

**MINUTES**  
**CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI**  
**FEBRUARY 18, 2008**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 18, 2008, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU and SKALA 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 February 4, 2008 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Wade and a second by Mr. Janku.

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

The agenda, including the Consent Agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Wade and a second by Mr. Skala.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Linda Kaiser - Introduction to the Council of a request from the League of Women Voters - Columbia-Boone County for a policy regarding civil liberties and the public's right to know.**

Linda Kaiser, 821 N. West Park Lane, stated she was representing the Columbia-Boone County League of Women Voters and provided a copy of her presentation to the City Clerk. She commented that over the past several years, there had been several instances in which the constitutional rights of citizens had been denied. Although the City had resolved each of them, it was only after some difficulties and, in one case, a lawsuit. The League of Women Voters was concerned that such events had occurred in Columbia. They felt the City needed to take the initiative in protecting citizens' rights. They believed the Council was committed to openness in government, but also believed the Council needed to adopt a more formal policy stating its commitment to the protection of its citizens' constitutional rights in order to avoid similar incidents in the future. They were proposing two possible wordings of such a policy in the letter the Council had received. She explained that although they were committed to the concept of such a policy, they were not invested in any specific wording. They were only encouraging the Council to adopt such a policy in the near future. She shared a quote, which she felt was relevant to this issue from a speech of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. stating "...in the end, we will remember not the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends...." She thanked the Council for their attention to the proposal.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**B28-08      Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to change the definition of a "family."**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained they were changing the definition of how they determined a single family residence. Council had referred this issue to the Planning and Zoning Commission, who recommended a change in the definition by removing references to one kitchen.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Annie Pope of the Home Builders Association (HBA) with offices at 204 Peachway noted this was an issue the HBA had been interested in for some time. She understood the reference to kitchen facilities in the zoning ordinance in the definition of family was included to specifically prevent any rental of a second kitchen and accessory living space. It was a mechanism to maintain only single family residences in single family zoning. She explained builders were continually receiving requests for a second kitchen facility for reasons having nothing to do with renting it out, so they had been asking for the language to be removed for quite some time. She understood Protective Inspection did not need this in order to enforce single family residences in single family zoning. She commented that they knew of no reason to not take it out and had a lot of good reasons to take it out. She asked the Council to approve the ordinance as written.

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

Ms. Hoppe understood this applied to existing housing as well. She commented that her neighbor recently tried to put a kitchen in her basement for recreational purposes and it was an obstacle.

B28-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B36-08      Calling for bids relating to the construction of repairs to Bridge 12 and the replacement of Bridge 13 on the MKT Nature/Fitness Trail; authorizing a Recreational Trails Program grant agreement with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources; appropriating funds.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the Parks and Recreation Department recently received notice of a grant to help pay for this project in the amount of about \$95,000. This project involved repairing the structural deterioration of Bridge 12, upgrading the safety railing and deck surfacing of Bridge 12 and replacing Bridge 13 with two large steel culverts. Capital improvement park sales tax money in the amount of \$51,000 would be used as the City's match for a total cost of about \$147,000.

Mr. Hood described the location of Bridges 12 and 13 using the overhead. Bridge 12 was the larger bridge over the Hinkson Creek, just west of the Twin Lakes Recreation Area, and Bridge 13 was the small bridge closest to Scott Boulevard. He noted it was primarily over a drainage ditch that was dry most of the time. He explained their primary concern was to repair, renovate, and replace the primary support structures for Bridge 12. It was an old

railroad bridge and some of the large timbers used for support were starting to deteriorate. They wanted to address it before it became a significant problem. At the same time, they would replace the deck and railing due to a fairly significant change in standards since it had been installed in the early 1980's. He commented that Bridge 13 was also showing some substantial deterioration.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

B36-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**(A) Voluntary annexation of City-owned property located on the south side of Gans Road, along Gans Creek Road.**

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted this project involved the Crane property, which the City purchased last year as the site of the next regional park. He explained it was a long standing City policy to annex when they had ground that was contiguous to the City. No action was required tonight as the actual annexation and zoning would occur at the next meeting. This hearing was to allow for comments with regard to whether this property should be annexed.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

**(B) Voluntary annexation of City-owned property located on the west side of Creasy Springs Road, north of West Prairie View Drive.**

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted the City purchased about 2.5 acres on the west side of Creasy Springs Road last year as it would be needed in the future when they began fixing some of the bad turns on Creasy Springs. City policy was to annex property that was contiguous to the City. He stated no action was necessary as the annexation and zoning would be discussed at the next Council meeting. The reason for the hearing tonight was to take comments on whether it should be brought into the City.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

**(C) Consider grant applications relating to the Safe Routes to School Program.**

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated MoDOT was making available \$5.9 million state-wide through this program. Last year, they were successful in receiving funding for three programs. He pointed out this program did not require a match and that they would not see this grant for two years. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct and explained MoDOT was consolidating years of the program. They expected to see the availability of more funds in future years after the federal transportation law was reauthorized.

Mr. Watkins noted as part of the grant application process, this public hearing was being held to obtain ideas. Staff was suggesting Council look at some of the projects that

were brought forward last year as there were a lot of good projects they did not get to last year. Those included the Parkade Elementary traffic calming median and improved crosswalk across Garth, a South Garth trail connection to the MKT, flashing yellow lights at the three middle schools, driver feedback installation on Park DeVille for Paxton Keeley and a five-foot sidewalk along the west side of Fairview from Fairview Elementary to Rollins.

Mr. Teddy noted there were two categories for Safe Routes to School grant applications. One was infrastructure, which involved construction projects. The City, as an applicant, would have a relatively long period of time to implement those and the limit for an infrastructure project was \$250,000. The other was non-infrastructure projects and those involve educational and encouragement type of activities, such as planning and design. The limit per application was \$25,000. One criterion for infrastructure projects was that the improvements be within two miles of a school that served grades kindergarten through eighth grade. Not-for-profits, such as the School District and City, were eligible applicants. Projects would be paid for on a reimbursement basis, so the City would have to appropriate funds and be reimbursed upon completion of the work. He pointed out this was very competitive. Last year, the first year of the program, 99 applications were received and 46 were funded. Of those funded, 21 were construction projects and 25 were non-infrastructure projects. He pointed out all of the non-infrastructure applications were funded. He explained staff's suggestions were based on projects that were in existing plans and met the criteria of the program. They were either unfunded projects or projects with funding that could be used for other purposes.

Mr. Janku asked if he thought the driver feedback signs would have a likelihood of success. He wondered about the criteria for evaluation. Mr. Teddy replied, in looking at the administrative guidelines, anything that added the element of safety to school zones was an eligible project. Beyond that, there were no detailed criteria in the guidelines. He stated he thought they would be competitive applications. He understood the State had a goal to reach as many program objectives as they could state-wide, so it depended upon the other applications. Mr. Janku asked if safety was the primary goal. Mr. Teddy replied it was safety, traffic diversion, permanent bicycle parking, a program to fund a Safe Routes to School coordinator, physical facilities, such as sidewalks, crossings and traffic calming devices. Mr. Janku asked if they should have a mixture. Mr. Teddy replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the seven projects suggested were ones they felt were strong in terms of receiving funding. Mr. Teddy replied they were projects drawn from City documents and plans. He explained the South Garth trail was on the GetAbout Columbia Working Infrastructure Plan and fit the criteria for the Safe Routes to School Program by providing a pathway to Grant Elementary. He noted the Working Infrastructure Plan would have a number of other projects that could be funded.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Mike Martin, 206 S. Glenwood, commented that a couple months ago, he started an e-mail chain with the Library Board, Mr. Wade and the administrators at Grant Elementary after he was side-swiped on Crestmere Avenue while waiting to pick his daughter up from school. It dawned on him that after five years something had changed about the quality of getting kids to school safely at Grant Elementary. Two things were the expansion of the Library and

the increased number of students at Grant Elementary. This caused traffic around Grant Elementary to explode making it one of the least safe routes to school while still being one of the most used routes. He noted many students and parents made the trip to Grant a morning ritual. The e-mail chain discussed all of the things that had been done to cobble together a solution and included the Library allowing Grant to borrow their parking lot at different times and Grant using the other parking lots and streets in the area for vehicle and bus traffic. He felt this situation was a nightmare. He pointed out this was not just his perception and referred to a column written by Joyce Hulett titled “Speeding in School Zones Dangerous for Children” where someone asked what could be done about speeding through school zones as they were worried a child would be hit by a car. Mr. Martin read portions of the article where Ms. Hulett indicated that while she was sitting in the left turn lane by Grant Elementary, a car sped by going at least 60 mph while there were children waiting to cross the street to go to school and that Grant Elementary was situated in a particularly dangerous area. He asked the Council to consider some solutions for Grant Elementary with the Safe Routes to Schools grant. He provided the Council a copy of Ms. Hulett’s column and an article from 2005, which discussed the School District and City coordinating on a sidewalk plan and stated “...Mayor Darwin Hindman suggested naming the project the Safe Routes to School Program....”

Mr. Janku asked if he had a specific idea. Mr. Martin replied one solution he noticed in other cities was the use of temporary one-way streets. He understood they turned certain streets into one-way street at certain times of the day. He suggested Garth be one way in one direction between the hours of 8:15-9:00 a.m. and 3:00-4:00 p.m. This would allow people to use both sides of the street going in one direction. They could park, walk across, etc. without worrying about traffic coming from two directions on the narrow street. It would turn a clogged bilateral artery into a unilateral single artery, which was a lot less clogged. He understood it worked very well in a many different cities. Beyond that, he suggested having traffic engineers look at the situation. He noted it was a little part of town that had outgrown its infrastructure. He felt catching up with infrastructure was critically important because he believed a child would be hit one day.

Ian Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, stated he was the Director of the PedNet Coalition and confirmed their support for the City’s proposals. They enthusiastically wanted to work with the City and School District on projects to encourage children to walk and bike to school and to make those activities safer through infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects. He pointed out they were already working on three projects funded last year and one was an innovative project involving the possibility of a remote drop off so all children, even those that came by car and bus, could walk. It also cleared congestion around the school. He believed the City should take this funding opportunity seriously as it was an excellent federal funding program and was likely to be expanded in the next federal transportation bill. He commented that more people were becoming appreciative of the benefits of this program in increasing the physical activity of children, improving health outcomes, improving educational outcomes at school, providing safety around the school and relieving congestion and air pollution.

Ms. Hoppe stated she had met with him with regard to walking and safe streets at Shepard Elementary School and asked if that would be appropriate for the Safe Routes to School program or if he would suggest holding off on that. Mr. Thomas replied he

understood she was referring to the walking school bus program and noted two of the three projects funded for this year involved the walking school bus program, so applying it to Shepard was a possibility. He commented that he believed Shepard was being proposed to be funded through the GetAbout Columbia program, so he believed that would happen anyway. He noted infrastructure improvements at Shepard could be another possibility.

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

Mr. Wade stated he would urge that a project for Grant Elementary be considered. When the e-mail Mr. Martin spoke of was being circulated, he forwarded it to staff, but had not yet received a response. He commented that Grant had an incredibly high level of students walking with extremely poor infrastructure and no space due to its location in the central City. He believed it was a dangerous situation. He thought creativity was needed as the solution was not obvious or easy due to the infrastructure already in place. He felt this would provide the opportunity to bring the City, School and Library together for creative planning and design. He thought this program could be used as a catalyst for thinking about what might work there. Mr. Janku understood staff had suggested a design charrette for Grant Elementary.

Mr. Janku noted they had a list of potential projects and asked if staff wanted the Council to make a motion directing staff to proceed. Mr. Teddy replied any direction they could offer would be beneficial. He stated at the second meeting in March, they would be bringing Council a resolution of support for the City's applications. Mr. Watkins agreed they wanted as much direction as Council could give to them in terms of projects. Mr. Janku understood the non-infrastructure project being suggested was the design charrette for Grant Elementary. He noted he liked the driver feedback signs being suggested and asked why some signs were a flashing yellow while others provided a speed. Mr. Teddy replied he was not certain as the Public Works Department had prepared the matrix for the traffic control devices. Mr. Janku thought the ones suggested for the various middle schools would be excellent.

Ms. Nauser stated she was in support of the suggestions for the middle schools. She noted her son attended Gentry and she saw a child who was almost hit the other day.

Mr. Janku referenced the project suggested for Garth and questioned whether they should pursue funding a median until the sidewalk was actually built on the east side for a link. Mr. Teddy explained the crosswalk median project a component of a larger grant application the City submitted last year. He noted they had an application for the east sidewalk, but found \$250,000 was not enough. Also through feedback from MoDOT, he understood the committee that reviewed the infrastructure applications did not favor sidewalks being built on the opposite side of a street from a school. In addition, they felt the City's sidewalk estimates were high. As a result, staff was suggesting they submit the crosswalk component even though there would not be a sidewalk immediately because children were still making that movement. It would allow a safer crossing by it being clearly marked and having a refuge. Mr. Teddy asked if it would help if they provided a match. Mr. Teddy replied no local match was allowed, so they would have to represent the \$250,000 would be one phase with the other phase being a separate City project. If they could come in

under \$250,000 on the cost estimate, they could submit the application and if successful, it would all be paid with federal dollars.

Mr. Wade asked when the Grant Elementary charrette was added as he did not see it in the material he received. Mr. Janku replied it was included in the February 11, 2008 staff report. Mr. Teddy stated it was in the concluding paragraph on non-infrastructure in the supplemental memo provided for the public hearing.

Mr. Janku commented that since they did not have a cost estimate for the South Garth trail, he did not believe it would be appropriate to include if it was not under \$250,000. Mr. Teddy stated it might be a better strategy to build it with GetAbout Columbia money since whatever portion could not be built for \$250,000 would require a local match. If there was a logical breaking point, it could be done in phases. Mr. Janku asked if he thought they would have the cost information in time for the grant application. Mr. Teddy replied they would have to obtain it. Mr. Janku explained that he was wondering if they should include it in the motion. He understood it would have a lot of benefit due to University Heights having many children going to Grant Elementary.

Mayor Hindman suggested they think about it in terms of having several funding sources available for these projects. He understood when looking at the different funding options, they were seriously considering the use of GetAbout Columbia funds for the extension of the trail from Garth. Mr. Teddy stated that in the Working Infrastructure Plan, that trail was a priority one improvement. It also fit the criteria for this grant program, so they could try to write a good application for it. Mayor Hindman understood there was a lot of coordination going on between the Parks and Recreation Department, the Planning Department and GetAbout Columbia to use the most appropriate funding sources in an effort to fund the projects.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to prepare the necessary paperwork to proceed with grant applications for the non-infrastructure projects suggested, which included the Grant Elementary School design charrette, and for the Parkade Elementary School traffic calming median, driver feedback signs at all locations instead of the flashing yellow lights, which included the three middle schools and Paxton Keeley Elementary, and the Fairview Elementary School sidewalk. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade.

Mr. Watkins asked if the Garth trail connection was included. Mr. Janku replied he left it out.

Mayor Hindman commented that he would refrain from voting on this since PedNet was involved. He pointed out there would be no personal gain, but felt it would be appropriate.

Ms. Hoppe asked if they could include Shepard Elementary related to Audubon Drive. She felt as Crosscreek developed, there would be more traffic on Stadium and more cut-through traffic on Audubon, so she was interested in traffic calming islands. Mr. Janku suggested they include Shepard Elementary for a design charrette similar to Grant Elementary. Mr. Teddy stated they could include it and asked that information to be provided to help define the problem for application purposes.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend the motion made by Mr. Janku and seconded by Mr. Wade by including a design charrette for Shepard Elementary School to include Audubon

Drive from Stadium to Shepard Elementary. Mr. Janku and Mr. Wade were agreeable. The amended motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote with Mayor Hindman abstaining.

The motion made by Mr. Janku, amended by Ms. Hoppe, and seconded by Mr. Wade was approved by voice vote with Mayor Hindman abstaining.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **PR31-08 Establishing revised Community Development Block Grant funding guidelines; establishing a revised review process for annual CDBG funding requests.**

The policy resolution was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the Community Development Commission (CDC) was suggesting the City approve multi-year funding commitments in order to improve the timeliness of expenditures and to change the range of percentages for various funding categories in an effort to emphasize housing and deemphasize streets and infrastructure. Staff was supportive of the multi-year funding recommendation, but was concerned with changing the funding percentages, primarily, because the only funding pot they currently had to improve local streets in older areas of town was Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. At this time, they were trying to do one street every two years. If it was cut back, they would have less money to do those types streets.

Mr. Teddy noted the CDC had asked staff to provide data on what they actually spent by category over the 2003-2007 time frame. The CDC felt their recommended changes in the funding percentages were in alignment with expenditure patterns.

Ms. Nauser asked if the infrastructure improvements were predominantly due to them wanting to bring streets up to standard or if they were due to some deficiency. She wondered about the criteria for infrastructure improvements. Mr. Teddy replied that when the Consolidated Plan was put together several years ago an inventory of streets had been taken and he believed the unimproved streets in the eligibility area were defined as the set of streets that could be addressed with CDBG funds. In addition, through the development of the Plan, there was an objective to improve one street per year to standard, which generally meant curb and gutter, a good quality surface and a sidewalk where it could be accommodated. He noted that was the objective in the 2005-2009 Consolidated Plan. Ms. Nauser explained she was asking if they were constructing streets up to standard or if they were working on them to fix other problems in addition to bringing them up to standard. Mr. Teddy replied there had been CDBG projects that had addressed just street drainage. There were also a number of stand alone sidewalk projects and total street reconstructions.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the City had improved any streets outside of the eligibility area with other funds. Mr. Janku replied yes and explained they were usually tax billed for at least 50 percent to the property owner. City policy was for the City to put in 50 percent and for the property owners to put in the other 50 percent, but in the CDBG eligible areas, the property owners could not afford to put in 50 percent so the City built the entire street. Ms. Hoppe understood one option was to use these funds as a substitute for the homeowner's portion, so the City paid for the whole street versus just 50 percent. Mr. Janku noted if it was not in

the CDBG eligible area, the City's policy was to tax bill because other people paid for their streets when a new subdivision was built.

Ms. Hoppe asked if other communities used these funds to contribute to the homeowner's portion with the City finding its portion elsewhere. Mr. Teddy replied he was not sure of the cost allocations from city to city. He understood a lot of the entitlement communities that received CDBG formula grants used the funds for infrastructure, but the proportions would vary.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was looking for a way to continue to improve streets in the area by using less CDBG funds and finding other funds to help those projects as it would allow more funding for affordable housing needs, etc. Mr. Teddy noted there was a mix of funds used for the Hunt project and explained they leveraged other City funds for some street projects. Mr. Watkins referred to B48-08, which was under the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda, and explained it involved \$150,000 in CDBG money, \$81,000 in water utility money and \$45,000 in capital improvement annual street funds. In addition, they were suggesting the remaining \$15,000 that would have been paid with tax bills be paid with annual street funds. He commented that he believed there had been a good mix on most streets funded with CDBG money. The change was potentially 5 percent and would equal about \$40,000 per year. They felt that was fairly significant in terms of funding for a street or sidewalk. Staff also felt they needed to take a holistic approach to neighborhoods. They could not just do housing without dealing with stormwater and street problems as well. He noted that over the years, in the older areas of town, they had been able to combine housing rehabilitation and new housing with the street improvements and other improvements and believed it made a difference.

Mr. Janku asked if it was possible to increase housing without decreasing streets. Mr. Watkins replied if that was done, they would have to take it from community facilities and economic development. Mr. Janku commented that if they left public improvements at 45 percent with housing at a minimum of 35 percent and planning at 16 percent, 4 percent would be available. Mr. Watkins noted that was the minimum. Mr. Janku thought housing could range from 35 to 40 percent. Mr. Wade thought it would be 30 to 40 percent if they had 35 percent for community facilities and left public improvements the same.

Mayor Hindman stated they had just received the Affordable Housing Task Force report and had not had a good chance to evaluate it, which, he believed, made it tough for them to make percentage policy decisions because they might want to emphasize housing or find different sources of funds.

Mr. Janku stated he agreed and thought they would want to emphasize housing. He pointed out the Commission would be using this for the next budget process. He stated he wanted to increase housing in response to what they had heard during the pre-Council meeting and would consider reducing community facilities to zero as it was the category in which they had a range of big projects that did not move forward.

Mr. Wade commented that when looking at the recommendations, community facility, services and economic development was being downplayed and housing was being increased. If they left public improvements the same, they could still increase housing. Although it would not be quite as much, it still followed the analysis as to why they made the

changes in terms of actual expenditures. He suggested 45-55 percent for public improvements, 25-40 percent for housing and 5-30 for community facilities as it was close to the recommendation. Mr. Janku stated he did not want 5 percent for community facilities as it could be meaningless. He thought zero would provide greater flexibility.

Mr. Wade made the motion to amend PR 31-08 so the percentages were 45-55 for public improvements, 30-40 for housing and 0-35 for community facilities. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Ms. Nauser stated she was uncomfortable changing the percentages since this was for the 2009 budget, which they were currently working on. She wondered about the implications of these changes. She understood only 7 percent was spent last year on community facilities, services and economic development, but noted they did not know what might be in the works. She preferred to follow one of the recommendations or not make any changes. She commented that in the scheme of things, 5 percent here or there would not really make a difference, other than a statement.

Mr. Janku felt it allowed more money to potentially be used for housing. This would allow a project within community facilities to be funded if there was a good option, but if there was nothing, the zero would allow them to not fund anything.

Mr. Skala believed the range took care of the details in terms of spending. They were only trying to emphasize housing due to recent discussions regarding affordable housing. He thought it spoke volumes to suggest they wanted to back that up. He believed the rest would fall into place as the projects could adjust according to the ranges assigned.

Ms. Hoppe suggested public improvements be 40-55 percent, so there was a possibility of providing the maximum or going a little lower than the present range. Mr. Wade and Mr. Janku were agreeable to changing the original motion to include Ms. Hoppe's suggestion.

Mr. Wade noted his revised motion was to amend PR 31-08 so the percentages were 40-55 for public improvements, 30-40 for housing and 0-35 for community facilities. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on PR31-08, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**B30-08 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to establish a 5-hour parking zone on the south side of Conley Avenue, from Maryland Avenue to Missouri Avenue.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this amendment would convert eleven existing meters on the south side of Conley Avenue, between the 700-800 block, from a 24 minute zone to a five hour zone. The University supported the change.

Ms. Nauser asked why they decided on five hours versus eight hours. Mr. Watkins replied since it was on campus, they thought five hours was sufficient. Ms. Nauser asked about employees that might work an eight hour day. Mr. Janku thought it was about 50 cents per hour, so it could be fairly expensive. He commented that it also encouraged turnover so others could use it.

B30-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: CRAYTON. (Ms. Crayton stepped out during the discussion for B30-08 and did not return until after the official vote was taken.) Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B31-08 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to long-term lease of off-street parking spaces.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was a change in policy and went along with what Sasaki was referring to with the downtown area by encouraging developers to give up off-street parking spaces and renting City-owned spaces, which would encourage redevelopment. This would facilitate the leasing of blocks of 5-30 off-street City parking spaces when it was determined the lease would benefit the City.

B31-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B37-08 Appropriating funds for Share the Light Program.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted there was an amendment sheet which would correct the account numbers. This would appropriate \$1,550 for the maintenance of public art and \$3,550 for the purchase of 200 carbon monoxide detectors, which would be given away by the Fire Department.

Ms. Hoppe asked how they determined who had the financial need for the carbon monoxide detectors. Mr. Watkins replied he did not believe it was entirely financial. If groups asked for them to be distributed to lower income individuals or seniors, they would do that. He noted they were also used for fire prevention events.

Mr. Wade made the motion to amend B37-08 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B37-08, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B38-08 Approving a settlement agreement with Sprint; assigning a percentage of the settlement proceeds to the Missouri Municipal League.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was the fourth settlement by a number of Missouri municipalities against major wireless companies to collect back payment of taxes. Each city had to approve the settlement. Columbia would receive a one time payment of about \$1.4 million. Staff was suggesting it be put into the general fund and not used for additional operating programs. He noted they did not expect to receive the check until May or June. At that point, depending on the financial situation, they might suggest the purchase of some equipment.

B38-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

## CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B29-08**      **Vacating a sanitary sewer easement located within Spring Creek Subdivision Plat 4.**
- B32-08**      **Authorizing acquisition of easements for construction of Phase I of the Brandon Road culvert replacement project.**
- B33-08**      **Appropriating funds to offset expenditures for replacement of a vehicle in the Solid Waste Division.**
- B34-08**      **Accepting conveyance; authorizing payment of differential costs for water main serving Bellwood, Plat 1; approving the Engineer's Final Report.**
- B35-08**      **Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.**
- R32-08**      **Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with Crawford, Bunte, Brammeier for engineering services relating to evaluation of the West Broadway corridor from Garth Avenue to Fairview Road.**
- R33-08**      **Authorizing an agreement with Sustainable Farms & Communities, Inc. for the lease of city-owned property located on the west side of Clinkscates Road for the operation of a farmers' market.**

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

## NEW BUSINESS

- R34-08**      **Authorizing the sale of Special Obligation Electric Utility Improvement Bonds, Series 2006C.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained as part of the on-going Capital Improvement Program for the electric utility, the voters approved a \$60 million bond issue in 2006. In order to avoid arbitrage and other problems, they sold the bonds as needed. He noted, so far, they had sold about \$38 million and this would allow them to sell the balance. They were proposing to sell them on March 3, 2008. He pointed the City was re-rated and maintained the excellent bond rating of AA-.

Mr. Janku noted Section 5 of the ordinance discussed municipal bond insurance and asked if that had been in previous ordinances or if it was something new. Ms. Fleming replied the City typically insured its bonds. She explained they bid it out to be insured and uninsured, and did a financial analysis to determine what made financial sense. She did not think these would be insured bonds because of the difficulties in the municipal bond insurance market and did not believe they would get the value of a lower rating if the bonds

were insured. She noted they would do the analysis regardless. Mr. Janku asked if that would be presented to the Council when they received the bids. Ms. Fleming replied yes.

The vote on R34-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R35-08 Authorizing a parking lease agreement with Walnut Market, LLC for parking spaces located on the south side of Walnut Street, between Tenth Street and Short Street.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this agreement would lease eight parking spaces to Walnut Market, LLC. It was the first agreement under the policy approved earlier tonight. It was on the south side of Walnut Street between Tenth Street and Short Street.

The vote on R35-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R36-08 Authorizing agreements for Sports Development Funds.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the Sports Development Fund began in March of 2006 and was funded by a portion of the hotel/motel tax. It was the third program under the umbrella of the Tourism Development Program. The Convention and Visitors Bureau Advisory Board recommended funding these four events.

Ms. Steiner stated the Sports Development Fund made it possible for them to bring a considerable amount of new business to the City. They were looking at about 3,000 room nights from these four new events.

Mr. Janku asked if the Sports Development Fund helped with the Missouri Grand Prix, which was the recent swimming event. Ms. Steiner replied they had submitted an application, but there were some issues so it was withdrawn. She noted they had submitted one the year before, which was funded. She thought they would submit an application again. Mr. Janku commented that he felt that had the potential for a big impact. Ms. Steiner stated it was huge in terms of press nationally and internationally.

The vote on R36-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R37-08 Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Chamber of Commerce relating to the remodeling of the Walton Building.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the Walton Building was jointly owned by the Chamber of Commerce and the City through the Convention and Visitors Bureau. It was now over twenty years old and in need of interior remodeling and work on the outside and with the parking lots. The Walton Building Board of Managers, which was set up years ago, had voted to contract for the development of a design plan for the remodeling. This would split the cost

50-50 between the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce with the City's share being about \$4,000.

Mr. Wade asked if the Convention and Visitors Bureau had taken over the space vacated by REDI. Ms. Steiner replied yes. REDI had moved to another facility in October of 2007, which allowed the Convention and Visitors Bureau to expand without expanding the building itself. Mr. Wade understood they were still using half of the building. Ms. Steiner replied yes.

The vote on R37-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

## **INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

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

- B39-08**      Authorizing the issuance of Special Obligation Electric Utility Improvement Bonds, Series 2006C.
- B40-08**      Voluntary annexation of City-owned property located on the south side of Gans Road, along Gans Creek Road; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.
- B41-08**      Voluntary annexation of City-owned property located on the west side of Creasy Springs Road, north of West Prairie View Drive; establishing permanent R-1 zoning.
- B42-08**      Rezoning property located on the west side of Old 63, approximately 1,200 feet northwest of the intersection of Bearfield Road and Old 63, from R-3 to C-3.
- B43-08**      Approving the Old Hawthorne Golf Club Maintenance Facility PUD development plan located on the west side of Old Hawthorne Drive West, approximately 1,800 feet north of State Route WW.
- B44-08**      Approving the Final Plat of Naydyhor Heights located on the north side of Brighton Street, between Ripley Street and William Street; authorizing a performance contract; granting variances to the Subdivision Regulations.
- B45-08**      Vacating an underground electric utility easement located generally south of Business Loop 70 West and east of Hunt Avenue.
- B46-08**      Authorizing service agreements with the Columbia Public School District, Mark Fenton and the Pednet Coalition, Inc. relating to the Safe Routes to School Grant funded by the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission; appropriating funds.
- B47-08**      Authorizing a first amended and restated cost participation agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Gans Road Interchange construction project.
- B48-08**      Authorizing Change Order No. 1 to the contract with Emery Sapp & Sons, Inc. for reconstruction of Hope Place from West Boulevard to Hardin Street, including construction of a sidewalk adjacent to the back of the curb on the north side of Hope Street, approving the Engineer's Final Report.
- B49-08**      Appropriating funds for fiber optic capital improvement projects.

**B50-08      Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.**

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

**(A)    Intra-departmental Transfer of Funds.**

Mayor Hindman noted this report was informational.

**(B)    West Nile Virus Prevention and Control.**

Mayor Hindman understood this report was informational.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the neighborhood association presidents could be notified of spraying in advance so they could individually notify the neighbors. Mr. Watkins replied yes. He explained they thought notice and education was important. It was difficult to ensure everyone was notified. This was another outlet.

Ms. Crayton asked what they would do if those entities did not provide notice. Mr. Watkins replied he did not think they could rely on one avenue. He pointed out they were only spraying where they had an active case. Since there was a lot of concern with regard to spraying last year, the Board of Health was asked to review the West Nile Prevention and Control Program. The Board was suggesting the City continue the program with an increased emphasis on notification.

Ms. Browning noted they were looking at what could be done to increase communication. They frequently used the media, but that was not the only way to reach people. They were proposing to use the Teleminder system and would, over the next few months, recruit people who wanted to voluntarily provide contact information. This would allow them to be notified anytime spraying was being done in the City via a cell or home phone. They could then find out if their neighborhood was impacted. She pointed out the most important way to avoid spraying was prevention. With GIS mapping technology and a history of cases, they could map locations. She noted they were seeing an overlay of areas, which were of concern year after year. This year they would map where they place larvaecide and would try to do some targeted prevention and outreach through neighborhood associations to identify where mosquito breeding sites were located.

Mr. Wade commented that a large number of the sprayings last year were in Ward 4 and that he had received a lot of e-mails concerning the issue with most of the concerns involving notification. He stated he was uncomfortable with the Board of Health's conclusion. He understood they concluded notification through the Health Department website and local media was sufficient and he did not believe it was. He noted that listening to a pre-recorded alert on a hotline or going to the website meant the person being notified had to take a positive action to be notified and he did not think that would work well. He suggested they stake signs when they planned a targeted spraying. He thought that would be more effective than the notification techniques currently being used. Ms. Browning explained she thought the Board of Health was trying to say the media and website were good venues. There was a lot of discussion about what other steps could be taken this year and the Board was very supportive of those. She did not believe they were saying that was totally sufficient. She thought they were saying it was a good start with the understanding staff was working on the issue. She stated they had talked about signs, but noted a drawback was cancellation of

spraying due to weather. She agreed notification in general was better than no notification. The biggest issue was to identify the areas, making sure they got there and that they stayed for the duration so people would see them. She pointed out several people she spoke with indicated they would go door to door in the neighborhood if notified. She thought they had many potential opportunities. Mr. Wade noted in Ward 4, there was a high level of list serve use and if he received a notification, he could send it out on his list serve. He thought that might work better than the hotline or website.

Ms. Hoppe noted they could put “weather permitting” on the yard sign notices.

**(C) Disabled Parking in Front of the Municipal Building.**

Mr. Watkins stated the Council asked them to take a look at parking around the municipal building and staff was recommending temporarily converting two on-street meters on the east side of Seventh Street, directly behind the one disabled space, into disabled parking. This would provide three right by City offices. As they completed the expansion, they could revisit the issue for better locations.

Mr. Janku made the motion to convert two on-street metered spots on the east side of Seventh Street, directly behind the one disabled space, into disabled parking and to include the Disabilities Commission when revisiting the issue. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(D) At Risk Youth Prevention Activities Follow-Up.**

Mr. Watkins stated this was informational as they tried to answer questions the Council posed.

Ms. Nauser thanked staff for providing the additional information and indicated she did not have any questions at this time. She noted she had received a large stack of information from the National League of Cities which she would review over the next couple of weeks for ideas. She reminded everyone of the Let’s Talk Columbia event with regard to youth issues that would be occurring on Friday and Saturday. She hoped it would assist to create dialogue between youth and adults with regard to what they could do to address the problem.

Mr. Janku provided a handout of information showing what was being funded by the Community Services budget. He noted they were meeting with Council on March 3, 2008 and thought the issue of coordination of activities could be brought up at that time.

Ms. Crayton suggested they visit with some of these groups to see what they had to go through to put on programs and whether they were doing enough. She recalled that before there was a Douglas Little League Baseball Team, she got most of the equipment from KFRU. She noted there was a City-wide drum line and high steppers. She thought they could do a lot more City-wide. She invited them to see what these kids were doing during Spring Break.

Mr. Skala noted there were a multitude of programs, with most being located in the central City because the facilities were there. He pointed out the northeast side of town did not have any facilities, but had a lot of kids who could benefit if they had a way to get them to places or if they had places there. He commented that Indian Hills was a candidate. It had some facilities, but not any indoor facilities. He thought they needed more equity in being

able to provide these useful programs to the kids that needed it all over the City and not just in a central location.

Ms. Crayton commented that when they first discussed building the ARC, they suggested satellite locations for kids who could not make it to the ARC. She agreed activities were needed in pockets around town.

Ms. Nauser understood the schools offered some after school programs and thought collaboration between the City and School District might assist with coordination of some of these problems. Mr. Janku thought they discussed talking to the School District as they developed and planned the new school site, so it could potentially be designed to be more accessible to the public after school hours. Mayor Hindman noted one of the reasons the schools were looking at the pod design was so they could open up recreational areas without opening up the entire school. He stated he also thought they should start talking about more indoor recreational facilities in other parts of town.

Ms. Hoppe commented that they should also look at transportation options to get kids to locations with opportunities. Mr. Skala noted they could also talk about improvements to roads with sidewalks, etc. so it was all connected.

**(E) Garth Nature Area Additional Parking.**

Mr. Watkins noted Council asked staff to take a look at the possibility of providing additional parking for the Garth Nature Area. Staff developed a proposal, which would add 22 spaces. There were two approaches. One was to put all of it in next years budget and the other was to try to split it between this year's and next year's budget, which would allow some of the construction to be done this summer.

Mr. Hood explained that adding 22 parking spaces would double the amount of parking. They looked at two to three alternatives with regard to location and were recommending the one shown on the overhead. The estimated cost was \$48,000. He noted this was similar to the parking situation at the Forum Nature Area where they added a second tier immediately behind the first tier of parking due to increased use. He commented that there was some concern with it being low and wet, so it could be quite valuable if they could start work late summer or early fall since those were in the driest parts of the year.

Mr. Janku thanked staff and commented that he noticed this to be a problem when daylight savings time ended because the time in the evening to walk dogs become constrained. As a result, he suggested they expedite the project so it would be in by that time period next fall.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to proceed with the project by funding it with this year's and next year's budget so it might be done by next fall. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(F) Howard Orchard Road Special Area Plan.**

Mr. Watkins explained this was a report on status of putting the plan together and was informational.

**(G) Downtown Columbia Leadership Council.**

Mr. Watkins commented that at the January 28, 2008 work session, they talked about downtown and one of the pieces of the downtown visioning proposal was the establishment of a Downtown Leadership Council. Staff outlined their thoughts with regard to proposed duties and membership. If the Council concurred, a motion directing them to bring back legislation would be appropriate. He noted they would also hold a public hearing to obtain further public input. He pointed out they wanted to get started quickly because they thought it would be important in looking at MODESA.

Mr. Skala asked if this was a way to supplant the structure that was already in place. Mr. Watkins replied no. He stated this was totally separate. It would be an advisory group to Council and would involve a broader and bigger area than the Special Business District (SBD). Mr. Skala understood there were two groups, the SBD and another group, and asked if this was related to the recent discussion in the newspaper with regard to getting rid of the SBD. Mr. Watkins replied this was not related to that at all. He pointed out the SBD had hired a consultant to help advise them as to whether or not a different form might work better. There had not been any decision yet. Mayor Hindman noted the other group was the CCA, which was a merchants group.

Mr. Janku commented that there appeared to be a lot of different groups, so it might be hard to coordinate. In terms of residential input, he understood there were two neighborhood associations. He noted there was also a potentially growing group of downtown residents that might have the most direct impact and asked how they would incorporate people who actually lived downtown. Mr. Watkins replied they were suggesting three independent members, which were not a member of any particular group, and thought those could potentially be used for this type of person.

Ms. Crayton stated a part of the area would include Douglas and she did not see a representative of the Douglas Neighborhood Association. Mr. Watkins commented that depending on where they drew the line, Douglas could potentially be involved.

Ms. Hoppe asked where the western boundary for Stephens-Benton was. Mr. Watkins replied one of the things this group needed to do was to figure out the boundaries of the planning area. He did not want to presuppose where the boundaries would be because his idea could be entirely different from what this group would recommend to Council. He thought they needed to keep the group from getting too big and believed the size, as proposed, in terms of total numbers made sense.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed it was dependent on where they drew the line and the make up of the body should be dependent on where the line was drawn. Mr. Watkins thought they needed to form the Council before drawing the line.

Mr. Janku suggested the representation vary dependent upon the project. If it was impacting one of the neighborhoods, they would want to ensure that neighborhood was involved.

Ms. Hoppe thought it was important to include the neighborhoods because neighborhoods supported the vitality of downtown. She believed it was important to include the adjacent neighborhoods even though some projects might not be in those neighborhoods since they would still abut to their neighborhood.

Mr. Watkins asked if they wanted to expand the membership of the group by two or if they wanted to decrease the number of independent people by two.

Mr. Janku asked if there was a map of the area. Mr. Watkins replied there was no identified area. That would be the first thing the Council would need to decide.

Mr. Skala did not believe the difference between 13 and 15 was great. Mayor Hindman agreed that if they included those two neighborhoods, they should increase the size of the Council.

Mr. Watkins stated they would bring back appropriate legislation reflecting a larger constituency.

**(H) Sub-Area Plan.**

Mr. Watkins explained the planning commissions of the County and City had been meeting jointly and the County Commission suggested tasking that group to do a sub-area plan in the area of the new high school, which would roughly be from I-70 to Mexico Gravel Road and from the City limits to east of Rangeline/Route Z. If Council concurred, a motion requesting the groups to take this on would be appropriate.

Mayor Hindman stated he thought they should do it. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mr. Wade made a motion for the City Planning and Zoning Commission to work with the County Planning and Zoning Commission in creating a sub-area plan for the area described involving the new high school.

Mr. Skala commented that he and Ms. Hoppe attended the first meeting of the joint group and that he was glad to see this. He recalled discussion indicating a sub-area plan might be the way to go. Since it had the backing of the Commission, it seemed to be the right size.

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

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

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

**BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES COMMISSION**

Muzzy, Doug, 2202 Potomac Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire August 1, 2009

**HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD**

Robinson, Edward, 801 Somerset Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2011.

**HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

Bixby, Mary, 1000 Yale Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire March 1, 2011.

Paredes, Oona, 104 Heather Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire March 1, 2011.

Thomas, Mark, 4402 Celebrant Court, Ward 2, Term to expire March 1, 2011.

**UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI EXTENSION COUNCIL OF BOONE COUNTY**

Curtis, Courtney, 2012 West Ash, Apt H5, Ward 2, Term to expire March 1, 2009

Ms. Amin pointed out, since it came up at a previous meeting, that with regard to the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee that Mr. Curtis had just been appointed to the University of Missouri Extension Council of Boone County and that Mr. Forrest had been appointed to two other boards and commissions last month. She noted they were both interested in being on more than one board or commission.

Mr. Wade stated he would prefer it be readvertised since both had substantial committee participation already.

Mr. Skala noted they had received a report and in some cases, one person had as many as four appointments. Mr. Forrest was recently appointed to two positions at the same time. He stated he was inclined to agree with Mr. Wade, but understood they did not have a policy.

Mr. Wade reiterated he would prefer to readvertise. Ms. Amin stated it could be readvertised, but pointed out this vacancy had been advertised for 2 or 3 months now with only these two applicants and they were still missing a CPA. She was not sure how often this Committee met, but since they held meetings on call, she thought it was primarily only during the auditing times of the year versus monthly meetings. Mr. Janku understood they would also meet if there was a fiscal crisis.

Mr. Skala asked which other boards and commissions these gentlemen served on. Ms. Amin replied Mr. Courtney was appointed to the University of Missouri Extension Council of Boone County and Mr. Forrest was an alternate on Building Construction Codes Commission and a regular member of the Health Insurance Appeal Board, which only met when there was an issue. Mr. Skala understood Mr. Forrest had two other positions and Mr. Courtney only had the one he was appointed to tonight. Ms. Nauser understood the University Extension met on the fourth Thursday of the month, so that was a pretty committed schedule as opposed to being an alternate. Ms. Amin pointed out consideration would be given to a business owner with regard to this appointment. She thought Mr. Forrest owned a business but was not sure about Mr. Courtney as she did not have the application in front of her.

Mayor Hindman noted this could be a very important appointment because they did have times when it was extremely significant to obtain comment from the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee. They typically reviewed audits and provided a report to Council regarding those audits. If something did not work quite right, it could be an extraordinarily important committee. Mr. Janku agreed and noted they were sometimes asked to provide an opinion and Council would depend on their evaluation.

Mr. Wade commented that based on the applications, they both had some good qualifications. His concern was not whether they were qualified to effectively serve, but the fact the same names were appearing a lot of times. Mayor Hindman pointed out there were quite a few “readvertise” statements on the list, so it was not always easy to attract the people needed.

Mr. Janku thought if the candidates did not have the qualifications that would be an issue. In this case, they had someone with qualifications who wanted serve in various ways.

He noted this could be a Committee they needed in the near future and he would hate to not have a well prepared Committee. He stated he was prepared to proceed with an appointment.

Mr. Boeckmann pointed out this might be the third board Mr. Forrest would be on, but he was an alternate of one of the boards and the other probably did not meet in most years. The Finance Advisory and Audit Committee did not meet often either, so it was not as though he would be doing a lot. He was not sure how often the University Extension Council met, but thought it was probably similar.

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individual was appointed to the following Boards and Commissions.

**FINANCE ADVISORY AND AUDIT COMMITTEE**

Forrest, Robert, 825 Bourn Avenue, Ward 4, Term to expire December 31, 2010

Ms. Amin asked the Council to let her know if they wanted to know when someone was already serving on another board so she could research that information. Mayor Hindman asked if that question could be placed on the application. Ms. Amin stated it already was on the form. Mr. Skala asked if the list Ms. Amin previously provided could be updated or if it could be put on-line so it could easily be checked. Ms. Amin replied they could provide the information easily if it was wanted.

Mr. Janku understood this information would be for their personal use and something each of them could weigh. They were not creating a policy. Mr. Skala stated he agreed as he did not believe there was a sane way to make a policy since some appointments involved more of a time commitment than others. He would use the information as part of his evaluation process.

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Ms. Nauser referred to a recent article regarding plastic bags in the landfill and stated she would like to know where these bags went, whether there was a market for those grocery bags and whether they could be added to the recycling program. She understood they were #2 plastic and thought the City recycled #2 plastics. If there was a market, she thought they should collect it through curbside recycling. She noted she did not think it would work well with the new bioreactor since it was not biodegradable.

Ms. Hoppe asked why the City did not recycle plastics other than #1 and #2 and wondered about the possibilities of doing that. Mr. Watkins stated he did not know the answer. Ms. Hoppe asked for this to be included in the motion so an answer could be provided.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to provide a report indicating whether there was a market for the plastic garbage bags and whether they could be added to the City's recycling program, and why the City did not recycle plastics other than #1 and #2 and what the possibilities of recycling the other plastics were. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser stated she received a letter in November of 2007 regarding auditory sensors at crosswalks and noting sidewalks that might need some work. She submitted the letter to the City Manager and asked for a response.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she had been contacted by people who had expressed an interest in having more recycling at apartment buildings. As a first step, she wanted information on what the City was doing, had done or had looked at in the past and the problems related to it. She also wanted staff to provide recommendations regarding what could be done to provide recycling at apartments versus them having to take it across the City.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding recycling at apartment buildings to include what was currently being done, what had been done or looked at in the past and the related problems, if any, and recommendations on what could be done to provide recycling at apartments versus them having to take their recycling across the City. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe noted the League of Women Voters spoke and provided Council a letter dated February 11, 2008 with regard to adding some wording into contracts or passing a policy indicating that when the City entered into contracts, it would not compromise a citizen's right to know or impinge on a citizen's civil liberties. She asked that staff look at the letter and provide suggestions. Mr. Watkins stated Mr. Boeckmann would take a look at the letter.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report indicating what was being done to educate people with regard to secondhand smoke, what further action could be taken, and what other cities with similar ordinances had done to educate people on the dangers of secondhand smoke. She thought they might want to partner with the University organization that had been working on it. She was not sure if the Board of Health had been working on it or had suggestions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe stated she had talked with the head of the Columbia Global Climate Change regarding the International Earth Hour event, which would occur on March 29, 2008 and 8:00 p.m. Communities around the world would be turning off their lights and using less or no electricity for an hour. Although it was a much larger city than Columbia, Sydney, Australia had saved 25,000 tons of carbon dioxide by doing it in the past. Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to create a resolution for Council to adopt indicating Columbia would participate in the International Earth Hour event by encouraging residents and businesses to turn off their lights for one hour at 8:00 p.m. on March 29, 2008. She noted it was a symbolic gesture and a continuing step in implementing the Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade.

Mayor Hindman asked for clarification on the motion. He understood it was for the Council to pass a resolution. Mr. Boeckmann suggested they just do it by motion tonight. Mr. Janku asked if it was just a voluntary action by individuals. Ms. Hoppe replied that was correct. Mr. Janku understood the City would not be turning off street lights, etc. Ms. Hoppe

stated that was correct. Ms. Nauser asked if it was just for citizens. Ms. Hoppe replied it was for citizens and businesses that wanted to participate. Mr. Wade assumed there would be national and international sponsors and asked if there would be publicity materials, etc. Ms. Hoppe replied she understood the Columbia Climate Change group was interested in publicity and thought they had spoken with the Tribune and other newspapers. Mr. Skala stated he thought there was information on the web.

Ms. Hoppe stated her revised motion was to encourage residents and businesses to participate in the International Earth Hour event on March 29, 2008 at 8:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman asked if they would turn off City Hall lights. Mr. Janku replied no. Ms. Hoppe explained it was a voluntary action.

Ms. Crayton commented that in light of the incident that occurred in Kirkwood, Missouri, she was concerned about the safety of the Council and staff when leaving late at night, especially for those whose vehicles were in the dark parking lot across the street. She noted there were people who were not well, so they needed to take this seriously.

Ms. Crayton made a motion directing staff to look into safety measures that could be taken for those leaving Council meetings at a late hour. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Crayton stated she noticed another business was closing in the downtown. She wondered if it was becoming a trend. She thought someone from SBD should explain what they were doing to stop this pattern. She felt they needed to know what was being done before discussing the TIF because the downtown needed to be productive. She did not think having empty buildings was a good sign.

Ms. Hoppe asked if she wanted a report on the emptying rate. Ms. Crayton replied yes and stated she also wanted to know what the SBD was doing with regard to this issue. Mr. Skala thought the report needed to establish if it was a real trend and what could be done to address this complicated problem. Mr. Janku thought the SBD had a marketing effort and suggested they get a report with regard to it and information on whether they had prospects for some of these buildings.

Mr. Janku stated he noticed there were subdivisions under construction where work began and then stopped due to the slow period in housing. He noted equipment and material were left behind and it was not very attractive for the neighborhood and existing residents. In addition, the build out rate of the subdivisions was not the same as it was a few years ago when homes were filling quickly.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to provide a report indicating whether they had the regulatory ability to require the material and equipment for new development to be removed if there was not active construction. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote

Mr. Janku asked about the status of the intersection of Providence and I-70 with regard to the GetAbout Columbia projects since pedestrians were crossing over I-70 on

Providence, which conflicted with the traffic coming off and going onto I-70. Mayor Hindman replied he understood it was on the list for planning.

Mayor Hindman commented that he believed there was a problem around town with regard to leasing to students when they did not meet the definition of family. It caused excess occupancy and an excess of parked automobiles in the area. He wondered what the procedures were if neighbors were confronted with a situation and wanted to do something about it. He understood proof would be a difficult as they probably could not get a warrant to inspect the house and find out how many people were living there. He noted it had happened near his neighborhood and he had received complaints from other neighborhoods. He understood there was a strong economic incentive, so they needed to do something to take away that incentive to some extent.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to provide a report with regard to the existing procedures for people who have complaints relating to excess occupancy in violation of the definition of a family. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala stated he apologized for not being able to have his regularly scheduled office hours last Saturday and as a result would have office hours next Saturday at 8:30 a.m. at the Coffee Ground.

Ms. Hoppe understood Ms. Nausser made a motion at the last meeting with regard to dirt piles and noted there was a large pile of dirt on Grindstone across from Wal-Mart, just to the east. After the rains, a huge amount of soil was in the street and went down the drain. She wondered what stormwater control measures were on piles of dirt and what kind of enforcement they might have.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to include in the report being prepared for Ms. Nausser with regard to dirt piles information on the stormwater controls and enforcement on those piles of dirt. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote

The meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk