She also wanted to see something that was forward thinking and believed the community wanted the photovoltaic system at the very least. While they did not have to put a specific time on that, she thought it should be done at the point it was economically advantageous.

Ms. Crayton stated she agreed with Ms. Nauser. She stated they were telling people to tighten their budgets and were raising rates, but would then putting something on a building they would not benefit from. She noted they were spending other people's money. She commented that she was in favor of saving energy, but thought they needed to be realistic in regard to people who would not be able to pay the rate increases.

Mr. Janku stated when they voted to do the new City Hall and renovate the Daniel Boone Building, they realized the initial cost would be greater than the current rental rates, but that it would be a long term benefit to the community because in future years, the payments on the building would be less than the projected rental costs. He thought that was similar to the photovoltaic system where initially they would be paying out somewhat more, but over future years the curve would change and there would be savings and more money available for services to the community. He stated he agreed with the recommendations of the Public Buildings & Finance Committee would suggest they install the reflective white roof membrane on both buildings, install a solar system to heat the buildings hot water and install necessary infrastructure with limited roof penetration so solar panels could be installed at a later date on both buildings. He also wanted staff to provide a financial evaluation to be presented to Council prior to completion of the building. He pointed out he would leave the skylights out because he thought those should be addressed separately.

Mr. Janku made a motion to proceed with items A, B, D and option A in item E in the resolution and to add language to item B requiring a financial evaluation to be presented to Council prior to completion of the building. Mayor Hindman asked if he would be willing to

add a statement indicating the goal was to install the photovoltaic system within three years if it was economically feasible. Mr. Janku agreed.

Mr. Boeckmann understood item B would be amended to include "with the financial evaluation to be presented to Council prior to completion of the building. The Council's goal is to install the system within three years if financially feasible."

Ms. Nauser asked if the TPO was on the original bid for the building. Mr. St. Romaine replied the original construction estimate included only a conventional roof. Ms. Nauser asked for the cost of replacing a conventional roof. Mr. St. Romaine replied the cost for a TPO roof was about $8-$9 per square foot and the cost of a conventional roof was about $5-$6 per square foot, so in terms of the addition, they were talking about $80,000-$90,000 for a TPO roof and $50,000-$60,000 for a conventional roof.

Mr. Watkins pointed out they needed the TPO roof to get a LEED point.

The motion made by Mr. Janku was seconded by Mayor Hindman.

Mr. Skala understood the four inch media would not preclude the photovoltaic option. Mr. St. Romaine replied they would have to remove the vegetative material. Mr. Watkins pointed out the dollars spent on the four inch would be costly. Mr. Skala understood it would have to be removed in order to install it. Mr. St. Romaine explained they would still have the membrane underneath the four inch soil packs, so if they removed the soil packs ten years down the road, they would still be able to use the membrane to support the photovoltaic system.

Mr. Wade suggested they eliminate the requirement that the photovoltaic cells be built by a specific length of time. Mr. Janku explained it was not a requirement. It was only a goal. Mr. Boeckmann thought the motion read that the Council's goal was to install the system within three years if financially feasible.

Mr. Wade made a motion to amend Mr. Janku's motion by removing the three year time limit because it was not a goal he agreed with. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Janku explained they would be receiving a financial evaluation prior to the completion of the building and he thought it was clear it was their goal to make a decision at that point. Mayor Hindman thought they needed to set that goal. Mr. Wade stated the photovoltaic analysis would come to them by the time the building was completed and at that point, they would make a decision. If it was not a reasonable decision, they would wait another period of time as the technology and cost factors changed. He thought they needed to leave it open as a decision process and not specify a time in which it needed to be done. Mayor Hindman did not believe they were doing much if they did not set a goal. Mr. Skala thought mentioning the three year time period as a goal was unnecessary because they would evaluate it as soon as it became economically feasible, which could be in three years or six years. Mr. Janku suggested rewording his motion to indicate the goal of the Council was to implement the photovoltaic system as soon as it was financially feasible with a financial evaluation to be presented to Council before completion of the building. He thought that was the time to make a decision. Mr. Wade stated he was congenial to Mr. Janku's suggested language. Mayor Hindman stated he thought they needed to state they would do it within three years if it was financially feasible. Ms. Hoppe commented that she interpreted

the Mayor's proposal as meaning the goal was three years if the financial report was done and if it had to be extended, it could then be extended. She did not think the goal was an absolute in that it had to be done in three years. Ms. Nauser stated she had a problem with setting goals for future Councils since they did not know what the future would bring. She would rather set goals on what roads would be built. Ms. Hoppe stated they set the goal for having a new City building when they had two Council people who did not have a chance to vote on that issue. She noted they were always setting goals for future Councils.

Mr. Boeckmann understood item B would be revised to add a statement indicating the goal of the Council is to install the system as soon as feasible and a financial evaluation shall be presented to Council before completion of the building. Mayor Hindman stated he did not like it but would live with it.

Mr. Wade withdrew his motion to amend Mr. Janku's motion.

Mr. Janku replaced his original motion by making a motion to amend R201-07 by changing item B to read "Installation of the necessary infrastructure to accommodate a solar electric photovoltaic (PV) system to be added later. The goal of the Council is to install the system as soon as feasible. A financial evaluation shall be presented to Council before completion of the building." and by changing item E to include only option A, which read "Installation of a reflective thermoplastic polyolefin (TPO) membrane of the City Hall addition." The revised motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend Mr. Janku's motion by substituting option B for option A in item E. He noted that was the four inch engineered growth media and did not preclude the idea of installing the PV system later. He stated he indicated he would support the green roof option if the cost was similar to the cost of a reflective roof.

Ms. Hoppe asked if it would have to be taken out to put solar in at a later date. Mr. Skala replied yes. He understood solar could be placed on the old part of the building. This would be on the new addition to ensure it could support the weight. It they wanted to make a large array with a photovoltaic sun roof, they would have to remove the packets.

The motion made by Mr. Skala died for a lack of a second.

The motion to amend R201-07 by changing item B to read "Installation of the necessary infrastructure to accommodate a solar electric photovoltaic (PV) system to be added later. The goal of the Council is to install the system as soon as feasible. A financial evaluation shall be presented to Council before completion of the building." and by changing item E to include only option A, which read "Installation of a reflective thermoplastic polyolefin (TPO) membrane of the City Hall addition.", made by Mr. Janku and seconded by Mayor Hindman, was approved by voice vote with Ms. Nauser and Ms. Crayton voting no.

Ms. Nauser stated she was not against obtaining LEED certification. She just did not like all of these other things in the resolution. She noted she was not in favor of the skylights due to the extra cost.

Ms. Nauser made the motion to amend R201-07 by removing item C from the resolution.

Mr. Janku asked when a final decision had to be made about the skylights in terms of preparing documents for bids. Mr. St. Romaine replied the architect was in the design development stage and hoped to have the construction documents ready by November or

December of this year in order to go out for bids. When they originally spoke with the Public Buildings & Finance Committee, they were only discussing one skylight. He noted the reason for the skylight was to bring more lighting to the dark lobby, so they asked the architects to look at installing one or all nine of the skylights. The cost to install one was approximately $15,000 and would accomplish the goal of getting more light into the lobby. It would also provide an option for a smaller green vegetative roof on the lobby roof. Mr. Janku understood they could decide that down the road. Mr. St. Romaine stated there would have to be a little bit of preliminary investigation to determine whether the lobby roof could support a four inch, but they thought it probably could. Mr. Watkins stated the skylight issue could be put off for about a month before it became critical.

Mr. Janku asked what Ms. Nauser was suggesting. Ms. Nauser replied her motion was to remove it from the resolution, but she was open to other suggestions. She noted one skylight seemed more feasible than nine skylights in terms of the cost. Ms. Hoppe stated if they postponed it, she wanted it referred to the Historic Preservation Commission. Mayor Hindman understood that by removing it, they were not eliminating it, so he thought they should proceed with removing it from the resolution. Mr. Wade asked if they could handle Ms. Hoppe's suggestion separately as he wanted additional information about the skylight issue.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser to amend R201-07 by removing item C was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R201-07, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NAUSER. 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.

B290-07 **Approving the Final Plat of Spring Creek Plat 4 located on the north side of Vawter School Road, east of Scott Boulevard.**

B291-07 **Approving the Final Plat of Wyndham Ridge, Plat No. 1 located on the west side of State Route KK, east of Scott Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract.**

B292-07 **Changing the name of "Arctic Char Lane" to "Waterfall Drive".**

B293-07 **Authorizing an agreement with the Boone County Regional Sewer District relating to sanitary sewer service for property located in Sugar Tree Hills Subdivision, Spring Park Subdivision and Arrowhead Lake Estates/University Estates Subdivisions.**

B294-07 **Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Route 763 reconstruction project from Big Bear Boulevard to Prathersville Road.**

B295-07 **Authorizing an agreement with Boone County relating to a geomorphic stream assessment and training grant; appropriating funds.**

B296-07 **Approving a waiver of claim and indemnity agreement with Bedford Walk Homeowners Association to allow construction of a bridge with**

abutments for a walking trail in utility, drainage and private walkway easements located on Lot 260 of Bedford Walk Plat 1 and Lot 193 of Bedford Walk Plat 4.

B297-07 **Accepting conveyances for sewer, utility, drainage, street and sidewalk purposes.**

B298-07 **Authorizing construction of water mains serving Wyndham Ridge, Plat 1; providing for payment of differential costs.**

B299-07 **Authorizing an agreement with Utility Service Co., Inc. for maintenance of water storage reservoirs and tanks.**

B300-07 **Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.**

B301-07 **Appropriating federal forfeiture funds for the purchase of Simunition® safety equipment for the Police Department.**

B302-07 **Appropriating funds for the acquisition of furnishings for Phase I of the City Hall project.**

B303-07 **Appropriating funds for the City Hall Percent for Art project.**

B304-07 **Authorizing development of Auburn Hills Park; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

B305-07 **Repealing Chapter 10 of the City Code relating to franchise regulations; enacting a new Chapter 10 of the City Code relating to regulation of video service providers.**

B306-07 **Establishing new group insurance premiums for employee and retiree/COBRA health and dental care plans.**

B307-07 **Amending the Classification Plan and adopting the FY 2008 Pay Plan.**

B308-07 **Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code as it relates to application fees and reinspection fees.**

B309-07 **Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code relating to Parks and Recreation fees.**

B310-07 **Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.**

B311-07 **Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to increase solid waste utility rates.**

B312-07 **Amending Chapter 26 of the City Code to increase the development charge for new construction.**

B313-07 **Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water rates.**

B314-07 **Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.**

B315-07 **Authorizing intergovernmental cooperation agreements with the Columbia Mall Transportation Development District, Stadium Drive Corridor Transportation Development District A and the Shoppes at Stadium Transportation Development District relating to the Route 740 (Stadium Boulevard) improvement project.**

B316-07 **Authorizing an agreement with Cook, Flatt & Strobel Engineers, P.A. for engineering services relating to the Route 740 (Stadium Boulevard) improvement project; appropriating funds.**

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

(A) Intra-departmental Transfer of Funds.

Report accepted.

(B) Street Closure Request - Pagan Pride Day; Starlight Bicycle Ramble.

Mr. Janku made a motion to approve the street closures as requested. The motion was seconded by Ms. Crayton and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(C) Columbia Transit Gold Route Update.

Mayor Hindman understood this report was informational. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct.

(D) Non-Motorized Project Infrastructure Working Plan Implementation.

Mr. Glascock explained they were moving forward with a more defined goal with the Infrastructure Plan. The defined areas now had projects listed within them. He commented that URS was currently under contract and would be completing the design for some sidewalks and noted three other contracts would be coming before Council in the near future. He wanted them to be aware of that as they were substantial contracts.

Mayor Hindman understood they wanted Council to accept the Infrastructure Plan. Mr. Glascock stated yes and explained it included the projects that would be brought forward.

Mr. Janku asked if the intersection of Providence and I-70 would be part of one of these contracts. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it was within the Twin Lakes/Vanderveen portion, but if it was not, he would ensure it was part of another one that came forward.

Mr. Janku stated he was interested in the dual surface demonstration suggested for Bear Creek as he was concerned with preserving the existing gravel surface at a sufficient width so people could jog and walk on it. Mr. Glascock asked if he had a width in mind. Mr. Janku replied he would suggest five to six feet because it would mimic a sidewalk. Mayor Hindman pointed out the project would have to be approved by Council, so they would have the opportunity to modify specific projects at that time.

Mayor Hindman made a motion to accept the Infrastructure Working Plan and approve the priority of engineering contracts for professional services. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Janku noted for years, the intersection at Garth and Business Loop had been a priority, particularly for the disabled community, and asked if anything was happening with that intersection. Mr. Glascock replied they were continuing to attempt to work with MoDOT. He thought they might be more receptive if they put some of this money toward that intersection. In the past, they were just trying to put in a concrete crosswalk. He stated they needed to look at the total system. Mr. Janku asked if that project was in the Plan. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure. Mr. Janku understood there was no money in the Plan for Business Loop or I-70 Drive and thought there should be given the fact they had repeated requests over the years. Mayor Hindman agreed it was an intersection that needed to be dealt with, but he was not sure it needed to come out of these funds. By doing these, he thought they should be able to work on intersections they would have had a hard time getting

to without this funding. Mr. Glascock stated he had noted those and would try to work with MoDOT. Mr. Janku thought they had set aside money for it at one point. Mr. Glascock noted they had, but MoDOT did not want to do it because they had just paved the road. They were afraid the concrete would rut the asphalt and tear up their equipment.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman and seconded by Mr. Skala was approved unanimously by voice vote.

(E) City Homeownership Assistance Program Loan Standards.

Mr. Watkins explained this report was provided as information per a Council request to ensure the homeowner assistance programs did not put people into bad mortgages.

Mr. Janku noted he asked for this report and was hopeful they could include the potential upside for adjustable rate loans. He commented that the rate options were confusing and thought they should give people an idea of what could happen. He wanted staff to provide ideas of what could be included in counseling. If they had a contract indicating the rate could go up at a certain point, he wanted to be able to show them how much a month that would be. Ms. Nauser noted that was usually disclosed on the Truth and Lending Disclosure Statement, but they could not predict it any further than the first interest rate change since no one knew what the rates would do. Mr. Janku asked if it told them the dollar amount. Ms. Nauser replied it did, but only for the first interest rate change. Mayor Hindman stated there was a lot of documentation at that time. Ms. Nauser agreed and pointed out it was overwhelming and confusing that it was hard for people to understand regardless the explanation.

Ms. Nauser understood the report indicated there was only one loan in default and asked if they knew whether others might be defaulting on their first mortgages, but had not defaulted on their home loans yet. Mr. Teddy replied no and explained that reference was to those that had defaulted on the City's $3,500, which probably meant they were no longer a resident of the home. He noted it was a forgivable loan and was essentially an incentive to stay in a home for five years. He stated they could not track what kind of situation folks were in from a private sector lender.

Mayor Hindman commented that there were a lot of foreclosures, but many were not sure of the reason and asked if Ms. Nauser had some insight. Ms. Nauser noted it was a national problem. There were so many creative avenues of financing in order to get people into homes that down the road they might not be able to afford. She felt the people these loans were designed to help had actually been hurt by them.

(F) Renaming of a Section of Providence Road "North Providence Parkway".

Mr. Watkins explained staff was not recommending a change because they felt the continuity of the name of the road from start to finish was more important.

Mr. Janku stated he would show this report to the neighborhood association that was interested in the change to obtain their thoughts.

(G) Graffiti Abatement.

Mr. Watkins stated there had been an increase in graffiti downtown, so the Police Department and Office of Cultural Affairs had reviewed programs that were successful in other cities.

Mayor Hindman understood there would be a pilot project on a signal box. Chief Boehm stated that was correct. He explained they had looked at things other communities were doing to try to deal with the graffiti issue and some were successful while others were not. They had partnered with Office of Cultural Affairs, the Public Works Department and the District in coming up with this concept. They would see how the pilot project went and would go from there.

(H) Community Characteristics Desirable to High-Tech Companies and Specific Site Location Needs.

Mr. Watkins stated this was an informational report.

Mr. Wade understood they named four extremely important criteria for the community to be a competitive player and believed, at some point, it would be worthwhile for the Council to see an assessment of how Columbia matched up with communities that were key competitors in this initiative. He commented that they had an unusual opportunity to become a national center in nanotechnology due to the University and hoped they would begin thinking about a specific and focused strategy on that industry. He believed that would allow them to get ahead of the game. He did not want to wait until the others were ready to catch up. He thought they needed to have a strategy that got Columbia there first.

(I) Korean Baptist Church.

Mr. Watkins stated they were asking the Council to provide direction in regard to this issue. He noted three were provided in the report and after brainstorming on Friday, they had a fourth option as well.

Mr. Dasho explained they were looking at options in terms of getting water to the site. Using the overhead, he explained staff was proposing to bring an extension off of the twelve inch main with an eight inch line. In the original proposal, they were coming down the street right-of-way. He pointed out the issue surrounded how they would provide enough fire flow protection to meet the standard. Their proposal was to come down Zinnia Drive, go around the east side and come back toward the Church so the Church could be served off of it. In discussing the issue further, they came up with another option of going down Zinnia Drive toward the west and then coming down the property line with a twelve inch main to the Church. The distance for this option was about 1,100 feet and was less than half the distance with the other option. They believed the cost would be about $117,000. He pointed out this would allow them to bring enough fire flow into the area, so the Church could meet the City fire flow standard. This would also be in the neighborhood of the dollar figure they had previously talked to the Church about. The other option they looked at involved a six inch main in two other directions with a cost of about $100,000, but that option would not provide proper fire flow. Using the overhead, he explained they were proposing bringing the eight inch line off of the twelve inch line on the back side of a particular piece of property. He stated they generally did not like doing that because it created maintenance problems for the

future. Since it was not a street right-of-way, they would have to bring heavy equipment into the non-street right-of-way. In addition, they would have to work with the landowners in order to obtain the right-of-way to do this project. Although, they preferred not to do this, for this situation, it would meet the fire flow needs. He noted they had not talked to the Church about this option since it had come up recently.

Mayor Hindman asked if the right-of-way would be an issue if the landowner refused to discuss it with them. Mr. Watkins replied it would require them to partner with the Church in order to obtain the right-of-way. Mayor Hindman asked if this estimated cost included the right-of-way costs. Mr. Dasho replied no. It was strictly the cost of putting the pipe in the ground. Mayor Hindman noted they might have a condemnation issue on their hands. Mr. Watkins agreed and explained that was why it was not included as an initial proposal. Mr. Janku thought it might be attractive to the landowner because water would be brought to the property.

Mr. Wade asked if they needed to delay a decision until there was more information on the viability of this option. Mr. Watkins replied he thought this option was viable. They wanted the Council to determine whether they needed to meet the Fire Code requirements and if so, the least expensive way of doing that was with this option at about $120,000. The Council could determine a variance was reasonable or allow other options that did not meet fire flow requirements. Staff believed the building needed to be sprinklered.

Mr. Janku stated he preferred the newly presented option and was glad staff was able to come up with that. He noted the fire response for this area came from the Worley Street Station near the Health Department, which was quite a distance for response, especially with traffic. Therefore, he believed they needed the appropriate fire flows and sprinkler system.

Mr. Janku made the motion directing staff to work with the Church and the appropriate affected property owners in an effort to move forward with the most recent proposal discussed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Hoppe asked if a lake was on the left side of the illustration on the overhead. Mr. Dasho replied it appeared to be a small pond. He pointed out there were two houses on the southwest corner of a property he pointed to on the overhead that were currently being served by a water line that was done by the Water District years ago and it would have to be moved before the new building was built because a building could not be placed over a waterline serving other houses. He noted that was another complication they would have to deal with.

The motion made by Mr. Janku and seconded by Mr. Skala was approved unanimously by voice vote.

(J) <u>Forum Street Lights.</u>

Mr. Dasho explained an inquiry by a citizen in regard to lighting along Forum was investigated and determined to be spotty. There were long stretches with no lights, while other stretches were well lit. Staff reviewed what was necessary to provide proper lighting along Forum Boulevard as it was a major street with a lot of night traffic and needed to be lit to a level that would provide public safety. They determined putting in lights at about every 200 feet on both sides of Forum was necessary in order to reach both sides of the street. He

noted they were asked to stop and provide a report to Council in regard to what they were doing. He stated staff felt the street needed to be property lit due to the amount of motorized and non-motorized traffic on it. He commented that they were planning to install full cutoff lights, which meant they would shine straight down on the street. They would not cause splatter off of the street to nearby homes. He noted that was the standard used in residential areas.

Ms. Nauser stated she was not necessarily opposed to lights on Forum, but felt other areas were darker, such as Nifong between Bethel and Forum, which in the future would have more foot traffic due to homes for senior citizens being built at the corner of Nifong and Bethel. In addition, she had a problem with the over abundance of tall, ugly gray poles in nice, fully developed medians. She counted sixteen within three-tenths of a mile. She thought it was a lot for an area that did not previously have lights and noted she had lived in that area for ten years and had never noticed it being dark due to spillover from other streets and the homes. She preferred something more decorative with the involvement of the neighbors. She understood one person indicated there was not enough lighting, but many others were asking why it was being added now. She did not feel it incorporated an open, public process.

Mr. Dasho stated it was a difficult situation because they were looking at it as a public safety issue. Since they were told there was a problem and agreed it was a public safety issue, he thought they had to install proper lighting. He noted this was a busy street and not a residential neighborhood street that received ornamental lighting. They were putting in lighting consistent with traffic on the street. He commented that they could put in a black pole instead of an aluminum pole, but they still needed the same height in order to provide the proper light coverage. He did not think they could wait for an accident to happen. Although they recognized the public would question why the lights were being put in since they were not previously in, he believed they needed to be installed due to public safety.

Ms. Nauser pointed out there were a lot of stretches of road without lighting, such as Nifong near Mill Creek School. Mr. Dasho stated he was shocked that Nifong was not lit since it was a major thoroughfare and was not sure how it was built without the lighting. He noted there were a lot of areas he was concerned with and would need to work on. Ms. Nauser asked if she would now be seeing more lights on Nifong. Mr. Dasho replied yes and added that those streets should not be dark. He felt they needed to provide a safe environment for the driving public and for pedestrians.

Mr. Wade stated he understood what Mr. Dasho was saying and agreed the rest of Forum was lit, but noted it was also all commercial. He agreed there needed to be a concern with safety, but also felt they needed to be congenial with what was on the street and not just go by engineering formulas for a particular type of street. He commented that they did not have many nice boulevards and he did not see the need to light that stretch at daylight levels for safety purposes. There were already large poles at each intersection. He wondered why they could not get an acceptable level of lighting with lighting fixtures and poles that were congenial to a residential neighborhood or boulevard. An example was Chapel Hill between Limerick and the Twin Lakes entrance. He did not understand why that kind of lighting system could not meet these safety concerns. He wanted something that took into account

factors other than engineering standards of lighting levels on certain types of streets. Mr. Dasho understood Mr. Wade was suggesting they not to go with levels determined by engineering standards to be correct for certain types of streets, but preferred they go with a lower level. He did not believe there was any other standard that could be used as the standard told them what they should be lighting the streets to. He stated they did not design on lesser standards. Mr. Wade pointed out that was done on Chapel Hill. Mr. Dasho replied he would look at that street and noted the standards had changed over the years. The design a number of years ago was different than the design today. Mr. Wade stated he did not believe they would find a higher accident rate in that area of Chapel Hill than on Forum Boulevard where it was lit to daylight levels. He commented that he wanted something that would take into account more than one standard.

Mr. Skala stated the problem at this location was that any given amount of light seemed incredibly bright because it was being put in a place that did not previously have it. If full cutoff fixtures, which focused all of the light downward, were being used and placed about 200 feet apart, he thought that conformed to standards used for parking lot lighting. He stated it would seem bright because there was not any light out there now.

Mayor Hindman thought they would have a hard time making a decision at this point. Ms. Nauser felt they needed to make some kind of decision because the poles were sitting out there and holes had been dug.

Ms. Nauser asked about the possibility of black poles. Mr. Dasho replied they could install the black poles. Ms. Nauser asked if they were the same type of pole. Mr. Dasho replied yes and added they were just black.

Mr. Watkins suggested they provide the Council alternatives with costs to assist in making a final decision. Mayor Hindman thought they might provide information on more decorative poles. Ms. Nauser agreed. Mr. Janku stated his concern with decorative poles was that if they installed them in one part of town, they would have to install them in others parts of town. Mayor Hindman agreed and suggested asking the neighbors to pay for the decorative poles. Mr. Janku was not sure about that solution as service would be based on neighborhoods that had money. Mayor Hindman noted they allowed subdivisions put in their own. Mr. Wade stated he wanted to see some consideration given to lower decorative poles closer together in areas that were boulevards or residential. He thought that would still provide adequate lighting without the high level of lighting.

(K) <u>PUD Development Charges.</u>

Mr. Watkins stated this report provided a summary of projects that had paid the $25 per linear foot. There were eleven since 1998 and there was currently a balance of about $93,000.

Mr. Janku asked if there was a reason why no funds had been received in association with some. Mr. Watkins replied he thought it had to do with the fact they had not all been final platted. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mayor Hindman suggested they discuss this at a work session instead of dealing with it this evening.

Ms. Hoppe asked what the $25 was going toward. Mr. Watkins understood she was asking what it would cost to build that street. Ms. Hoppe stated yes and wondered what the cost per foot was. Mr. Glascock replied it was about $300-$400 per foot for a local street.

(L) Extension of Bus Service - Old Plank Road.

Mr. Watkins stated this was in response to a request they had on the cost of extending bus service to the Old Plank Road area. Staff was not recommending this due to the cost.

Ms. Nauser asked if the property owners in this area were willing to make contributions toward this service as others had. Glascock replied they had not checked with the apartments in that area. Ms. Nauser thought a person with property on Old Plank Road had suggested they would contribute to some of the cost and wondered if that had been discussed with them. Mr. Glascock replied no. He noted they were concentrating on the areas of town that already had buses running. This would be a new route, so they had not concentrated on those as much.

Ms. Nauser understood two buses were in the budget for replacement purposes and asked where those would go. Mr. Glascock replied they would keep those since their spare ratio was down. Ms. Nauser asked if those buses could be used for this route. Mr. Glascock replied they could look into it.

(M) Extension of Bus Service - Smiley Lane.

Mr. Watkins stated they believed the orange bus route could be extended to accommodate this area within the current bus pattern and time constraints. This would add about 1.6 miles to the route and would cost an additional $9,500 per year.

Mr. Glascock pointed out the $13,000 was for the benches and bus stops. Mr. Janku thought the benches and bus stops were included in the budget. Mr. Watkins replied some were included. Mr. Glascock stated he was not sure these were in there. Mr. Janku thought they were and noted that if they were, the only addition would be the operating cost, which could be done by amendment. He asked if that would come out of the transportation sales tax. Mr. Glascock pointed out the report noted it was allotted in FY07, but removed from the budget. Mr. Watkins stated it could be an amendment to the budget.

(N) Disabled Access Parking on Broadway.

Mr. Watkins stated this report reviewed disabled access parking on Broadway per Council request. He thought it might be a subject for a work session.

Mayor Hindman suggested it be referred to the Disabilities Commission. Mr. Skala agreed.

(O) Parking at Rockbridge and Hickman High Schools.

Mr. Watkins explained this report outlined some expenses and issues in regard to how they might address on-street parking issues at Hickman and Rockbridge. As the Rockbridge campus continued to expand, they were eliminating more and more parking. A substantial amount of parking complaints had been received from the neighbors in that area. Staff had posted signs in the past, but those would immediately disappear. He noted, at times, there

was not enough room to get an ambulance or fire truck into the area. He pointed out they had to determine whether this should be done in the Hickman area as well because there were also complaints in that area. He commented that there were pros and cons for both.

Ms. Nauser asked what the policy was for parking. Mr. Watkins replied for Hickman he thought it was provided to seniors and involved a lottery.

Ms. Nauser stated she understood trying to have equity at both schools and as far as the Rockbridge area was concerned, she was in favor of coming up with a solution for the area because the traffic there was awful. There were a lot of new businesses developing in the area and the students were taking up business parking. She wondered if staff could work with the School District for other solutions. She stated she was in favor of moving forward with parking meters to accommodate the issue in that area.

Mr. Janku stated he had concerns with implementing this in the Hickman area. He noted there were a lot of reasons students drove. Some were involved extra-curricular activities in the morning or evening and the bus system would not get them to and from school at those hours. He stated he was willing to bifurcate the issue and noted the report suggested some of this would go away with the new school. He thought it could have a negative impact on kids who needed to park along the streets and pointed out the Hickman area was different than the Rockbridge area in that the major streets abutted Hickman and some residential property. He was not sure how they would accommodate homeowners and apartment owners who wanted to park on the street. Ms. Crayton agreed.

Ms. Nauser agreed this was not a one size fits all solution and did not think the building of a new school would solve the problem. She wondered if the School District was calculating enough parking for the student population, which she understood might have changed since theses schools were built.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed that one size did not necessarily fit all, but also felt there was a fairness issue. He noted the East Campus area also had parking issues. It was not just restricted to high school kids.

Mr. Janku pointed out some of the students might be driving because they had after school jobs. This cost would be about $2 a day. He thought if they wanted to implement a program, they might want to start with college students. He noted years ago there was a request from the east campus neighborhood and their response was that nothing could be done. He commented that if Ms. Nauser wanted to move forward with Rockbridge, he would support it.

Ms. Nauser understood the need for a car for an after school job, but felt there were many kids that just had cars. She thought it was a privilege to have a car and when public safety was impeded or commerce was blocked, it was a problem that needed to be addressed.

Mr. Wade thought the issue with Rockbridge was different than the one at Hickman because he had received complaints about streets being blocked where cars could not get through. He felt they did not have that issue of public safety at Hickman.

Mr. Janku made the motion to proceed with an ordinance for the Rockbridge area. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Wade stated a constituent had contacted him in regard to reviewing the inadequate street lighting on Edgewood.

Mr. Wade made the motion directing staff to prepare a report indicating how the lack of street lighting on Edgewood could be addressed.

Mr. Watkins asked from where to where. Mr. Wade replied he forwarded an e-mail to Ms. Rhodes, which provides the area of concern. Mr. Watkins noted at some point they would need to address an overall street lighting policy.

The motion made by Mr. Wade was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade commented that at their last work session, they agreed to start fifteen minutes earlier with the 5:45-6:00 p.m. time period being the time for Council to bring up items of interest to them. Mr. Watkins suggested the change be made by motion during a Council meeting.

Mr. Wade made the motion to change future agendas to begin sessions at 5:45 p.m. instead of 6:00 p.m., so the first fifteen minutes could be allotted to Council members to bring up items of interest to them. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was contacted by the manager of the Gateway Apartments, which was located south of Grindstone and east of Providence near Buckingham's, in regard to speeding through there. She noted there was a bus stop at that location. In her discussion with the manager, he indicated there was a lot of traffic cutting through in order to avoid the intersection of Providence and Grindstone to go east on Grindstone.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to review the situation and provide a report with suggestions on how to discourage cut through traffic near the Gateway Apartments.

Mr. Watkins noted that issue might be addressed when they opened Southampton and State Farm Parkway. He stated it was the objective of that road.

Ms. Hoppe stated, currently, parking being allowed on both sides of Buttonwood along with the bus stopping in that area obscured traffic, caused congestion and could potentially cause an accident. She suggested only allowing parking on one side of the street.

Ms. Hoppe added to her previous motion and directed staff to provide a report in regard to allowing parking on only one side of Buttonwood

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe understood there would be a delay in funding for CAT and asked if they had a mechanism in place to assist CAT for the next couple of months. Mr. Watkins replied that if Council elected to increase the franchise fee, the City might be able to advance some money. An appropriation would be required in order to do that. Ms. Hoppe asked when that

would be done. Mr. Watkins replied after it was approved by Council. He pointed out he would be providing Council a potential process for consideration in regard to how they might want to allocate the additional funding. He noted he was not sure he could support an automatic allocation of the two percent to one particular user because there were multiple users. He stated this was a decision Council needed to make and pointed out they did not have to spend it all on communications. Some could be used for right-of-way. He commented that they had options. He stated if that was something they wanted to address, staff could provide a report on the next agenda for their consideration if they decided to increase the franchise fee. Ms. Hoppe asked if the staff would be providing a recommendation. Mayor Hindman thought staff should provide some alternatives.

Mr. Wade asked if the allocation decision would be on the additional two percent or the three percent that already existed as well. Mr. Watkins replied that was one of the questions they would need to address as they needed to decide whether they wanted to maintain the existing City cable channel and communication effort over anything else.

Ms. Hoppe stated she attended the East Campus Neighborhood Association's annual meeting and noted there were no street signs on William Street or other streets from Broadway to Rollins. It was the worst she had seen. She asked if they could paint street names on the curb. She understood that was done at Seven Oaks. She felt it was a safety issue. Mr. Watkins suggested she ask staff to provide alternatives and suggestions as there was also a problem with placing street names on curbs due to snow and parked cars.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding alternatives to street signs for situations such as what was described in the East Campus neighborhood. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe noted there were mounds of trash in front of residences several days before the trash pickup day in the East Campus neighborhood. She understood if someone called in, the City would pick up the trash and charge a $15 fee on the utility bill. She thought they might want to increase that to $45 or another amount that would make an impact.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report on the potential of increasing the fee for trash pick up in an effort to make an impact in situations like this in the East Campus neighborhood. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku understood Mr. Glascock had suggested the City investigate the idea of a Heritage Fund. Mr. Glascock explained it was used by the Corps and people that could not mitigate could contribute to the fund to do things in the watershed.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to provide a report in regard to creating something similar to the Heritage Fund. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku noted they discussed the difference between duplexes and villas earlier in the evening and stated he wanted a report explaining how they could distinguish the two legally.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to provide a report indicating what factors could legally be put into place to distinguish a villa from a traditional duplex. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku stated he had previously brought up the idea of plantings along Blue Ridge and thought that would happen this year. Mr. Glascock commented that he would check into it, but thought it would be done in the fall. Mr. Janku noted some trees on Garth had died and asked them to look at those at the same time.

Mr. Janku asked if there was a vending machine in the waiting room after going through security at the Airport. Ms. Crayton replied no.

Mayor Hindman stated he had been contacted by someone in regard to bus service on Forum Boulevard. He provided Mr. Watkins with the letter and asked staff to look into the issue.

Mr. Skala stated he recently received a neighborhood watch newsletter, which included a chart entitled “Crime Recap by Beat” for June – August, 2007, and noticed that if the incidents were tallied by beats, the beats in the Third Ward led the pack. He understood this was a tight budget year and requested a report on the issue.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to provide a report to address this issue and suggested subdividing the beats in order to have a better response. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala noted a constituent of the East Walnut area, north of Stephens Park, contacted him with regard to Moberly College and the traffic problems of trying to exit onto Old 63.

Mr. Skala made the motion directing staff to provide a report with suggested solutions for the traffic problems at the intersection of East Walnut and Old 63.

Mr. Janku understood there was some discussion about a round-a-bout at that location in the past. Mr. Skala stated it was a problem people were talking about again. Ms. Hoppe noted she had heard complaints as well and commented that Reichmann Pavilion also had quite a bit of traffic when it was used.

Mr. Skala stated he would be participating in a show for CAT called “Counterpoint.” It would be civic affairs type of programming and the first show would be filmed on September 11, 2007. He believed it would show four times per month in the 8:00 – 8:30 time slot. He noted one of the first topics they would be taking up would be high school site selection.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk