

**MINUTES**  
**CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI**  
**MARCH 17, 2008**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 17, 2008, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE and NAUSER 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 March 3, 2008 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Janku and a second by Mr. Skala.

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

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

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

Mayor Hindman recognized Boy Scout Troop 708, whose members in attendance were working on their citizenship badges.

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Becky Markt, Tori Smith-Harvey, Monique Evans, Dalton Cote, Heather Windham - A report on the 2008 Let's Talk Columbia Events (02/22/08 - 02/23/08 and 03/04/08).**

Becky Markt, 1661 High Quest Circle, stated she was the Coordinator for the Youth Community Coalition, which was also known as YC<sup>2</sup>, and on behalf of YC<sup>2</sup> she submitted a report of the recent Let's Talk Columbia studies circle event. She thanked everyone who participated for their involvement in the event.

Heather Windham, 1578 Doulton Drive, stated she was present on behalf of the Youth Community Coalition and thanked the Council for allowing them to team up with the Human Rights Commission on the recent Let's Talk Columbia events. The study circle process was very helpful in bringing adults and youth together in order to make Columbia a safe and healthy community for people of all ages. She thanked the Council for their ongoing participation and support and thought it would be helpful to provide a report with adult and youth perspectives. As an adult participating in the event, she found it to be extraordinary in that adults were committed to listening to the youth about their experiences in Columbia and their creative ideas.

Tori Smith, 1411 Rosemary Lane, stated she was 16 years old and appreciated and enjoyed being a part of the events that took place. She commented that she was able to meet a lot of people and adults that really cared about where she was headed. It opened her

eyes. She learned she had connections with a generation she thought was on an entirely different page than her. She noted one of the common ideas was having youth serve on a special advisory council or as members of already existing councils. The adults and youth both found teens had something valuable to offer to the community. She hoped the Council would help in accomplishing that goal and would be willing to listen as the group brought their ideas forward in the coming months.

Monique Evans, 5897 Kent Drive, stated she was sixteen years old and participating in this event showed her there were adults in the community who cared about what they had to say and that they could promote change. She commented that the study circle process was interesting because the different circles of adults and youth came up with the same ideas and concerns. She noted the adults indicated they were the same when they were teens. The idea of a youth summit was mentioned by a lot of people. She believed the benefit would be to provide teens with skills they could use on a daily basis. She understood some organizations, such as YC<sup>2</sup>, were already trying to plan something of this nature. The study circles helped confirm this was a strategy YC<sup>2</sup> should include in planning. She hoped the Council, as elected representatives, would see its importance by supporting something like it as it would help teens be better students, community leaders and, eventually, adults.

Dalton Calcote, 2301 Garden Drive, referred to the report provided and noted it included The Five Promises established by the committee and anyone wanting to sign up to participate could still do so. With regard to his experience, he commented that they were all just people and although they were many years apart, the different generations came together to discuss the problems facing youth. He noted there was a lot of mention of the cost-effective opportunities youth had. He hoped the Council could include a focus on youth in the next budget cycle and that they could be involved because some youth did not realize how much they could do.

**Daniel Cullimore - The Corner, Suspension of Renovation Efforts.**

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, stated he was the Vice President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association and the project manager for The Corner renovation. The Corner Action Committee from the North Central Columbia Neighborhood area was announcing the suspension of efforts to renovate the historic Heibel-March building at 900-902 Rangeline in Field Neighborhood Park for use as a local community center, but would continue to promote the three values at the core of their vision for the center, which included a provision for indoor neighborhood-sided community space, the utility of historic preservation and sustainable development and the benefits of intergenerational experiences in arts. The last few years had provided many opportunities for neighborhood collaboration and growth focused on the goal of a neighborhood gathering place. During the project's history local banks, businesses, community organizations, and many individuals had worked in providing funds, labor, materials and insight. At the beginning, when the idea was to create a neighborhood park, the Columbia Parks and Recreation Department directors stood with them as they searched for the right location. The Parks and Recreation Department staff and the Eugene Field Elementary fifth grade geography class did an excellent job involving the community in the design of Field Neighborhood Park. When preserving the building became

a vision, the Columbia Boone County Community Partnership and the Field School Caring Communities Site Council helped develop the concept and survey the need for a publicly accessible meeting and classroom space. In addition, the Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA) stepped up to act as its fiscal agent and held title to the Heibel-March building when the City Council agreed to give the neighborhood residents an opportunity to save the building. He commented that Progressive Artists Incorporated opened their eyes to how new artistic ventures with youth could strengthen and build communities. Columbia Builds Youth provided young workers for major reconstruction of a part of the roof using materials provided by businesses and individuals from all over Columbia. Service learning students from the University of Missouri helped them learn about grant writing and research. The Voices from The Corner project, with a grant from Boone Electric Trust, engaged neighborhood children and families in documenting the culture that had been the glue for the neighborhood's past. KOPN Radio facilitated the recording of oral histories from neighborhood elders. These documents preserved in the State Historical Society archives provided the sources for a mural designed by Field Elementary students, which was documented by New Media Network youth photographers. He stated that since they had started the campaign to honor the present by preserving the past, historic preservation had taken root in Columbia. The Heibel-March building was designated as a notable historic property in 2005. Art as an economical development tool found fertile soil in Columbia, especially in the North Central Neighborhood, and they believed their goals helped to inspire or further these efforts. Unfortunately, the leaders of CMCA were no longer in a position to support the renovation of the Heibel-March building, though they continued to believe in the core mission of the Committee. Their preferred choice was to return the recently awarded Missouri Department of Economic Development NAP tax credits to the State and relinquish the land lease to the City meant the project could not continue without major rethinking and restructuring. This was a hard and sad moment for those who had worked so hard toward transforming this former corner store into a neighborhood gathering place. He noted that absent CMCA or another champion, there was no future for this project. As they looked toward the future, they saw that the need for accessible neighborhood-sided resources remained high. Lorah Steiner, Director of the Convention and Visitors Bureau, and David White, Director of the Missouri Theatre Center for the Arts, urged him to remind the Council of the need for locations in which youth intervention programs could function. Programs such as the Boys and Girls Clubs, C.A.R.E., etc. needed space from which to positively influence the lives and prospects of youth. He urged the Council to consider this as they pondered the future of this building.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **B51-08      Approving the O-P development plan of The Blum Law Firm; approving less stringent yard, parking and screening requirements.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was a proposed O-P development plan at the corner of Ninth and Park that would allow for the conversion of a residential structure to office space use. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the plan subject to some

wall signage issues and building setback, parking space and screening variances. He pointed out the O-P development plan had been revised by the owner to include the Commission's recommendations regarding the maximum square foot wall sign area and the allowance of a six foot landscaping screen.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Linda Rootes, 402 N. Eighth Street, stated she was President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association and noted the neighborhood was very happy with the interaction of this applicant and thought it was a great example of what they could look forward to with their overlay district. She stated they were in support of it.

Kimi Chinn Rother, 411 E. Broadway, stated she was the architect working on this proposal for the Blum Law Firm and commented that they had put in a lot of time and effort into developing this proposal. She explained they had asked that the plant screening to the north be lowered from eight feet to six feet and the Commission agreed. In addition, the Commission asked them to reduce the sign size maximum to 32 square feet on the east and south sides of the building.

Mike Blum commented that he had introduced a concept plan several months ago and stated they received unanimous approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission. He noted he wanted to be a good neighbor in the North Central area, so if the Council had suggested changes, he would be happy to accommodate them.

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

Ms. Hoppe stated there appeared to be good communication between the development and the neighbors and it sounded like a good project.

Mr. Skala noted the Planning and Zoning Commission had covered this thoroughly and was unanimous in their decision, so he felt it was pretty straight forward and was willing to support it.

Mr. Wade believed the District was moving north and this transition of small businesses in older houses was very appropriate. He noted the change in the sign made it compliant with the sign regulations for the Special Business District.

Mr. Janku noted the variances allowed made this much closer to C-2 zoning standards while also having the protection of planned development. He believed it was a good compromise. Mr. Wade commented that he felt it should be C-2 zoning versus C-P zoning.

B51-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B52-08 Approving the C-P Development Plan of Wellness Center Old Hawthorne Golf Club; approving less stringent screening requirements.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a proposed C-P development plan which would allow for construction of a 5,000 square foot recreation building, swimming pool, tennis courts, etc. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval with a vote of 5-1 with one Commissioner abstaining. The minutes reflected the Commissioner with the dissenting vote was of the opinion that parking was excessive. After the applicant provided an explanation,

the other Commissioners felt the requested space was justified. He pointed out staff also felt the requested number of parking spaces was justified.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering Consultants, 2608 N. Stadium Blvd., stated he believed this was a straight forward request. He explained with regard to the variance for the screening requirement, the property they were asking a variance for screening from included the golf course to the north and some PUD zoned property to the west. Both were owned by his client, so they would not be burdening other property owners. He commented that they also had a significant number of spaces over the City requirement, but noted there would be about 1,150 residential living units utilizing the facility so they did not think there were too many. In addition, they expected several hundred off-site memberships that would not live in the immediate area.

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

B52-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B62-08 Authorizing construction of a four court tennis complex at Cosmo-Bethel Park; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the Parks and Recreation Department was requesting authorization to proceed with construction of four tennis courts to be located in Cosmo-Bethel Park. This would create a twelve court complex with eight located on City property and maintained by the City and four located on Columbia Public School District property and maintained by the Columbia Public Schools. The total cost of this project was about \$120,000 and would be funded by parks sales tax. If Council approved the project, they anticipated completion sometime in August of this year.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

B62-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**(A) Construction of the Clear Creek Pump Station and Force Main Improvement Project.**

Mayor Hindman pointed out staff was requesting this item be table to the April 7, 2008 Council meeting.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this involved the construction of a major pump station and force main in southeast Columbia. The project had been approved to be funded in the 2003 sewer ballot issue and was one of the last projects they had to complete. The resolution estimate for the work was about \$4 million. He noted they anticipated being able to fund it from the State Revolving Loan Fund, which was substantially cheaper than what they could borrow money for on the market. He stated they neglected to send out appropriate letters to

interested parties and were therefore suggesting they hold the issue over until the next meeting. This would allow them to ensure everyone had adequate time to consider their position.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor Hindman continued the public hearing to the April 7, 2008 Council meeting.

Mr. Wade made a motion to table Item A to the April 7, 2008 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**R65-08      Approving the FY 2007 Consolidated Annual Performance Report.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was an annual report submitted to HUD every year and it required a public hearing. He noted any comments from interested parties would be attached.

Mr. Teddy stated this report was available for public inspection and pointed out they were mainly reporting expenditures from the block grants. They also provided information on behalf of other organizations within the City that received federal funds for housing and community development purposes. In addition, they looked at the objectives and goals made when the Plan was approved by Council in 2004. It was a five year plan and this was a third year performance and evaluation report. In the 2007 calendar year, the City and various agencies spent just over \$1 million in CDBG funds. HOME program expenditures were \$528,220.04 in 2007. He explained they also reported on discretionary grants and those expenditures totaled \$1,643,596 in 2007. In addition, they acknowledged the City's Community Services Advisory Commission allocated funding. The 32 organizations running 49 programs and services received \$886,023 from the City's general fund. The report also included recommended actions to remove impediments to fair housing, the leveraging of other funding sources with block grant expenditures, management of the federal community development process and comparisons with prior years of the Consolidated Plan. He pointed out they would complete a new plan for 2010-2014 and would use this information to evaluate themselves at that time as well.

Mr. Janku understood HOME funds were not being spent as quickly as they wanted. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He explained one reason was because they usually did all housing rehabilitations with HOME funds and this year in order to meet timeliness requirements for spending down CDBG, they shifted a number of housing rehabilitation jobs to CDBG. Other reasons included the fact that programs, such as rental rehabilitations, had not caught on since there were a lot of owner reporting requirements and an equity match requirement. He noted some projects like the 15 percent CHDO projects and the senior housing project on Nifong were just starting to get going. Mr. Janku noted a report on the NRT had recently been given and it mentioned a backlog for the home ownership rehabilitation program. He asked if HOME money could go towards it to meet federal expenditure goals. Mr. Teddy replied they could look at strategies for getting through the waiting list quicker. Mr. Janku asked if an amendment needed to be brought forward or if they should wait for the 2009 budget. Mr. Teddy replied they could take into account what

they should be doing with the funds in the Action Plan for this year. Ms. Hoppe asked if they needed to address it as part of the budget. Mr. Teddy replied he thought they could make it part of the review for this year, which was the fourth year.

Mr. Janku noted the Affordable Housing Policy Task Force had recommended a scientific study be done and asked if that could be funded with HOME funds. Mr. Teddy replied if it was a plan, it might be able to be funded with CDBG funds. With regard to other ideas provided by the Affordable Housing Policy Task Force, such as a housing trust, CDBG funds could be used at the organizational end, but HOME funds were a more appropriate source for ongoing operations.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

The vote on R65-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **PR47-08     Establishing policy and guidelines for Tax Increment Financing.**

The policy resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained they had been discussing TIF legislation since the Sasaki Plan had been presented. A couple of public discussions and forums had been held with regard to tools that could be used in the downtown to assist in redevelopment or economic development downtown. The last discussions were on January 28 when Council asked staff to prepare an ordinance and policy resolution. The policy resolution set out when they might consider using TIF. The ordinance would create a commission to put it into place. With regard to the policy resolution, each applicant had to demonstrate that without the use of TIF, the project was not feasible and would not be completed. In addition, the total amount of assistance should not exceed 20 percent of the total project cost. Also, each project had to be brought back to the Council to be considered on its merit at a public meeting. This would not be delegated to a commission or committee.

Ms. Crayton referred to item 8 in the policy resolution, which referred to projects that creative jobs or wages exceeding median income level of Columbia being favorable, and asked how they would ensure it brought in some of those jobs. Mr. Watkins replied he thought there would be a periodic review after the project was done. They would build in a provision requiring a payment to the City if they did not meet the provisions in the original agreement.

Ms. Nauser asked if it would be too burdensome to request they guarantee or at least attempt to have a certain percentage of jobs above the median income when making application. Mr. Watkins replied this was a policy resolution where the Council was setting out their preferences and what they would consider when reviewing an application. These were points the Council would have to consider on a case by case basis. They were putting everyone on notice that this was the criteria they would have to address. Ms. Nauser commented that she felt “favored” was subjective and suggested they use “required.” Mayor Hindman noted one of the projects they were talking about was a hotel, which would not

generate too many jobs above the average wage due to the nature of the hospitality industry, but could indirectly generate that type of job by beefing up downtown. If they made it a requirement, they might run into a situation where they were not able to do what they thought they should. Ms. Nauser noted the hotel would have management. Mayor Hindman agreed, but pointed out many in the service industry were not in management. Ms. Nauser explained the reason she was asking was due to research she had done on crime and other issues of employment. She understood it was recommended that when implementing TIF policies, they hold people who wanted to use public dollars to standards that would provide good positive jobs for people of the community to offset the public investment. Mayor Hindman commented that these might be good jobs for people of low income or who were unemployed. Ms. Nauser agreed. Mayor Hindman stated he was concerned about the unintended consequences of a standard such as that.

Mr. Skala stated he felt this was an evaluation document and noted that what might fall short in certain areas could be made up in other areas given the number of criteria available. He commented that he was reasonably satisfied with this targeted approach as they were talking about a review by the City Council for each individual TIF with a recommendation from the TIF Commission. He felt it was narrow enough to be consistent with the Visioning feedback and the growth management issues they would soon take up. He believed the downtown was a great area for taking advantage of resources that were already in existence. He noted, historically, they had been reluctant to broaden this, but he was satisfied with there being enough of a case by case emphasis for TIF to be used as a tool. He thought it could be very effective for the downtown.

Ms. Hoppe suggested they give preference to historic preservation. With regard to consistency with Visioning, she noted that the Community Character section on page 26 of the Visioning Report stated Columbia would provide and advertise incentives for building and retrofitting houses and businesses for energy efficiency and tailored renewable energy resources, so she wanted to include a provision indicating preference would be given to renovation and new buildings that were energy efficient, tried to meet an Energy Star standard or promoted green buildings. Mayor Hindman commented that he thought she might have a good point with regard to green buildings, but pointed out key suggestions of the Sasaki Report did not necessarily involve historic preservation. In addition, historic tax credits were already available as a major incentive and the hotel on Broadway was not historic. Ms. Hoppe noted it would be a preference. It would not be essential. Mayor Hindman stated he thought they wanted to develop a tool that enabled them to go with the Sasaki recommendations as much as possible, so their preferences needed to be in line with those.

Mr. Skala stated he felt the TIF idea was based on the “but for” test and conservation areas. He asked how the definition of blight worked its way into this with regard to the Tiger Hotel project. He understood Regency/Hyatt was not a TIF candidate. Mr. Watkins stated they had not asked for any kind of TIF or tax abatement. Their interest was in help with the parking garage. Mr. Skala asked for clarification on the issue of conservation. Mr. Watkins replied if Council elected to proceed with this and the Downtown Leadership Council, one of their charges would be to oversee a conservation study for downtown. They would first need

to determine what was downtown and would then need to look at a conservation study, which would apply to this.

Mr. Janku noted there were many acronyms and explained a TDD involved an increase to the sales tax paid by people shopping in a retail establishment. A TIF was not an increase in the taxes paid by people using the particular establishment. This allowed a portion of the taxes to help finance the redevelopment. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct and explained they would be freezing the value of the property as it was before any redevelopment. The taxes on the increased value would be applied toward the project. It was a public improvement project, such as streets, sidewalks, etc.

Mr. Janku stated he understood in some communities, such as Kansas City, the TIF was not funded exclusively from the increment revenues generated by the project. It was also funded with other general funds. He understood they were funding TIF's out of the general revenue, which meant that money was being taken away from other services and projects in the community, because the TIF's were not raising the money needed to pay off the obligations. He stated he did not see anything in the policy resolution that would protect them and from that particular problem. He wanted it made clear that they would not bail a TIF out with money from the general revenue. Mr. Watkins referred to item 4 and noted it discussed what the TIF could be used for, which included public improvements. In addition, item 7 indicated the TIF project would not negatively impact the City's credit rating. He felt that meant the City was not putting its credit behind any TIF bond. Mayor Hindman stated he understood the City was immune with respect to these bonds. He thought Kansas City might have backed them so they were sellable. Mr. Boeckmann commented that he was not familiar with the Kansas City situation, but did not believe Columbia would be on the hook for TIF bonds under normal circumstances.

Mr. Wade noted this was a policy resolution in which they were stating the basic guidelines that would be used by the TIF Commission in their evaluation and by the Council in their final decision. They were not creating a checklist of minimum standards for eligibility. They were creating a set of policy guidelines to help identify projects that would move them forward in achieving what they wanted as a community with a revitalized downtown. He pointed out there would be a range of different types of projects for which these guidelines would apply. They would help identify projects that met the technical requirements and contributed to the outcomes they wanted to achieve for the community. He thought they needed to be careful in making guidelines standards as that could remove the Council's ability to evaluate a range of projects.

Ms. Nauser stated felt this was a checklist to some degree and wanted to ensure they were not disallowing something because they had one project in mind since this was an overarching policy and not just for the benefit of the first catalyst project.

Mr. Wade pointed out that just because a project met the guidelines did not mean they were required to approve it. This was a legislative act for them based on recommendations from the TIF Commission. Mr. Skala stated he agreed and noted they did not need to have the same problems as Kansas City. He understood they were overextended and had too many TIF's. He felt they needed the ability to take the advice of the Commission along with

these guidelines to make prudent decisions and to ensure they were not liable for anything in any future TIF that was granted.

Ms. Crayton understood they were concentrating on downtown as far as the TIF was concerned and asked if it could also be used in neighborhoods close to downtown. Mr. Watkins replied he thought that fell into the question of what was the downtown and explained that was why they were creating a Leadership Council in which they added the Douglas, Benton-Stephens, East Campus and North Central neighborhoods. He hoped the Leadership Council would have a recommendation the Council could agree with in terms of what would be included in the downtown. Mr. Janku noted it did not say it would be exclusively downtown. It was only a preference, so it could involve other areas. He thought the Business Loop might be an appropriate area.

Mr. Janku stated he felt it would be hard to tell someone no once they said yes to someone else and was concerned with that. He was trying to determine what factors would lead them to say no to someone because there might be projects they felt did not meet the scope of what they were trying to accomplish. Mayor Hindman thought that might be one of the purposes of the TIF Commission. Mr. Watkins pointed out the cost of putting together a TIF was very expensive, and therefore, if it was not a sizable project, it would not make any financial sense to proceed. Mr. Skala noted the Council also needed to look at with regard to what they would get in return. Mr. Wade commented that in looking at the history of TIF's in communities, it tended to support what the community defined as catalyst projects due to the structure of the TIF and the requirements that needed to be met.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he had attended the Council work sessions involving TIF's in October and January. He commented that he did not have a problem with forming a TIF Commission or adopting guidelines, but thought the Council's consideration should be substantially guided by the downtown concept and strategic plan and that consideration of any project should wait until that was done. He felt for this to be reasonably done, it would take 6-12 months. He understood people were pushing for projects right now, but until they hired really good consultants to complete the plan, they would have no idea how much hotel space, etc. was needed. He hoped they would adopt this and wait until the downtown concept and strategic plan was complete as that would be the substantial guide with regard to the types of projects they would consider forwarding on to the Commission for consideration. He stated a really well done stakeholder plan with broad consensus and support from many parts of the community would be a great basis for those decisions by the Council.

Ms. Nauser stated she concurred with the adoption of the TIF policy. She asked how long they thought it would take the Downtown Leadership Council to develop a plan for their review and adoption. Mr. Watkins replied if they had a cohesive group with a good leader and consultant, it could be done in 6-12 months. Mayor Hindman noted Sasaki pointed out some key elements for the plan, so he felt comfortable in dealing with those.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend PR47-08 by changing item 14 to item 15 and adding language stating "preference will be given to projects that meet green building standards and/or EPA Energy Star standards for energy efficiency, which involve residential,

business or commercial development or redevelopment” to item14. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman.

Mr. Wade asked for clarification with regard to green energy standards. He stated he did not know what that was. He understood LEED was a specific standard. He asked if Ms. Hoppe would consider “standards of high energy efficiency” instead. Ms. Hoppe replied she could change it to LEED. Mr. Janku thought that was very narrow. Mayor Hindman agreed and noted he had spoken with people from Austin regarding this and understood they did not require LEED. They created their own green building standards because LEED involved such a tremendous amount of paperwork and cost. He suggested they keep it broad. Mr. Skala commented that it would be inclusive of LEED standards. Mr. Wade reiterated he would suggest “high standards of energy efficiency.” Ms. Hoppe pointed out energy efficiency and green building could overlap, but were not the same.

Ms. Nauser pointed out that retrofitting some of these older buildings for these types of standards could be very costly. Mayor Hindman noted it was just preference. Mr. Skala agreed and stated these were just recommendations that were encouraged. Ms. Hoppe stated the goal was that it would save money for the City in the long term by reducing energy costs.

Mayor Hindman asked Ms. Hoppe to restate her motion. Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted to add that “preference will be given to projects that meet green building standards and increase energy efficiency standards, such as EPA Energy Star involving residential, business or commercial development or redevelopment.”

Ms. Nauser asked where green building standards were defined. If they were giving preference for it, she thought it should be defined. Mr. Wade agreed they needed to know what they were giving preference to. Ms. Hoppe suggested they say green standards as established by LEED. Mayor Hindman felt since these were guidelines, it was sufficient. Mr. Skala stated he agreed in that these were guidelines for the recommending body to give to the Council. At this point, he suggested they state “green building standards such as LEED” like they did with energy efficiency.

Ms. Hoppe revised her motion to be an amendment to PR47-08 by changing item 14 to item 15 and adding language stating “preference will be given to projects that use green building standards such as LEED and employ energy efficiency standards such as EPA Energy Star program involving residential, business or commercial development or redevelopment” to item14. The revised motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting no.

The vote on PR47-08, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**B63-08 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish a Tax Increment Financing Commission and to adopt procedures and policies for requests for redevelopment proposals.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this ordinance would establish the Commission that would be the recommending body to the policy resolution that was just adopted.

Ms. Nauser asked if there was set criteria for people that would be appointed by the Mayor to the Commission. Mr. Watkins replied the State statutes were silent, but it did not preclude the Council from coming up with standards or guidelines. He pointed out it was set up so every project had its own Commission. Ms. Nauser thought it was a standing commission since the appointments had terms. Mr. Watkins referred to item (d) on page 3 and noted it indicated members who were appointed by taxing districts other than the City should serve on the TIF Commission for a term to coincide with the length of time a redevelopment project, plan or designation of an area. Mr. Skala understood that did not preclude one person from serving on more than one TIF. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct. Ms. Nauser thought City appointees would have staggered four year terms and would be long standing members. She wanted to ensure consistency and a higher standard since it involved public money. She asked if they needed to include criteria. She did not think the criteria needed to be determined today, but believed they might want to include it in the future. Mr. Wade stated he would not want to do that. He wanted the evaluation based upon the application. He noted there were many different skills that they might want the ability to mix on the Commission. He commented that financial people were good at making certain kinds of decisions and not good with regard to other types of decisions. TIF included a range of decisions, so he wanted the ability to look at the qualifications of the applicants.

Ms. Nauser suggested they ensure the Council had the ability to review the applications even though they were not choosing them. Mr. Janku agreed they wanted an application with a list of references and experience, but did not want criteria as it would narrow the applicant pool. He thought the application should be similar to what they did with other boards. Ms. Nauser agreed and stated that was what she was getting at. She wanted it more open. Mr. Watkins noted it would be several months before they needed to be ready. He suggested they discuss it again and agreed an application process was appropriate.

Ms. Hoppe referred to Section 2-375.7(b) and noted it indicated the Mayor would appoint six members with the consent of the City Council, but did not refer to an application. Mr. Watkins explained this was language from the State statutes. Ms. Hoppe asked if they needed to indicate this should be done by application. Mr. Janku replied he thought it could be added later, although he agreed it should be done by application. Ms. Nauser wondered if they needed to go ahead and add it now. Mr. Wade stated he would not add it to this. Mr. Skala agreed, but noted he hoped they used a similar approach to that used for the Citizen Oversight Committee.

B63-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**PR48-08     Establishing a policy for sewer extensions funded by the Sewer Utility.**

The policy resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained staff had prepared a policy resolution for Council consideration which outlined funding options for trunk sewers, which were sewers larger than eight inches in diameter. There was currently no Council approved policy. Everything they had done thus

far was based on internal staff policy. He stated he believed it was important to have Council consensus with regard to how they spent these resources. The proposed policy would leverage scarce City funds because they would not be in the position to extend major trunk sewers without partnerships and leveraging other funds. In addition, it would set a formal prioritization in terms of how these funds should be used and what they should be used for. It also set a policy for special tie-in fees, so whoever extended the sewer could recover a part of their cost as others tied-in and used it. He noted it was similar to the green line policy for water lines. He pointed out the drainage area would be changed from 80 acres to 100 acres, which he felt was reasonable.

Ms. Nauser stated she believed the first person who had to pay the differential should receive the benefit of the City paying for the differential cost. She did not, however, understand why they continued to pay differential fees into perpetuity. She believed the people beyond that development should have to pay for the increased size. She did not understand why the City was paying into perpetuity. She understood the City would pay for the differential cost of installing sewers when the City required a larger pipe size to serve other property in the drainage basin. Mr. Watkins pointed out there was a difference between water and sewer. With water, they were looping the system through, but with sewer, they were gradually getting smaller and those were looped. He noted the differential cost was unlikely to be extended on into perpetuity like it was with water.

Mayor Hindman asked what her remedy would be. Ms. Nauser replied with water lines, her remedy would be that once the differential was established and installed, all others should be required to install the increased size as the cost of doing business.

Mr. Janku asked if this would be recovered as part of the project costs. Mr. Watkins replied under this policy, the Council had to approve a development agreement for every project, so if there was a concern, it could be addressed at that time. Ms. Nauser stated she did not agree with the philosophy, but would not vote against it due to it.

Mr. Skala commented that if they incurred the cost of a larger sized sewer system, everyone else that connected to the larger system would contribute. He felt that was fair. Mr. Watkins stated that was the intent. Mr. Wade understood they recovered the differential that was initially paid. Ms. Nauser thought they the City had always paid for the differential in cost and provided an example of going from 6 to 8 inches. She understood the developer paid for the cost of the six inch line and the City paid for the difference in cost between the six and eight inch line. Mr. Wade thought that was one of the changes with this policy for the sewer. Ms. Nauser stated she might have read it wrong. Mr. Watkins noted this applied only to sewers.

Ms. Hoppe understood one component was compliance with the growth management plan and noted they did not have a growth management plan, but when they did, they would assess points and change the total score accordingly.

The vote on PR48-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**B53-08 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to public improvements and sewer extensions.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was the ordinance that put the provisions of the policy resolution just approved into place.

B53-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B54-08 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to private common collector sewers.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would change how they dealt with private common collectors, which were prevalent in many of the older areas of the community. Current policy involved the City paying half of the cost and the property owner paying the other half through tax bills. They were proposing to allow the City to repair or reconstruct the line without tax bills if easements were given. He noted staff spent a lot of money and time in trying to gain easements. By concentrating on just solving problems and using the half they already had, he believed they could accomplish as much as they did under the old policy with tax bills that most people found to be a problem. This policy would change the City's procedure for private common collectors. He commented that the sewer ballot issue for April included \$4 million to deal with existing sewers and problems, which included some private common collectors.

Mr. Wade asked how many times things came to Council for a vote under the old system from the time a sewer was reported as bad to when the new sewer was built. Mr. Glascock replied he thought there were about three times. He explained they had to form the district, hold the public hearing for the district and hold a public hearing for the tax bills. Mr. Watkins thought they also had to obtain easements and believed it was four times. Mr. Wade asked what it would be under the new system. Mr. Boeckmann replied there would be a hearing for the public improvement process and a bill for the acquisition of easements. If all were given to the City already, it could be included on the Consent agenda. Mr. Wade thought it reduced their work. Mayor Hindman agreed and noted it would also eliminate the contentiousness.

Linda Rootes, 402 N. Eighth Street, stated she was the President of North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association and believed this policy change would benefit the neighborhood. She understood there were some sewers in the neighborhood that needed to be replaced and this would facilitate that.

Mr. Wade stated he had pushed for this and noted private common collector sewers in the Southwest created a huge portion of the total. He thanked the people in the past that had worked cooperatively with the City to get sewers replaced. He believed public perception was that this had been done because some people had been contentious and that the people who had cooperated by providing easements were wondering if they were being treated fairly. Through the many years of experience, they had discovered the old system was burdensome and he believed the new system would be better, even when people were cooperative. He commented that anytime a policy of this nature was changed, there would

always be those projects and people that came before and after. It was just the way change took place. He pointed out this was not just in response to a few contentious people. It was in response to finding a system that worked better for everyone and was more cost efficient even when people were cooperative. He thanked staff for a creative analysis in beginning to identify a better way of doing it.

B54-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B55-08 Authorizing construction of Brown School Road from approximately 250 feet west of Highway 763/Rangeline Street to Providence Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this would authorize staff to bid a public improvement project involving the construction of approximately 3,200 feet of Brown School Road from Providence to where the 763 project ended at Brown School Road. They had to wait until they knew what 763 would look like. He noted they had discussions with MoDOT with regard to how far 763 would go to the west on Brown School Road. He explained the project was included on the list the Council prioritized for the 2005 capital improvement sales tax ballot. The estimated cost of the project was about \$3.5 million. Funding sources included capital improvement sales taxes, development fees and county road tax rebate funds. He noted a public hearing was held on April 2, 2007.

Mr. Janku thought they agreed to build the pedway on the south side at the time of construction of the first two lanes and asked if they were not doing that now. Ms. Lea replied that during the design of the project, they determined the 30-foot pavement and the five-foot sidewalk on the north side would be better. They would still be acquiring the easements for future expansion and grading.

Mr. Janku stated he could not recall why they decided the pedway would be placed on the south side with a sidewalk on the north. He understood Brown School Road had a pedway on the north side toward the east. If they were only doing one of the two now, he wondered why they did not put the pedway in on the north. Ms. Lea replied that could be done. Mr. Janku thought it made sense because it was anticipated that a major shopping center would be going in on the north side, which would draw a lot of foot traffic from nearby residential areas.

Mr. Wade commented that when looking at Brown Station Road, all of the current development was on the north side with no development on the south side. If the pedway was put in on the north side, it would make a greater incursion into already developed areas. Mr. Janku understood the project would just move toward the south. They would start at the same point and move south. Mayor Hindman stated it would all be in the right-of-way. Mr. Glascock explained they were looking at 110 feet of right-of-way and it would be placed within that.

Mr. Wade asked if they would grade the entire thing. Mr. Janku replied no. Mayor Hindman understood they were originally going to do that, but decided against it. Mr. Janku understood it was because they would end up with a major weed patch.

Mr. Janku asked if an amendment was needed to address the issue of the pedway. Mr. Boeckmann replied the plans and specifications would need to be changed. Mr. Glascock stated he would direct staff to change the pedway to the north side.

B55-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Janku made a motion directing the plans and specifications being approved by B55-08 be amended to include the pedway on the north side of Brown School Road. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B56-08 Authorizing construction of Providence Road from its current terminus north of Vandiver Drive to Blue Ridge Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a bid call ordinance for the construction of about 4,100 feet of Providence Road between Vandiver Drive northward where it terminated to Blue Ridge Road. The resolution estimate for this project was about \$4.1 million. Funding sources included surface transportation program funds, which would be used for the bridge, transportation sales tax funds approved by the voters in 2005 and development fees which were increased by the voters in 2005. A public hearing was held April 16, 2007. He noted this was a public/private partnership due the development agreement with Rampart Investments as it involved some easements and construction assistance, so the cost to the City to extend the road was less.

Mr. Glascock stated the typical section showed a six foot fence. The Council received a report on fences, which would be brought back to them to determine what kind of fence would be placed on the bridge. He noted the report would be provided before the project was bid.

Mr. Janku understood they were also in the process of deciding on standards for light poles. If there were policy decisions affecting this project and the Brown School Road project, he understood they would be implemented as part of the project. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mayor Hindman understood there would be a five foot sidewalk on the west and an eight foot sidewalk on the east side as an add alternative and asked if that involved the bridge or lanes. Mr. Glascock replied they wanted to put an eight foot sidewalk on the bridge if they could afford it because they wanted to build it all of the way from Blue Ridge to Vandiver. If it was too expensive for the bridge, he did not believe there was any reason to build it along the roadway either. Mr. Janku asked what the standard was indicating it was too expensive. Mr. Glascock replied he was trying to stay within the budget of what they put together for the ballot. He pointed out it would be brought to Council as an add alternate and they would decide whether they wanted to spend the money or not.

Mr. Janku asked if Rampart was putting in an eight foot pedway on their side or if the City was building it. Mr. Glascock replied he was not certain, but thought Rampart was building the sidewalk for the portion that abutted them. He thought the City might pay them

for the extra three feet, but he was not certain as he could not recall the details of the agreement. Mr. Janku stated they did not want to leave it without one. Mr. Glascock agreed and hoped it was patterned after what was done on Brown School Road and the rest of Providence where they did the street construction and the City put in some of the sidewalk to pay for some of the extra width.

Mayor Hindman understood it would be graded so the northbound lanes could be put in later. Mr. Glascock stated that was their goal. Mayor Hindman understood if they put in the eight-foot pedway, it would be on the east side of the grading and would swing over to the bridge for a temporary eight-foot pedway there. Mr. Glascock stated that was the vision.

Mr. Janku understood they were not bidding all four lanes, even as an alternative. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct as he did not believe it was feasible. Mr. Janku noted if development occurred, they might have a two-lane bridge between the two four-lane segments. Mr. Glascock stated they would build the substructure for a four-lane bridge. They were just not building the superstructure and the substructure was in the bid. Mayor Hindman understood it would include the substructure for the eight-foot pedway, so it was not an alternate. Mr. Glascock explained only the superstructure would be the alternate.

Mr. Wade stated the assumption was the eight-foot pedway would not be damaged or interfere with the construction of the other two lanes. Mr. Glascock explained the pedway for the road section would be out where it was supposed to be, which was a foot inside the right-of-way. Using the overhead he showed where the pedway would be.

Mayor Hindman stated he believed this would be a very significant route for people from all of the nearby subdivisions to be able to get into town once the bridge was built. He understood it might be a good number of years before the other two lanes would be constructed and thought they might want to have the pedway as part of this project. Mr. Glascock noted it would be, but this provided them the ability to not do it if it came in at a very high cost. He reiterated it was the Council's decision. Mr. Janku thought they could try to find money from various sources.

B56-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B58-08      Authorizing acquisition of easements relating to construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Fairview Road and Worley Street.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this project was approved by Council as part of the Fairview Wal-Mart development and would take out the jog at Fairview and Worley. It required three easements, which the TDD had been unable to acquire. As had been done in other CIP projects where it was a public improvement, they were agreeing to acquire the easements subject to reimbursement by the developer, which in this case was the TDD. They wanted Council authorization before the right-of-way staff began acquiring easements. He reiterated the costs would be reimbursed by the TDD.

B58-08 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B64-08 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish a Downtown Columbia Leadership Council.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained Council directed staff to prepare an ordinance establishing this Leadership Council at the February 18, 2008 meeting. He noted this was one of the ideas called for by the Visioning process. There would be fifteen members and that included the two neighborhood associations, Douglas and Benton-Stephens, the Council asked be added. They would have six functions to include identifying the boundary of the expanded planning area, which would address the question of where downtown was. They would also assess the assets and opportunities downtown, advise them on the MODESA application, which they still intended to file, develop a strategic plan, which was to extend the Sasaki recommendations to the boundaries, recommend physical guidelines in the downtown area and do other items as directed by Council.

Mr. Janku commented that the neighborhood associations involved would be Benton-Stephens, Douglas, North Central and East Campus. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct and explained there were four neighborhood associations, the SBD and three appointments at-large by the Council. He suggested they advertise for those positions with the next round of appointments.

Mr. Skala understood there were several businesses downtown that had representation by the SBD and a merchant association and asked if there was any overlap. Mr. Watkins stated they were separate entities, but there could be participation in both. He noted Columbia College, Stephens and the University had seats as well.

Ms. Nauser asked if it would be appropriate, since they were starting a Downtown Leadership Council, to begin looking at some of the zoning downtown. She thought that was a recommendation of Sasaki and believed it should be done in partnership. Mr. Watkins stated he thought that should be assigned to the Planning and Zoning Commission, but suggested they obtain this group's input before getting too far into the project. He agreed they needed to clean up the old zoning in some places.

Linda Rootes, 402 N. Eighth Street, stated she was President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association and explained the Board discussed this at their last meeting and was supportive of the concept as it was important to the neighborhood. She noted she and Betty Rottmann participated in the Sasaki meetings and were happy to see the concept spreading to the greater downtown. They also appreciated the fact they had included the neighborhoods. She pointed out there was a neighborhood association in the downtown that might also need to be represented. She understood it was the Tenth, Hitt and Locust Neighborhood Association and that Brian Ash was the head of that organization.

Betty Cook Rottmann, 1200 Coats Street, stated she had lived at her residence for 50 years and was the co-founder of the North Central Neighborhood Association. She believed they needed to be a part of this and supported it strongly.

John Ott, 212 Bingham Road, noted there were two other neighborhoods that had a strong affiliation with downtown, although they were not in the downtown and those were the Old Southwest and the Grasslands Neighborhood Associations. He was not sure if they were considered, but thought he would point them out.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he attended three of the five Sasaki group meetings and praised the Council for asking neighborhood associations to send a representative versus handpicking a representative of the neighborhood. He commented that he had some concerns with the composition and process outlined. He believed it was important to do the planning process correctly with the consensus support of stakeholders. He agreed with Mr. Ott in that it did not just involve the people downtown, but also the surrounding neighborhood associations and a little beyond it. He noted the Central Columbia Association, which was the downtown business group, was not named. He felt the group was top heavy with institutional and governmental members and wondered whether they would hire a consultant to guide the process or if this was the stakeholder group that would do the planning itself. He suggested they have a smaller group guide the planning process. He stated he saw the government people as more of a resource group rather than stakeholders. He also hoped the stakeholders from groups, such as the SBD, were business people versus executive directors because he did not believe they were well served by executive directors of agencies and associations being on these groups unless it was the small group planning the process. He suggested they think about this a little longer. If the goal was a real consensus resulting in a conceptual plan that would last over a 15-20 year period, he thought the stakeholders on the planning group would be a problem. He stated he hoped they hired competent planning assistants versus doing this in-house. He commented that he saw Sasaki as a process versus a plan. It was a stakeholder driven group with Sasaki being the facilitator. He wondered if the composition of the group included prominent stakeholders versus a group that would select a good process. If that was the group and they were the stakeholders, he questioned whether a report, developed by a facilitator or good consultant, should come back to the stakeholders or go directly to Council. He reiterated he had concerns about the process.

Mr. Wade stated it was suggested this group also have a representative from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Skala noted there were comments indicating they had left out other neighborhood associations and understood there were three interested persons that would be appointed. He believed it was problematic to include some associations and not others, but it also needed to be balanced so it was not too large a group causing it to be unwieldy versus nimble. He thought they would need to make some hard decision with regard to inclusion and exclusion and how big of a group this would wound up to being.

Mr. Janku commented that he believed they wanted the ability to include people outside the immediate neighborhood as well.

Ms. Hoppe stated she was interested in knowing more about the downtown neighborhood association and how many downtown residents were included in it. Mr. Watkins stated he was not familiar with the group. Mr. Janku wondered if it was active because when Mr. Ash had organized it, there was a problem in the area with regard to a

convenience store. Ms. Hoppe understood if they left off someone significant, they could appoint them as one of the three representatives or change the ordinance.

Mayor Hindman suggested they proceed, as it was drafted, unless someone saw a glaring issue because they could always amend it if something was discovered at a later date. He commented that there was always compromise when appointing commissions.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with Mr. Wade's suggestion for a Planning and Zoning Commission representative. Mr. Janku understood the Planning and Zoning Commission would be reviewing the work product and thought it might be odd to have a representative on the group since they would be voting on the final product or part of the final product. Mr. Wade believed having a representative of the Planning and Zoning Commission was an important linkage with City function. Mr. Watkins pointed out the Planning Director was a member, so there was a staff liaison. Mr. Wade felt the Planning and Zoning Commission representative would be a Council liaison. Ms. Nauser asked if they might be overburdening the Planning and Zoning Commission due to some of the other things they were working on. Mr. Wade replied that would happen regardless of this.

Mr. Wade made a motion to amend B64-08 by adding a representative of the Planning and Zoning Commission to the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council.

Mr. Watkins suggested they add two members so they had an odd number. Ms. Nauser suggested they add another neutral interested person for Council appointment. Mr. Skala asked where they were. Mr. Watkins replied they started with thirteen, suggested two more and were now suggesting another one or two. He was concerned they were getting unwieldy. Mr. Wade was not sure having an odd or even number was an issue due to the size and function of the group. He thought they would be working versus voting on issues. Mr. Skala commented that because they were in the realm of making representation fair and equitable across the board, they might end up with an unwieldy group and in this instance more nimbleness was preferable.

The motion made by Mr. Wade to amend B64-08 by adding a representative of the Planning and Zoning Commission to the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Mr. Boeckmann pointed out they could also delete one of the appointments to keep the same number.

The motion made by Mr. Wade and seconded by Ms. Hoppe to amend B64-08 by adding a representative of the Planning and Zoning Commission to the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council was seconded by Ms. Hoppe was approved by voice vote with only Mayor Hindman, Ms. Crayton and Mr. Janku voting no.

Mr. Skala asked if they wanted to reduce the City appointees by one since they added a representative of the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Janku thought they should leave it as three since there might be some really good people they wanted to appoint.

B64-08, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER.

VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B65-08 Amending Chapter 10 of the City Code to establish a Public Communications Resource Advisory Committee.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the Council enacted legislation to increase video provider fees from 3 percent to 5 percent as it was provided for by new State legislation. Earlier this year, they had appropriated \$250,000 of the increase of which \$100,000 would remain in a general fund and \$150,000 would be provided to CAT. He noted there would be an amendment to the contract with CAT later in the evening. Staff was suggesting the Council appoint a five member group, similar to the Community Services Commission and other recommending agencies, to provide a recommendation to Council with regard to how the additional funds would be spent so it was included in the budget each year. He explained they would take proposals and make recommendations. He understood it was the intent of Council for the additional provider fees to go toward public access of some sort and believed the fairest way to do that would be to have an independent group taking proposals and making recommendations to Council. They were proposing a five member committee with some basic qualifications and conflict of interest requirements.

Mr. Janku suggested expanding the board to seven members in order to have at least one member from each ward. This would broaden representation throughout the community.

Mr. Janku made the motion to amend B65-08 so there would be a total of seven members with one member being from each ward and one being an at-large member. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Skala stated he was supportive of that idea in general even though there were a lot of board and commissions that were not represented by every ward. He noted that when evaluating positions to the boards and commissions, ward representation was something he considered. He agreed seven was not unwieldy, but did not believe absolute representation from every ward should be a precedent.

Mayor Hindman noted they had a lot of re-advertisements and that worried him. Mr. Janku pointed out the Parks and Recreation Commission required ward representation and he found it encouraging when he had applied to that Commission as he was only competing with others from one area of the community versus it being a City-wide competition. He thought it would entice people to apply as they might have a good shot of being appointed. Ms. Nauser understood they could always make an amendment if it did not work. Since it was a unique committee, she agreed it might need representation.

The motion made by Mr. Janku and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend B65-08 so there would be a total of seven members with one member being from each ward and one being an at-large member was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B65-08, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:  
VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER.  
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B67-08 Authorizing an agreement with Thumper Productions, LLC for the 2008 Roots N' Blues and BBQ Festival; appropriating funds.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would authorize an agreement and appropriate \$100,000 from the hotel/motel tax from the Tourism and Development Fund for the 2008 Roots N'

Blues and BBQ Festival. He noted the Festival was supported very heavily by Boone County National Bank last year. He understood they would still be a sponsor, but their contribution would not be nearly as much as it was last year. The group assembled to put on the 2008 version of the festival approached the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board about a one time \$100,000 contribution to the fund. He noted an amendment had been prepared to require the books be open on the \$100,000 the City would contribute so the public would have confidence it was being spent for entertainment as indicated by the agreement.

Terry Woodruff, 515 Cherry Street, stated that on behalf of Thumper Productions, he wanted to express their appreciation to the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board for unanimously approving the request and submitting it to the Council for approval. He commented that they appreciated the Council for appropriating \$10,000 last fall toward the Festival. They were respectfully requesting the Council keep those dollars on the table as they wanted to develop a recycling and refuse management program in partnership with the City.

Mr. Skala noted the question had come up with regard to whether the intention for the expenditure of the \$100,000 should include a clause requiring it to still be a no fee event or a free event. He asked if it was their intention to keep it a no fee event. Mr. Woodruff replied at this time they planned on keeping it as a free event. He pointed out they were developing the concept of VIP packages as an alternate revenue source. Mr. Skala asked for clarification on the VIP packages. Mr. Woodruff explained people could have the option to purchase a VIP package that would allow priority parking, meet and greets with the artists, etc. They would be a revenue generator for the Festival. Mr. Skala asked if admission would still be free. Mr. Woodruff replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe suggested they include something in the agreement indicating it would be free to the public.

Mr. Janku made a motion to amend B67-08 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Boeckmann suggested they make a motion directing staff to add a provision to the agreement associated with B67-08 stating it would be free to the public. Mayor Hindman commented that he wanted to ensure the language did not preclude them from selling VIP packages. Mr. Skala agreed. Mr. Boeckmann understood.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to add a provision to the agreement associated with B67-08 stating it would be free to the public. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku stated it was a great event last year and he was looking forward to another one. Mayor Hindman agreed and believed they might be able to prove this was something outside organizations should sponsor. Mr. Skala stated he thought last year's event was terrific for the community. Ms. Nauser noted the report indicated an economic impact to the City of Columbia and Boone County of almost \$6 million. Mr. Wade stated he was impressed by the optimism of being able to take this kind of event and converting it to a national event in two years. He anticipated it would be three years before they reached that stage and that they might need one more year of some kind of support, but not at the same level.

B67-08, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER.

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.

- B57-08** Authorizing acquisition of easements relating to construction of the Harvard Drive storm water management project.
- B59-08** Accepting conveyances for drainage, utility and sewer purposes.
- B60-08** Authorizing an amendment to the interconnection and water sales agreement with Public Water Supply District No. 9 of Boone County, Missouri as it relates to water rates.
- B61-08** Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B66-08** Appropriating funds for street maintenance.
- R49-08** Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of I-70 right-of-way and property on the north side of I-70, east of the present city limits.
- R50-08** Setting a public hearing: considering an amendment to Chapter 9 of the City Code as it relates to fire sprinkler systems in fraternity and sorority buildings.
- R51-08** Setting a public hearing: considering approval of a design concept proposed by artist Howard Meehan for the City Hall Expansion, Plaza and Streetscape Percent for Art Project.
- R52-08** Authorizing an agreement with Boone County for public health services.
- R53-08** Authorizing an agreement with Boone County for animal control services.
- R54-08** Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri on behalf of the School of Nursing to provide health clinic experience for nursing students.
- R55-08** Authorizing Adopt A Spot agreements.
- R56-08** Authorizing an agreement with Little League Baseball - Missouri District for Sports Development Funding under the Tourism Development Program for the Little League Baseball Senior League Central Region Tournament.
- R57-08** Authorizing the purchase of compact fluorescent bulbs for distribution to low income tenants and City utility customers.
- R58-08** Authorizing a tax credit agreement with the Missouri Development Finance Board relating to streetscape improvements at the intersection of Eighth Street and Broadway as part of the City Hall plaza project.
- R59-08** Authorizing revisions to the Drug and Alcohol Testing Policy and Procedures for City employees.
- R60-08** Agreeing to allow Memorial Day Weekend - Salute to Veterans Corporation to conduct an air show at the Columbia Regional Airport.

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

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **R61-08 Authorizing the addition of a provision to the agreement with Columbia Access Television for operation of the public access channel.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted this was an amendment requested by CAT to the contract previously authorized by the Council. According to their cover letter, if the Council agreed to the amendment, which allowed them to get out with 120 days notice, they would be glad to take the City's money. The 120 days was significant because new State legislation provided the City 90 days to have programming in place so they did not lose access to the channel. He pointed out he believed the channel was something, as a community, they needed to protect. This provided the City adequate time and notice to come up with another plan.

Ms. Nauser asked if it would meet the City's obligation to the State if they allowed the 120 day extension. Mr. Watkins replied it did not necessarily meet the City's obligation to the State, but gave them an opportunity to pull together another plan in order to keep that channel as public access. If the City did not provide new programming for 90 days, Medicom and Charter could take it back.

Ms. Nauser understood that money could be given to the School District, used for the City channel or provided to other community program channels. She understood it could be divided up. Mr. Watkins explained they internally discussed the issue of whether the City could take it over when they received CAT's initial rejection and believed they probably could but felt they would run into a lot of problems. In his mind public access was public access and he did not want the City to be seen as influencing what could and could not be on air. He noted they had talked to other groups in town and no one was prepared to take it over, but they did receive positive feelings so if CAT went away, he thought they might be able to find another group to take over with this kind of notice.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was the only one who voted against this previously. After offering \$150,000 and \$200,000 for subsequent years, she was offended by being told it was not enough. She noted they had worked on the process since September, when they discussed increasing the franchise fee from three to five percent. She stated she had not been provided adequate information with regard to their fundraising operations over the past year or since they came into existence. She felt they had ample time to develop a business plan and was not sure she wanted to provide them a 120 day notice. Mr. Watkins clarified they would sign the agreement and could get out of the agreement with a 120 day notice. He explained if they signed the agreement and decided on October 1 they could not or did not want to provide that service, they would have to continue to provide it for 120 days before they could quit. Ms. Nauser felt they had an opportunity to take the money and declined, so she was uncertain about providing an extension so they could take and hold the money while still having a way out. She noted these were public dollars and a decision should have been

made previously. In her mind, the opportunity had passed. She stated she could not support allowing them to sign a contract they could get out of because they determined they did not want the money as they had indicated they did not want the money in February because they felt the funding was inadequate.

Mr. Skala stated he disagreed and noted he was not offended, but had been surprised when this was previously discussed. In the interim, he had received some assurance. He understood the situation was more complicated than it looked on the face of it and the representation that led to his surprise was a function of not explaining themselves very well. He reiterated that since that time, he had become reasonably satisfied this might work out best for the community at-large. He felt this was a compromised position that gave the City another alternative should something happen. He stated he was willing to support the idea.

The vote on R61-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE. VOTING NO: NAUSER. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R62-08 Authorizing application to the Missouri Department of Transportation for Safe Routes to School funding.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the Safe Routes to School Program involved MoDOT funding on a State-wide basis. He noted they had a public hearing regarding what should be submitted and staff was recommending seven projects, which would each be considered on their own merit.

Mr. Teddy stated there were seven application proposals in the resolution. Four were non-infrastructure projects and subject to a grant limit of \$25,000 per application and three were infrastructure projects and were subject to a limit of \$250,000 per grant. It was 100 percent federally funded through reimbursement to successful applicants. All seven projects were in one way or another mentioned in the public hearing last month. He noted in their previous list, they had an additional construction project which was a trail connector from the MKT from the Grasslands neighborhood north to a connection with South Garth. They were now recommending not pursuing Safe Routes to School funding for that project because the cost was anticipated to be about \$300,000 and because GetAbout Columbia had it in their Working Infrastructure Plan. He explained there were a number of traffic control devices in one of the applications involving flashing yellow lights at the middle schools. He noted they had added Grant Elementary School.

Mr. Janku asked if they would receive a portion if there were limited funds with regard to the project involving flashing yellow lights. Mr. Teddy replied it would go as one grant totaling \$93,000, which was well within the \$250,000 limit. Mr. Janku asked if the City would receive all or nothing. Mr. Teddy replied yes as it was a single funding request.

Mr. Janku asked for the width of the Parkade Elementary School median. Mr. Teddy replied he was not certain, but it was wide enough for a pedestrian refuge. Mr. Janku stated he had some concerns about that project. He did not want to receive funding from the State and then have a lot of problems with the project. He anticipated this would require taking parking off of Parkade at that point. At this time parking was not restricted and was used by

the school and church. Also, the medians would constrain cars and bikes to a more restricted area. He was concerned by the impact without public buy-in. He preferred to leave it off.

Mayor Hindman asked if they had received suggestions from the school. Mr. Teddy replied Dr. Jensen had provided a letter endorsing these projects. He did not think there were any original suggestions on the list coming from the Columbia Public Schools, but they had conferred with all of the principals of the involved schools.

Mr. Janku commented that another issue was that this would not be effective until the sidewalk was built as part of the PedNet Plan, which would also be controversial. He thought this was putting the cart before the horse. He understood this was tied to building a sidewalk on the east side of Garth. Mr. Teddy explained last year's grant application that was not funded included a sidewalk on the east side and the crosswalk and median. That project left the City with a share of the cost. This project was within the estimate. He noted the group discussed and debated it, but the consensus was that the children were already there and walking on that side, so this would help.

Mr. Watkins pointed out it was very unlikely they would receive seven grant applications. Two or three was the most they could expect. If there were problems, he suggested those be taken out and they go with the ones they felt the most comfortable with. Mr. Janku agreed and suggested they do this project when they build the sidewalk on the east side so it could be planned together.

Mr. Janku made a motion to amend R62-08 by deleting item 2, which was the Parkade Elementary School project involving the median and crosswalk on Garth Avenue. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade explained with regard to item 5, the groups were specified but did not include Columbia Public Library. He believed they needed to be included in terms of the groups that would participate in the design charrette. Mr. Teddy agreed. Mr. Wade stated he thought the purpose as stated in the resolution was too narrow. It indicated it was to determine whether an alternate student drop-off and pick-up location could be identified. He felt the issues of safety were far beyond that. He recommended the purpose be to consider a broad range of changes that could or should be done at that location to make it a Safe Route to School. He explained there were so many safety issues, so changing a pick-up/drop-off would not address all of the issues. Mr. Teddy stated they would broaden the narrative in the application. Ms. Hoppe asked that item 4 involving Shepard Boulevard Elementary School be broadened similarly. Mayor Hindman asked if she would be satisfied with Mr. Teddy just taking care of it. Ms. Hoppe replied yes.

The vote, as amended, on R62-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R63-08 Authorizing an agreement with Little Dixie Holding Company, Inc. relating to the extension of Maguire Boulevard.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained Council recently directed staff to realign the north-south connection between AC and Stadium to Maguire Avenue. This required a couple of changes within the property owned by Bob LeMone. He noted Mr. LeMone passed away this morning and there were a number of agreements in which Mr. LeMone had been very helpful in trying to resolve so there were no issues and this was one of them. Using the overhead, he described the alignment, which went through two separate parcels as well as along a county gravel road that was generally for the University. Mr. LeMone and Jeff Smith owned the parcel shown on the overhead in yellow and Mr. LeMone and Tom Smith owned the property above it. This development agreement provided for a donation of the northern gold right-of-way along with \$300,000 in cash, which was the amount Mr. LeMone was going to pay to extend LeMone to the first crossing. It also included an agreement to sell the City the right-of-way across the property he owned at \$6.00 per square foot, which staff felt was a reasonable price. He noted there was an adjacent building and the road would eliminate the possibility of expanding that building. Staff was recommending the Council accept this development agreement. If they elected to not accept it, the property would be in the estate and it might take a while for it to get out, which would prohibit them from going north and south in the future. He noted they still needed to acquire property from Bumgarner's, which was the purple piece, in order to connect it to the north and through the property that was Crosscreek. He explained they also needed to acquire another fairly expensive piece of property, which he pointed to on the overhead because it would make much of that lot unusable. He believed this was an opportunity to move the project along at a reasonable pace. He noted they still had to come back to Council to get the Bumgarner easement to the north and to acquire the right-of-way to the south and down Warren Road. He commented that it was important from a traffic perspective for them to work with the Lenoir group as they were re-doing their campus planning to bring a four-way intersection at the corner of Warren and New Haven, which would join this extension to the north and provide another good outlet for Lenoir residents. There was also a school that needed to be considered as they moved traffic that direction. As they made plans to widen New Haven, they would need to consult with the Lenoir residents and administration, the School District and several property owners. He pointed out if Council did not accept the development agreement, he was afraid it would preclude them from moving either north or south.

Mr. Glascock stated they showed the Lenoir group this plan in January in order to help them design their campus to fit this alignment.

Mayor Hindman stated he received a letter from the Lenoir people, but was not sure he understood the problem. Mr. Janku thought it was a timing issue. He understood they were afraid this would be built and there would not be something to the north. Mayor Hindman asked what difference that would make. Mr. Skala replied they thought it would create more traffic. Mr. Janku explained they wanted to ensure traffic went to the north as well so it did not all come south.

Mr. Skala noted with regard to the extension north and south, he had provided some information involving other alternatives in terms of relieving traffic congestion and providing another access to the north, which was not through the Maguire extension and wondered how that was being evaluated or whether there was any comment on it. Mr. Glascock

explained they discussed this with a traffic consultant in the St. Louis area and he had a draft report, which would be provided to Council at the next meeting.

Mr. Skala stated he did not want to preclude the ability of improvements to the south to allow another ingress and egress point to the LeMone area as it was dangerous in terms of fire safety, etc. He noted he had no problem with the City making a prudent decision to acquire right-of-way, given the circumstances, but he did not want that action to get them further down the road with regard to the road to the north. He understood there was a little piece of land whose easement was critical to whether or not the northern extension would occur. Mr. Watkins pointed out it involved both north and south. Mr. Skala understood there was no money set aside yet for construction. Mr. Watkins explained they still needed Council to approve acquiring the rest of the right-of-way and the plans and specifications. Mr. Skala agreed, but noted they were getting further down that road. Mayor Hindman agreed. Mr. Watkins noted Council agreed to proceed with the design and with making these changes.

Ms. Hoppe asked if there was a problem with holding this to the next Council meeting in light of the report that would be provided. She wondered what the urgency was with making a decision today. Mr. Watkins explained, originally, they were anxious to get it completed while Mr. LeMone was still alive and it had been placed on the agenda before they knew of his passing. At this point, he wanted to keep it moving. He understood this was not a consensus project.

Harold Wilson, 4 Lavinia, stated he was part of the traffic congestion problem at the intersection of LeMone, Lenoir, New Haven, and Nifong. It was a problem that had been well identified and he believed the only viable solution was to have access to the north. As far as 63 was concerned, he was about 98 percent convinced it was great. He reiterated access north was his primary concern. He did not understand the access to the south. He commented that he was sure it would enhance Little Dixie. By doing it, they were only diverting traffic to New Haven and back to the problem intersection. His primary concern involved dumping traffic and trucks in front of New Haven School. He understood there were rumors indicating New Haven would move. He recommended they consider not completing the access to the south until New Haven School moved.

Mr. Skala stated he saw no reason why they should not wait for the report to make a complete evaluation with regard to this development plan due to the circumstances. Mayor Hindman understood the Sierra Club suggested something similar to this. Mr. Skala noted it had nothing to do with the extension to the north. Mayor Hindman understood the Sierra Club's hope was to avoid that. Mr. Skala agreed the southern projection was still there. In addition, part of the plan was the improvement of New Haven Road to accommodate the two ingress and egress points.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table R63-08 to the April 7, 2008 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Ms. Nauser stated she disagreed with the idea of waiting as this process had been going on for a long time. While there might not be unanimous consent, there was still consensus among the Council to move forward on the project. She understood there were new business entities that wanted to move into the area bringing economic development. She felt adding the extension to Stadium Boulevard would relieve some of the truck

congestion at the intersection. She did not believe re-routing people down Warren would solve the problem with trucks because they needed to exit onto the highway. She suggested they look at the issues as they came up, but did not believe there was any reason to not move forward on this. She felt it was imperative for them to continue moving forward in order to allow this area to become more of an economic engine for the community. She thought they were taking many precautions to include building the safest bridges they could for the environment. She believed they needed to continue moving forward as they could look at other options as they became available and make changes accordingly.

Ms. Hoppe pointed out the Council passed a motion to look at the alternatives and this report would provide them with recommendations with regard to traffic relief. She thought they made it clear they wanted to see the traffic report and if it could provide an alternative. She noted they were not deferring this for a long time. It would only be deferred to the next Council meeting so they could review the report and make a good decision.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Ms. Hoppe was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Skala and Ms. Hoppe voting in favor of it.

The vote on R63-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, WADE, NAUSER. VOTING NO: HOPPE, SKALA. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R64-08      Supporting the sewer system revenue bond issue on the April 8, 2008 ballot.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted this included the County's issue as well. Earlier today, the County Commission endorsed both the County and City issues. Both committees also wanted Council's endorsement as they promoted the activities.

Mr. Skala understood a figure of \$140 million was out there. He understood the City bond issue was \$77 million and the other bond issue was \$21 million, which was close to \$100 million. He wondered where the \$140 million number came from. Mr. Watkins stated he did not know. Mr. Janku asked if there was another phase down the road. Mr. Watkins replied there might be another phase in 10-20 years if things such as nutrient removals needed to be added. Mr. Skala stated if that was a mistake, he wanted to correct it. Mr. Wade noted it was a statement about the amount of the sewer bond issues in the upcoming election and thought it needed to be corrected. Mr. Watkins stated he had no idea where that number came from.

The vote on R64-08 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER. 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.

**B68-08      Rezoning property located at the eastern terminus of Chapel Hill Road from O-P to C-P.**

- B69-08 Amending Chapter 23 of the City Code as it relates to billboards.
- B70-08 Approving the Final Plat of Oakland Ridge, Plat No. 2 located on the southeast corner of Oakland Gravel Road and Oakland Ridge Drive.
- B71-08 Approving the Final Plat of Bluff Creek Estates Plat 8 located on the east side of Bluff Creek Drive, west of U.S. Highway 63; authorizing a performance contract.
- B72-08 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County relating to 2008 revenue sharing funds for the Clark Lane improvement project; appropriating funds.
- B73-08 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with Donohue & Associates, Inc. for engineering services for the Bear Creek Stream Bank Stabilization Project; appropriating funds.
- B74-08 Authorizing Change Order #1 with T-N-T Excavating; approving the Engineer's Final Report relating to construction of the C-3 Trunk Sewer Extension, an 80-acre point sanitary sewer serving the University of Missouri South Farm property.
- B75-08 Authorizing Change Order #1 with Joshua Excavating, LLC; approving the Engineer's Final Report relating to construction of the H-21 Relief Sewer, Hominy Branch Relief Sewer.
- B76-08 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B77-08 Authorizing an agreement with Ed and Carmel Skrabal relating to construction of a pedestrian trail connection to Longview Park; accepting permanent and short-term recreational trail easements.
- B78-08 Accepting and appropriating donated funds for Parks and Recreation Department programs.
- B79-08 Amending Chapter 9 of the City Code as it relates to fire sprinkler systems in fraternity and sorority buildings.
- B80-08 Authorizing an amendment to lease and agreement for hangar ground site at Columbia Regional Airport with Jeffrey E. Smith and Robert M. LeMone.

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

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

Mr. Janku understood money was being spent on the Bear Creek project, but there had not been any interested parties meetings unlike with other projects and he was afraid they were moving too fast. Mr. Watkins asked if he was talking about the stabilization project. Mr. Janku replied yes, if that was what it was. Mr. Watkins stated he did not believe it had a trail component and that it was just a creek bank stabilization project. Mayor Hindman understood interested parties meetings were required. Mr. Watkins stated he would check on it and get back to him.

**(B) Amendment to Section 22-156 of the Code of Ordinance.**

Mr. Watkins noted the Council amended the definition of residential earlier this year and it was referred to in the residential refuge section of the Code. Staff was suggesting the

definition be the same in both places. He understood it would have no impact on customers in terms of rates or costs.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to prepare an ordinance to amend Section 22-156 of the Code related to the definition of residential unit. The motion was seconded by Ms. Crayton and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(C) Violent Crimes Task Force.**

Chief Boehm explained this was a Council request with regard to whether the Violent Crimes Task Force would be ongoing or re-implemented from time to time. He noted the report outlined the issues and complications. While it was something they thought they could do on rare occasions, they felt they needed to be careful in asking for resources from other law enforcement agencies on a regular basis because they had to pull their resources from other full time jobs while helping with the Task Force. A possible solution being considered for the upcoming budget involved a full time unit of a smaller scale that would only include CPD officers.

Ms. Nauser stated she hoped they brought forward their idea during the budget process as she would support adding that type of crime unit to the police force. She asked that they incorporate gang prevention and investigation under the activities assigned. She noted there had been a proliferation of graffiti throughout the downtown area and was something they needed to address.

Mr. Skala stated he thought this was a good idea and should be discussed in the upcoming budget. He commented that he noticed there was a hand written note in the margin that indicated they generally tried to add about three officers per year to the department and asked if this would be a net increase of one with assignment to a special group. Mr. Watkins replied the comments were his and explained that for the past few years they have tried to add about three officers per year to keep up with growth. He point was that this was in the realm of increases in police staff.

Ms. Nauser stated she would be in agreement with making this in excess of the police officers they hired to keep up with population growth. She did not believe these issues were going away and the City was continuing to grow. She planned to look at this as a supplement rather than adding one more officer to the mix.

Mr. Wade asked if “rip off” was the same as “robbery.” Chief Boehm replied not necessarily. He explained “rip off” was the slang term used among the groups committing robbery against each other. He noted that many times the victim of the robbery would not report it because they were drug dealers themselves and did not want the Police dealing with the issue or being in their residence.

**(D) Columbia Farmer’s Market – Proposed “Option to Lease” Property.**

Mr. Watkins explained the Columbia Farmer’s Market was attempting to raise a substantial amount of money and wanted neighborhood assistance program tax credits, which required site control over a prolonged period of time. They were asking the City to consider the possibility of an option to lease, so if they secured the tax credits, the City would

be required to lease the ground to them for a period of time. Staff did not have a problem with it provided the tax credits were used and were of a sufficient quantity to do good.

Mr. Hood explained they had been working very closely with the Farmer's Market over the past year. He thought they were making a concentrated effort to raise money. The report indicated they had pledges of over \$100,000. He had spoken with them this past Friday and understood they had raised between \$180,000-\$200,000 to date and were very interested in pursuing these tax credits because they thought it would assist them with fundraising.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to prepare an ordinance approving an "option to lease". The motion was second by Mr. Janku.

Ms. Hoppe noted there were various time periods referred to in the letter and requested clarification. Mr. Hood replied they had some differing information, but the bottom line was that they had to assure a five year lease beyond whatever period the tax credits were issued for. Tax credits were normally issued for two years, so that would require a seven year period. When the Farmer's Market wrote their letter, he understood they were under the impression the tax credits would only be issued for a one year period requiring a six year lease.

Ms. Nauser praised them for raising \$180,000-\$200,000 as this process had not been ongoing for a long time. She recalled agreeing to this new plan last year. Within about a year's time, they had solicited support for their proposal. She believed this was how a true public/private partnership should be as they had people actively working for their cause. She stated that was a lot of money to be raised in a relatively short period of time.

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

**(E) Neighborhood Leadership Program.**

Mr. Watkins explained that as a result of discussion at the retreat, staff had outlined a Leadership Program for citizens interested in serving in local government and other community roles.

Ms. Britt commented that when this was brought to Council last year, the response was to divide it up in order for a better focus. They were recommending a multi-session program that would be focused primarily for community leaders and neighborhood association leaders, but could be used by other folks in the community as well. The goal of the program was to help them become more familiar with local government and to help develop leadership skills so they could take more action within their neighborhood. She understood there would be other people in the community that would want to participate as well, such as leaders from non-profit organizations, board and commission members, etc. She suggested a committee that included City staff and other community leaders be established to help design the program, set the parameters and recruit people to be a part of it. She was hopeful they could offer this program in early 2009.

Mr. Wade stated he believed this was essential if they were to have quality citizen engagement. He felt they had a responsibility to help build community capability. In addition to the suggestions of Ms. Britt, they also had access to expertise at the University including one person that had worked with 75 programs of this nature throughout the State. He noted

there were a lot of models that could be designed to work for the City. He reiterated that he believed this was an important step in building a neighborhood association structure and community leadership.

Ms. Hoppe stated it appeared to be a good program. She understood registration would be limited and the committee would be asked to help with recruitment and the selection of participants. She wanted to ensure this was an open process and asked if people would be allowed to apply in order to be selected or if they would specifically be picked. Ms. Britt replied they would allow the committee to assist with the guidelines, but she thought it would involve a little of both. She thought they would want to encourage participation by trying to get the word out to the neighborhood associations and other targeted groups, but might also want to be selective because they would have to limit participation to some degree in order for it to be successful. They also wanted to ensure a good representation from people throughout the community. Mr. Wade stated he thought there would be an application process and applicants would be selected from those applications. He noted they could only have so many people for this to be successful, so they would need to select applicants to fill the class. He pointed out this was not a one time event. He believed it needed to be a regular event in order to build community capability. He thought the citizens committee was critical in ensuring fairness and equity in the selection process and believed the guidelines needed to be clear and open.

Mr. Skala stated he felt this was a vast improvement over the old way of doing things, which involved posting a rezoning sign somewhere and generating enough enthusiasm so people would band together to establish a neighborhood association. He believed this was much appreciated and was a great improvement.

Mr. Wade made a motion to accept the report and authorize the City Manager to proceed with the formation of a Neighborhood Leadership Program for 2009. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(F) Landscaping Major Entryways.**

Mr. Watkins noted Council asked staff to work on the beautification of the entryways at last year's retreat. He pointed out funds were included in the 2005 ballot issue for substantial landscaping. A report had been received from the consultant and Council was asking for something less expensive, so he felt more direction was needed.

Mr. St. Romaine explained a public meeting had been held where they received a lot of good ideas and were able to identify some key entryways into the City that could use some enhancement. At a work session in December, they identified the four discussed in the memo. Before they moved forward, they wanted the Council's input on the design created for the I-70 and Stadium interchange, which was ranked the highest. He noted the cost for this interchange was about \$117,000 and pointed out they were working within a budget of \$400,000 for all four interchanges. He understood the other three would cost about \$100,000 or less. He referred to the spreadsheet included in the packet as that discussed the cost of maintenance for at least the first three years, which were the most expensive years due to watering and weeding. It became a little cheaper in years four and beyond. He pointed out those maintenance costs were not included in the \$400,000 budget.

Mr. Skala understood there had been Council discussion in the past with regard to indigenous species for less maintenance. After reviewing the lists, he thought they might want to lean toward picking varieties that were self-sufficient, but less decorative. He stated he was uncomfortable with the range of choices in terms of whether this would look different than what real Missouri looked like. In addition, he was concerned with the maintenance costs.

Ms. Nauser understood Stadium would be widened in the future and asked if those improvements would include the intersection area. She wondered if landscaping would be installed and then later destroyed. Mr. Watkins replied he understood there would be some work at that intersection, so if Council elected to proceed with this intersection, they would delay installation of materials for a year or two while they did the construction.

Ms. Hoppe understood the cost of maintenance for the first three years was more than the cost of installing it. Mr. St. Romaine stated \$45,000 was the annual cost to maintain the I-70/Stadium interchange, so that was correct. Ms. Hoppe noted the report indicated maintenance costs would run as high as \$175,000 per year for the first three years and asked if that was for all of the intersections. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes. He explained \$45,418 was the annual cost for maintenance of the I-70/Stadium interchange for the first three years. Mr. Wade understood they were looking at \$135,000 in maintenance costs for the first three years for a project that would cost \$117,000 to do.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with Mr. Skala in that they might want to use native plants to try to reduce the maintenance costs.

Mr. St. Romaine referred to the maintenance schedule and noted they had to hand weeding fourteen times a season, chemical weed control seven times a season, mowing with a 72" mower thirty-six times per season, etc. He thought that was in the high end of maintenance and could probably be modified.

Mr. Janku asked if they could get numbers on comparable interchanges. Mr. St. Romaine asked if he wanted those numbers for maintenance or installation. Mr. Janku replied both. Mr. St. Romaine stated they looked at the installation costs in some of the St. Louis suburbs, which were the million dollar projects. He had also asked the Parks and Recreation Department to take a look at the maintenance costs included in this plan to see if they were at least reasonable and they believed they were. Mr. Hood stated the landscape staff thought it was in the ballpark based on their experience in maintaining their landscaped areas around the City. He noted they were taking on the mowing of the intersection, which was currently being done by MoDOT. The City would be maintaining the entire area.

Mr. Skala thought the areas in the suburbs of St. Louis were planted with beds of bulbs. He believed the grass was so low the bulbs could come up. He stated it was hard for him to believe there was that much of a maintenance cost associated with mowing. He wondered if some of it could be eliminated by putting in a type of grass that did not grow as fast.

Ms. Hoppe understood there was ground cover that looked good and did not need mowing and suggested using more of it as an option. She understood the people involved in the session discussed using low maintenance native plantings.

Mr. Janku noted trees were tough because a certain percentage would die causing a need for replacement costs.

Mr. Watkins explained the \$45,000 was about one person's salary for those few months. Equipment, gas, supplies, etc. were still needed. He noted the intersection was essentially a 12 acre park. The question was what Council wanted it to look like. If they wanted a groomed and manicured area, they would be spending that kind of money for maintenance.

Mr. Wade commented that as much as he appreciated and enjoyed the nice intersections in other communities, he noted they had been adding maintenance costs to the Parks and Recreation Department without keeping track of what they were adding. Every time they built a trail, it added to their ongoing operations costs. At some point, they would have no discretionary money. He stated they had not included the maintenance impact of the projects and believed it might be a problem for future Councils. He thought they needed to take those issues into account as part of planning. Every time they built something, they were adding a cost to the operations budget of some department.

Ms. Nauser stated she agreed with Mr. Wade and noted she brought that issue up at the last meeting. She commented that she was having a hard time justifying spending that kind of money on the entranceways. She thought it might be in their best interest to pay the consultants for the work they had done and scale back. She believed a nice attractive sign stating "Welcome to Columbia" with native plants and minimal landscaping in a small confined area would be appropriate at this time. She did not believe moving forward with this project would sit well with voters due to today's economic climate. She thought they could come up with something else or find other uses for the \$400,000.

Mr. Janku pointed out that money was designated for landscaping. He thought they could learn from other communities. He understood there might not be other communities with four interchanges, but thought they could find a couple of communities with less of an initial investment and a smaller area to maintain while still having a relatively attractive area. He suggested they keep looking. He noted the consultants had done great work, but they did not have the money in terms of maintenance. He reiterated he wanted to learn from other communities.

Mr. Skala asked if they could request a reasonable re-evaluation in order to focus their attention on size and reducing the maintenance cost further. Mr. Watkins explained one of the issues in terms of maintenance was that once they did anything, they would have to mow. He understood that was MoDOT's long standing policy. Mr. Janku asked if that was the case in Ashland where the garden club put in landscaping around the interchange. Mr. Skala stated that seemed wrong. Mr. Janku asked if the City had to mow at Broadway and 63. Mr. St. Romaine replied he was not sure, but could find out.

Mr. St. Romaine noted that almost half of the \$117,000 was due to shade trees as there were 152 shade trees. If Council wanted them to look at more perennial ground cover, they could. He pointed out the trees provided a big impact and key image. He stated they could ask PDS to pare this down if they could provide a dollar amount.

Mr. Wade stated his concern was with the ongoing maintenance as opposed to the initial cost. He noted they had \$400,000 and suggested the initial investment be made with designs that did not break the bank in terms of maintenance.

Mr. Skala suggested they limit the amount of improvements for each interchange to include maintenance since they had four interchanges and only \$400,000.

Ms. Nauser asked if they could pay the consultant for work that had been done and pare it down themselves. The City had an excellent Parks and Recreation staff that worked in the area of maintenance. Mr. St. Romaine agreed that was another option. He noted they had a termination clause in all of their contracts, so they could terminate the contract at anytime.

Mr. Watkins understood the Council was reluctant in taking this project on now that they had significant information on what it would take in terms of the initial cost and annual maintenance. He thought it was a legitimate decision by the Council to say they had the information and were electing not to proceed in this direction at this time.

Mr. Wade stated he would love to see attractive entranceways as they were important, but with the budget situation and a series of other unmet needs they had higher priorities for the money right now. Mr. Janku thought they needed to find a way to take advantage of this money as it was set aside, but they also needed to find a way to handle the maintenance issues. He suggested they find out how other communities had done it. Ms. Nauser noted they could make changes to the budget throughout the year. She did not believe there was any obligation to spend the \$400,000 on landscaping. Mr. Janku pointed out they specified it in the ballot. Mr. Skala thought the landscaping money needed to include some of the maintenance costs. Mayor Hindman noted if they started taking operating money out of a ballot issue, they would be in trouble. Mr. Janku thought they needed to keep thinking. Mayor Hindman agreed. Mr. Wade asked what that meant. Mr. Janku replied they should try to come up with a plan they could afford to maintain. Mayor Hindman agreed and stated he thought they should go ahead terminate their contract.

Ms. Nauser asked if there were areas in town needing improvements to landscaping to which they could apply some of this money without increasing the obligation for maintenance. She suggested rain gardens or other forms of landscaping. Mr. Janku stated most landscaping required maintenance, even trees as they needed to be replaced when they died. He thought they needed to find a way to accommodate the ongoing costs.

Mr. Watkins thought there was a general consensus to terminate the contract with the designers. Mr. Janku agreed and noted they could employ local designers if necessary.

Ms. Hoppe stated she thought they should ensure future intersections looked good, so they did not have to come back and try to improve them. Mayor Hindman pointed out they would still have the responsibility of making them look good and maintaining them.

## **APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

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

**SUSTAINABLE FARMS AND COMMUNITIES BOARD**

Matthews, William, 3105 Crabapple Lane, Ward 5, Term to expire December 31, 2009

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Mayor Hindman commented that the City of Columbia won the National League of Cities Diversity Award for its population size. He felt it showed the kind of community they were and thought it was quite an honor. In reading what should be done with regard to economic development and trying to attract innovative people, one of the top questions asked was with regard to the diversity of the community. He noted they had diversity and had worked hard to emphasize it. He pointed out Mary Anne McCollum came up with the idea of the diversity breakfast and Councils since then had followed through by supporting it every year.

Mayor Hindman noted everyone had received a letter in regard to the Blind Boone Home from Reverend Ruffin. His proposal was to take \$250,000 from the park fund to put toward it. He asked for a report regarding what could be done to include a history of what had been done as a lot had been done.

Mr. Janku wondered if CDBG funds could be used. Mr. Watkins explained they had used about as much CDBG funds as they could on that building. He noted the building was bought with CDBG money.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to provide a report on the Blind Boone Home indicating where they were, what limitations there were and its history to include what had been done, so it could be a topic for budget discussions.

Ms. Crayton noted a friend of hers from Kansas City had contacted her with regard to submitting the Blind Boone Home to a historical museum committee. She understood Mr. Watkins had provided some information last week. Mayor Hindman thought that was great. He thought a funding source could be found to at least paint the outside of it.

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

Mayor Hindman stated he was not sure what to do with regard to the Heibel-March building. He thought they should all think about that.

Mayor Hindman recalled receiving reports in the past with regard to video streaming and understood there had been some fairly advanced technological improvements. He thought they needed to look into that as more and more people were going to dish. He asked if they would be getting new equipment with the new building. Mr. Watkins replied some. Mayor Hindman thought that might be a good time to look at its possibility.

Mayor Hindman noted Austin, Texas had worked out a system where they were encouraging builders to build green buildings and were having a lot of success in getting the private sector to go along with it. He understood they had set their own standards as to what green buildings were. They were very similar to LEED, but they were not required to go through the LEED process. They still encouraged people to build LEED buildings, but had

set up their own standards for green buildings. He stated he wanted staff to look at the Austin to see if it was transferable.

Mr. Skala stated there had been a recent article in a governing magazine about Austin, Texas and this very topic.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to provide a report with regard encouraging the use of green building standards as was being done in Austin, Texas.

Mayor Hindman stated he had talked to the Mayor of Austin and understood they did not have a requirement to build green buildings, but it was encouraged in a big way.

Ms. Hoppe stated she attended a luncheon at the Missouri Bank with a variety of people including builders who were becoming interested and positive about this being the way they needed to move. She noted she was also encouraged by Septagon Construction as they were lauding this as the way to go during a True/False Film Festival film about green building. She thought the development community was interested as well.

Mayor Hindman pointed out it was a great way in creating local jobs, so some of the local contractors wanted this kind of thing as it would provide them a leg up. Mr. Skala understood it also cut back on energy costs.

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

Mr. Skala commented that he attended the Keene Street Community Improvement District meeting last Wednesday. It was an organizational meeting called by Craig VanMatre's office and the CEO of the Columbia Orthopedic Group and included some of the homeowners around the Keene area and beyond. He stated he was drafted as the Council liaison to get this distribution list together because people were considering where they wanted to go with this. He noted everyone was in a cooperative spirit and he hoped to head off some of the controversy they always had. He wanted to let the Council know things were progressing on that front.

Mr. Skala stated he wanted a report regarding the clustering of sex shops in the Benton-Stephens Neighborhood on North Highway 63. There were two there now. He understood there were issues in terms of property rights, free speech, etc., but thought they might try to get a handle on this along the lines of other rules they had in the ordinances including certain kinds of uses not being allowed so many feet from schools or each other. He did not know if there was anything that could be done about this situation, but some of his constituents were concerned about this getting out of hand.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to provide a report with suggestions or solutions with regard to the location of sex shops and their clustering together. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala stated his neighborhood had recently tried to reinvigorate the neighborhood watch system due to a rash of burglaries. He thought community conversation was starting to revolve around a number of ways to address this to include prevention, intervention and protection. He stated they had talked about protection by increasing the street crimes unit, which was a step in the right direction. He thought the areas of intervention and prevention

might have a better payoff, but took longer to address. He stated that included providing facilities and perhaps jobs for the youth. He noted they had a lot of programs but very few community resources in terms of where the youth could go to take advantage of the programs. On the northeast side, they were isolated and part of the reason was due to infrastructure costs and not having facilities. He thought they might need to look at ways of extending recreational facilities to other areas in the City. He pointed out he had mentioned considering police protection as a function of new growth infrastructure and thought Mr. Janku indicated they might not be able to fund it with development fees since it had been voted on. He wondered if there was some way to augment the Police Department in terms of parks patrol by having a couple of officers that would deal with parks funded by the Parks and Recreation Department in order to allow the other officers, patrol officers, a little more freedom to do what they needed. Mr. Janku stated the City had a park ranger. Mr. Skala noted there was only one. Mayor Hindman commented that the City had a major volunteer park patrol program which had received national recognition. Mr. Skala stated he was trying to relieve the pressure on the Police Department as there were a lot of problems they were dealing with whose origin was in some of these parks.

Mr. Skala pointed out the Citizen Oversight Committee announced a series of public input sessions. He understood five were remaining and those were on March 20, 22, April 10, 12 and 17. He encouraged everyone to attend to provide input to the Committee.

Mr. Skala understood the National League of Cities (NLC) got together with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) in California. The website for the California Cities Gang Prevention Network was <http://www.ccgpn.org/> and it had a wealth of resources and links. He thought he would bring that up in order to get some conversations going. He did not know the extent of gang influence in Columbia but thought there might be some causing them to want to get on top of it as quickly as possible.

Mr. Skala commented that he might want to request a report regarding budget issues and understood they would have a mini-retreat on May 3<sup>rd</sup>. He explained that last year, an issue came up with regard to cutting the budget of larger departments by a quarter or half percent to better fund some of the smaller departments, but was too late in the process to pursue. He suggested looking at large budget departments, such as the Public Works, Water and Light and Parks and Recreation Departments, in order to redistribute a small portion of those funds to other departments that were not as well off, such as the Planning and Development, Health and Human Resources Departments. He thought this might be early enough to take a look at that, so they at least had some options to better fund smaller departments. He understood infrastructure costs for larger departments might need to be addressed by going to the public with regard to bond issues.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to provide report with regard to some of the across the board cuts for the larger departments. He wanted to know whether that was doable, how much money would be raised, how much money would be available, etc. Mr. Watkins suggested they talk about that at the mini-retreat by providing some guidance as to

what was important. He thought it might be better to talk about emphases versus cuts. Mr. Skala was agreeable.

Mr. Wade stated he was tentatively scheduling two informational forums for the Fourth Ward regarding the sewer bond issue. One would be held on Tuesday, April 1<sup>st</sup> at Fairview School and the other would be held on April 3<sup>rd</sup> at the Library from 5:00 - 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Wade noted they discussed the easement acquisition for the intersection at Fairview and Worley earlier in the evening and that sometime ago, they had raised the issue of Fairview and Ash, but he had not seen anything regarding it. He understood it was within the purview of the Fairview Marketplace TDD even though it might not be in their current plans. He thought it looked like an ideal location for a round-a-bout versus lights and asked if it was possible to have the Public Works Department look into that and discuss it with the Fairview Marketplace TDD representatives. Mayor Hindman asked about the status of the report. Mr. Watkins replied staff was still working on it. Mayor Hindman asked if they could wait for the report. Mr. Wade replied staff had been working on it for about four months. Mr. Watkins pointed out they had one traffic engineer. Mr. Wade stated he understood and noted the moving forward with Fairview and Worley stimulated this. Mr. Watkins explained that had been designed by the TDD and the City was only acquiring easements. Mr. Wade asked if there was a way to get the TDD to assume some responsibility. Mr. Watkins replied they could talk about that.

Ms. Nauser stated she had been compiling information and data on other communities for a month and a half. She had looked at some of the things suggested by Council such as prevention, intervention and enforcement options. She noted she had created a report of about 10-12 pages with reams of information from other communities and hoped to present it to Council sometime in April to begin a good dialogue in how they wanted to address some of these issues. She stated there was a wide range of possibilities.

Ms. Nauser stated she read an article in a local magazine regarding the Bleu Restaurant. She also recalled an e-mail in January regarding some issues and wanted a report indicating what the Code violations and problems were. In the article, the City was being portrayed as not being cooperative in trying to solve this problem, so she wanted to know what the problems were with regard to Fire Code, etc. She also wanted to know if this was something they would be seeing in the future due to redevelopment downtown since those properties were unique and built to the property lines.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to provide a report indicating what the Code issues were, what was being done, where they were and if this might be an issue with other properties.

Mr. Janku asked if they had gone before the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Amin replied she had not seen an application. Mr. Boeckmann explained it would be the Building Construction Codes Commission. Ms. Nauser understood they missed that meeting by a month and now had to wait. She noted she was not sure of the issues. Mr. Watkins stated the Codes Commission had ruled and the developer wanted to change the Codes

Commission's ruling. Ms. Nauser asked what they were asking for. Mr. Watkins replied it was a fairly complicated fire suppression issue that had to do with putting holes in walls and having no sprinkler system above it. Mr. Watkins stated they would provide a report showing the time frame and describing what the issues were. Ms. Nauser asked if this was a new issue due to a Code that was recently adopted. Mr. Watkins replied no and explained he had participated in several meetings with the developers and staff.

Ms. Nauser noted a couple weeks ago the stormwater consultant talked to them about what they had found with regard to the City's ordinance. In the report, she noticed a notation about ponds and lakes. It indicated they were not clear with regard to using them as best management practices for detention ponds. She understood some issues were going back to a new committee to be addressed and asked that the committee look at item 6.4 on page 25 of the report.

Ms. Nauser made a motion asking for the committee to look at item 6.4 on page 25 of the stormwater consultant's report. Mr. Watkins stated staff would provide a report. Ms. Nauser asked if they would not have a committee. Mr. Watkins stated he was not sure of the process at this point. Ms. Nauser commented that she would be satisfied with the report.

Ms. Hoppe stated her office hours location was still at Uprise, but they had moved to 10 Hitt Street with Ragtag. Her office hours were on the Saturdays before the Monday Council meetings, but if people were interested in meeting at other times, she could also meet on the off Saturdays. They just needed to call or e-mail her.

Ms. Hoppe noted there had been a lot of publicity regarding pharmaceuticals in the water.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report, which included whether Columbia tested for pharmaceuticals in the water, what education was done to inform residents and businesses of the proper way to dispose of pharmaceuticals, and what could be done to increase and improve education. Mr. Watkins stated staff would provide a report.

Ms. Hoppe commented that the intersection of College and University did not have a pedestrian light and it was a high pedestrian crossing. She understood GetAbout Columbia was not aware of any plans for placing a pedestrian light at that location. In addition, if one was going west on University from the east, crossing College, and turning left to go south onto College, there was no left turn signal. She was informed by a lot of people that it was very difficult to turn with pedestrians and traffic. She asked if the City would need to ask MoDOT to install a left turn light. Mr. Watkins replied it was a MoDOT street, so the best thing to do would be to ask for a report so staff could talk to MoDOT to see what the process and issues would be.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding the installation of a pedestrian crossing light at College and University and the installation of a left turn signal as described at the intersection of University and College. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Mayor Hindman asked if he could add an item to the motion. He noted hundreds of students crossed College to go to the sidewalk for white campus and suggested a walk light at that location as well. He clarified when going through the Memorial Tower, there was a sidewalk that went to the east to College Avenue and the college students went through there to their houses. He stated there was no pedestrian protection there at all. Ms. Hoppe and Mr. Janku were agreeable to adding that to the motion.

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

Ms. Hoppe referred to the intersection of Old 63 and Stadium and indicated there were two issues there. When going south on Old 63 to Stadium and making a right turn to go toward the University, it was difficult to make that right in high traffic times due to the timing of the lights and the amount of traffic. There was a line as far as one could see to the south for cars turning left. In addition, cars were going east to west on Stadium. All of these factors made it difficult to make a right turn during high traffic times. She thought it was essentially a timing issue with regard to the lights. Also, if someone wanted to go north on Old 63 when going east to west on Stadium, there was a designated right turn lane, but with traffic stopped with one or two cars, it was difficult to get into. She did not believe it functioned well. She thought it needed to be extended in order to be more useful. She noted this would be more essential down the road due to the Crosscreek development.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to contact MoDOT in regard to these issues described. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe stated Boone Hospital constructed offices on the north side of Broadway some time ago and noted tree preservation was required when those offices were built. She understood they were doing some more building and the trees that had been preserved were cut down. She wanted a report regarding when trees required for preservation could be cut down and what they could do to firm up those ordinances. She asked some Hospital Board Members and they were not aware they had been cut down.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report reviewing City ordinances with regard to when trees required for preservation could be cut down and how any issues in that regard could be firmed up. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe noted the buoys at Stephens Lake were left out during the winter and had become dirty and moldy. She asked if the Parks and Recreation Department could bring them in during the winter and thought these might need to be replaced.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding what the City could do to keep the buoys in good condition in the future. Mr. Watkins stated a report would be provided.

Ms. Crayton noted Spring Break was coming and the lack of opportunity bred certain things. She stated they sometimes assumed programs were working, but were not when the

kids really needed them. She explained those kids that received free and reduced lunches would not have lunch. They would be on the streets during that week. She felt they needed to ensure programs that indicated they would be open were open, especially if they received City funds. She believed all of the programs needed be monitored to ensure their facilities were open. She noted the fighting went on at night when everybody else went home. She asked for a report to determine what places would be open for kids. She understood some of the Council indicated they wanted to hire more police and asked them not to penalize the children for them not doing their part, which was to ensure these services were reaching the people they should. She stated they also needed to help the parents. She gave as an example a 32 year old man who was an ex-offender that had served for 12 years and could not find a job. She noted he had four teenage children. She stated there was no where she could send him because he had a record. If he was not able to get a job, he would have to go back to the old life since there were no opportunities. She also wanted a report listing the ex-offender programs and providing suggestions for the young men and women who were being released and coming back to Columbia.

Ms. Crayton made the motion directing staff to provide a report listing the organizations the City was funding that provided support to ex-offenders. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku stated he found a handbook for the City Council dated March 1990 and wondered if it would be helpful to the Council in the future or the Neighborhood Leadership Program as it included ordinances, charter provisions, etc.

Mr. Janku understood they were looking into placing some red light cameras in areas of town and had not included the Stadium and Bernadette intersection. Mr. Watkins thought Stadium and Bernadette was being proposed to be redesigned and expanded as part of the Stadium project. As a result, it might have been one the consultant shied away from. Mr. Janku noted that was a couple years down the road and the intersection was prone to runnings of red lights and accidents. He suggested that intersection be looked at.

Mr. Janku stated he read a letter regarding the disposition of property for Fire Station No. 7, which indicated the appraisal was based on 2004 and wondered if the appraisal needed to be updated. Mr. Watkins replied it had been slightly updated. Mr. Janku understood adjoining property owners had first shot. Mr. Watkins replied yes and noted both had indicated some interest at least tentatively.

Mr. Janku noted they had not spent all of their money during the budget process and discussed putting more money into the C.A.R.E. program. He asked when that decision needed to be made. Mr. Watkins replied it would probably need to be done in April. Mr. Janku stated if the Parks and Recreation Department felt they had a lot of good applicants and were having to turn them away, he wanted some feedback so they could discuss it. He suggested they discuss it at the March 31<sup>st</sup> work session.

Mr. Janku made the motion directing staff to provide a report regarding the C.A.R.E. program to include information regarding the number of applicants and what the need might be. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Ms. Crayton stated she wanted to know how many kids they turned away and asked if it could be included in the report being provided. Mr. Watkins stated he did not know, but they would have that information available. Ms. Nauser asked if that information was included in the report regarding at-risk youth. Mr. Watkins stated he did not recall. Mr. Janku and Ms. Nauser were agreeable to including the request for that information in the motion.

The motion made by Mr. Janku, amended by Ms. Crayton and seconded by Ms. Nauser directing staff to provide a report regarding the C.A.R.E. program to include the number of applicants, the financial need and the number of kids that have been turned away was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk