

MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
APRIL 6, 2009

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 6, 2009, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU and SKALA were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of March 16, 2009 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Wade.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Watkins explained staff was requesting R78-09 be added to the new business portion of the agenda. Mr. Janku made the motion to add R78-09 to the new business portion of the agenda. Mayor Hindman noted it had to do with the applying for a Byrne grant under the Recovery Act. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote. The agenda, as amended, to include the Consent Agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Wade and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

SPECIAL ITEMS

FY 2008 Annual Financial Report.

Dale Swoboda, 910 W. Broadway, stated he was the Chair of the Finance Audit and Advisory Committee and explained the Committee had met with Ms. Fleming and the external auditors on March 31, 2009 with regard to the findings of the 2008 audit of the City of Columbia. He noted Ms. Fleming gave an overview of the financial condition of the City, and he thought they were doing well. Jacqueline Dippel and Elizabeth Dionne of KPMG, LLP, the City's external auditors, reported on the results of the audit they conducted. No significant or unusual transactions were found during the audit. The auditors felt the adjustments to the financial statements were so insignificant that they did not need to be made, and the Committee agreed. The Committee was pleased with the outcome of the audit and unanimously approved it. He pointed out they had questions and were satisfied with the responses of Ms. Fleming and the auditors. The external auditors discussed the four documents that were reviewed. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report was clean with no exceptions or findings. The Passenger Facility Charge audit, which was conducted to meet FAA requirements, did not have any findings involving compliance or internal controls. The management letter from the auditor contained three recommendations to improve the operations of the City in reporting the finances, and they were minor. One recommendation was for improved procedures for accounts payable with regard to the cutoff date. A second recommendation was to change the wording in a footnote that made new accounting

pronouncements. The third recommendation was for the City to receive and review the SAS-70 reports for vendors the City utilized for third party administration of health and insurance programs on a timely basis. The SAS-70 report was an audit of those vendors, and the Committee thought it was a good idea to know how people had evaluated those that were providing services. Based on these findings, he was pleased to present the fiscal year 2008 audit of the City to the Council and the Mayor, and as a representative of the Committee, he recommended they accept the clean audit on behalf of the citizens of Columbia.

Ms. Fleming pointed out these reports were posted on the City's website.

Mr. Janku made a motion to accept the report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman thanked Mr. Swoboda and the other members of the Committee. He also congratulated Ms. Fleming on a job well done.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Justin Thomas – Storm and Sewer Water Infrastructure on West Sexton Road.

Justin Thomas, 202 W. Sexton Road, stated he moved to 202 W. Sexton Road in late August of 2007. On September 13, 2008, rain came due to Hurricane Ike. In addition, earlier in the week, it had rained a couple inches as well. He noticed water coming into his basement, so he contacted the City to find out if anything could be done and was told to call a plumber. On September 13, it had rained several inches and he had 1.5 feet of water in his basement damaging some of his property. He understood others in the neighborhood had the same issues. Someone showed up Monday morning to lift the manhole cover and a few seconds later someone knocked on his door and asked if there was water in his basement. He indicated he did have water in the basement and was given guidelines following a sewer backup from the Department of Public Works. He told this person he was not the only one in the neighborhood with this problem and pointed him in the direction of the other houses, however, none of those residents were made aware of these guidelines. He called the number on the guidelines and requested information on what could be done. He was told to file a claim for damages with the Risk Management Division, which he did. He was also told to provide two estimates, which he provided. After the estimates were submitted, he was told he was not eligible for compensation for the damages or the estimates he was told to solicit. He commented that in November, he was happy to see Proposition 1 on the ballot because it included words such as repair, maintain, extend and expand, however, in the City Source when they were thanked for supporting Proposition 1, he noticed the money borrowed through bonds would pay for capital improvement projects, primarily focusing on water distribution and the replacement and upgrade of existing water mains, which would not help his situation because his was a sewer water issue. He explained he had talked to various people in different departments and understood this was a backflow prevention issue, but that they could not do anything about it. He was told to contact a plumber and the plumber indicated it would cost \$6,500-\$7,000 to repair the problem. He noted it was repairable and a backflow valve could be put in. He questioned why this needed to be done by him because it was coming from the City sewer.

Mayor Hindman asked Mr. Thomas to e-mail the pictures he had to the Council or to the City Clerk for distribution to the Council.

Terry Woodruff – 2009 Roots ‘N Blues ‘N BBQ Festival.

Steve Sweitzer, 902 Wayne Road, stated he was a partner of Thumper Entertainment, the entity that owned the Roots ‘N Blues ‘N BBQ Festival, and that the continued mission of the Roots ‘N Blues ‘N BBQ Festival was to promote the shared experience of live music and encourage harmony among people from all walks of life. In 2007, this free festival was funded by Boone County National Bank and key local and regional sponsors. After the festival, an independent economic impact study was prepared, and the economic impact for Boone County in 2007 was estimated at nearly \$6 million. In 2008, Thumper Entertainment brought the free festival back with the help of sponsors and generous funding from the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the City of Columbia. The economic impact for Boone County in 2008 was estimated at nearly \$12 million. Other anecdotal results included attention for the Festival and Columbia, Missouri in the New York Times and other national media. National artists’ festival groups hailed the Festival as an artist show. In addition, BBQ competitors from all over the United States competed to be accepted into the competition. All of these tangible and intangible things helped put Columbia on the national entertainment map. He felt the Festival was instrumental in transforming Columbia, Missouri into a destination city, and therefore wanted it to live on in 2009. In order for Thumper Entertainment to bring the festival back, it would take more funds. Unfortunately, the Festival did not meet expenses in 2008 and Thumper Entertainment took a loss on the event. Since October 2008, they had been working to secure more regional and national sponsors for the 2009 event. Although it looked promising, he felt it was a tall order in a time when sponsors were cutting back or eliminating event sponsorships. He stated they were asking the City to allot additional funds to support the 2009 Festival, waive any outstanding invoices for City services rendered, consider allowing Thumper Entertainment to charge a modest admission price to attend a portion of the events within the footprint and allow an extension of the temporary open container permit to the Festival owners throughout the Festival footprint during hours of operation. He explained alcohol sales were a crucial revenue stream. A proposed map, along with copies of the economic impact studies, methodology and additional documents, had been provided to the Council prior to this meeting. He thanked the Council for consideration of these items and believed with their continued support, they could bring the event to life in 2009.

Mayor Hindman acknowledged the service of Mr. Janku as this would be his last meeting, and would complete his 18 years and six terms of the City Council. He stated it had been a pleasure to serve with Mr. Janku as he had admired what he had done, and felt the Second Ward had been very well represented. He noted 18 years came close to, if it was not, a record for service on the Council. He thanked Mr. Janku for his service to Columbia.

Mr. Janku thanked Mayor Hindman for his comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B77-09 Authorizing the acquisition of land for construction and operation of an historical museum and research facility.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this had become moot because this particular site was no longer needed, and staff was recommending withdrawal of this legislation.

Mayor Hindman made a motion to withdraw B77-09. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(A) Considering Addendum No. 1 to the 2004 Wastewater Systems Facilities Planning Report on Wastewater Collection and Treatment.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the 2004 Wastewater Systems Facilities Plan was the City's sewer master plan and was last updated in 2004. Staff was suggesting it be amended to include an amendment for the Clear Creek Pump Station and Force Main due to a need to provide additional hydraulic capacity. Council held a public hearing on this capital improvement in April 2008 and funds for the project, estimated at about \$4 million, were included in the last sewer ballot issue. This public hearing was a requirement of the State Revolving Loan Fund, which would help lower the cost of interest for this project.

Mr. Glascock pointed out the current Clear Creek Pump Station pumped into the Mill Creek drainage area, which was under capacity with the new development in the Gans Creek.

Ms. Hoppe noted page 8 of the Report referred to a letter from the Department of Natural Resources - Division of State Parks and asked if the letter had been received. Mr. Glascock replied he did not believe it had because it generally took 60-90 days to comment. Ms. Hoppe asked if that would cause a problem. Mr. Glascock replied it would not. Ms. Hoppe asked if it affected the State Park. Mr. Glascock replied he did not believe it would affect State Park because it was north of it. He explained they were trying to intercept anything that would come before the State Park.

Mr. Sturtz referred to the drawing on the overhead and understood the dotted line indicated the right-of-way, which was almost a three mile path from the pumping station. He commented that he did not have a good sense of where that went. In addition, he understood a 100 foot wide corridor would need to be cleared of vegetation, which was fairly significant, and asked why it was necessary to go that wide in order to put in a 20 inch pipe. Mr. Glascock replied he thought the clearing would be between 18-30 feet wide at the most. Mr. Sturtz commented that page 8 indicated the vegetation in the construction corridor would be removed, but the cleared width should be kept to less than 100 feet, and noted he might have misread it. He asked for clarification on the location of the corridor. Mr. Glascock replied it would run due north along the new South Hampton extension to AC, would go on to Green Meadows, cross north of the Wal-Mart at Grey Oak and go toward the creek in a northerly fashion. He noted some of this would be gravity.

Ms. Hoppe asked if it would go west of the tree line. Mr. Glascock replied yes and explained they were trying to stay out of the tree preservation area.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Watkins thought it was important to note that the alternative to doing this was to build an outfall sewer along Mill Creek, which would involve a very long-term developed area. They felt this was a lesser impact alternative than building the outfall sewer.

Ms. Hoppe stated she had provided a copy of the map to some residents who lived along the area at Seven Oaks and had not heard back from them, so she assumed it was not a problem.

Mr. Skala commented that Mr. Glascock' clarification of 18-30 feet made sense because it would minimize the impact to the land and the cost of the project. Mr. Glascock stated they did not want to clear anymore than was absolutely necessary.

Mr. Wade made a motion to direct staff to proceed with the proposed sewage improvement project as outlined in Amendment 1. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(B) Considering the Water and Light 2009 Renewable Energy Report.

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained the renewable energy mandate that was passed by the voters in 2004 required the City Water and Light Department to publicly release a report outlining compliance with the mandated ordinance each year, prior to February 1. This year's report provided details on the amount of 2008 renewable energy, a description of the projects and the 2009 portfolio forecast. In 2008, the City's renewable portfolio reached nearly two percent, and there would be a near five percent portfolio in 2009. As the ordinance provided, the Report was reviewed by the Water and Light Advisory Board and the Environment and Energy Commission in February, and he thought they had received some comments from the Commission. He noted the ordinance required the Council to hold a public hearing and vote to approve the report.

Mr. Kahler pointed out the Ameresco Landfill Gas project in Jefferson City actually went on-line late last week. It had been behind schedule, so it was good news that it was in operation.

Mr. Skala stated it was brought to his attention that they were doing a pilot project with wood fuel at the Municipal Power Plant and asked how that was going. Mr. Kahler replied it was working very well. They were mixing up to 20 percent fuel with wood from an oak barrel manufacturing facility. The actual cost per megawatt hour to burn the wood was less than the cost to burn the coal. He noted they were trying to get a more permanent permit to continue to burn "biomass" at the coal plant.

Mr. Sturtz stated the Report indicated 1.7 percent of the City's portfolio was through renewables as of last year and asked if it included the renewables that pre-dated 2008. Mr. Kahler replied it included some energy consumed by the City prior to 2008. They had come up short, and instead of meeting two percent with generating sources, they had only met 1.7 percent. The main reason was due to the cracked turbine blades being taken out of service for repair at the Bluegrass Ridge Wind Farm. Had that not occurred, they would have exceeded the two percent. They went back to 2007 and 2005 for some renewable energy that was banked during that time. They actually brought 3,572 megawatt hours into this year

in order to make the two percent. Mr. Sturtz asked what percent they were at in 2008 if they were to remove that number. Mr. Kahler replied 1.7 percent.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Elaine Blodgett, 3803 Woodrail on the Green, stated she was the President of the League of Women Voters of Columbia and Boone County and noted the League was a strong supporter of Columbia's renewable energy ordinance and efforts to develop and acquire renewable energy sources. Increased reliance on renewable sources for electricity would reduce Columbia's greenhouse gases as called for in the City's 2006 Climate Protection Agreement and move the community toward a more sustainable future. They commended the Water and Light staff for their comprehensive and detailed 2009 Renewable Energy Report, but had two issues of concern. Page 2 listed the average cost per megawatt hour of each renewable source, but the costs were not comparable. Certain costs were identified for some sources and not for others. They felt it was important to have the cost figures clarified, so they could be easily compared. She thought there was information on transmission, but not on the delivery of the wood chips, and wanted to know the real cost. In addition, they did not support the idea of counting renewable energy purchased prior to 2007 as credits to be used in meeting ordinance targets. The electricity bought before 2007 was distributed to customers at that time, and therefore, was not available as credits. In addition, the renewable energy credits were not listed in the appendix as an approved renewable energy source. They felt the use of the credits did not meet the original intent of the law. They understood the total percentage of renewable energy received by Columbia in 2008 was only 0.3 percent short of the two percent target and the City had contracts for wind and landfill gas, which were expected to deliver the required megawatts. They believed the landfill construction delays and turbine breakage were unfortunate, but beyond the control of the City's Water and Light Department. Based on past diligent efforts to secure renewable energy, they were confident the City would soon reach the mandated two percent target and would acquire sufficient renewable energy generation to meet or exceed the compliance target of five percent by December 31, 2012.

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

Ms. Hoppe commented that she believed it was good to receive a summary of what had been done and noted sometimes things outside of their control happened causing them not to get as much renewable. She pointed out they had also received a letter from the Environment and Energy Commission recommending they not allow prior year credits for renewable energy because it was not in the language or the intent of the renewable ordinance.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend the Report by deleting the paragraph on page 3 regarding credits and to accept the amended Report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Mr. Janku asked if they could take out the reference to credits, but leave the information in so it showed it was done in prior years. Mr. Wade agreed and noted it was a renewable energy report, which was more than just a report on how they were doing on their goals. He believed the prior renewable energy needed to be left in the report, but agreed the use of those credits should not be included in the 2008 total.

Ms. Hoppe amended her motion so the prior year information was left in the Report, but the credits were not included in the 2008 total.

The amended motion made by Ms. Hoppe to remove the prior year credits from the 2008 total, and to accept the amended Report was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman felt the Water and Light Department should be proud of what they had done to make this happen. It was unfortunate that things happened beyond their control, but if it were not for that, they would have made the goal, and he thought that was important.

OLD BUSINESS

B62-09 Voluntary annexation of property located southwest of State Route WW and Elk Park Drive; establishing permanent C-P, O-P and PUD-12 zoning; setting forth conditions for approval.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would approve the voluntary annexation of about 37.5 acres on Route WW, near the Elk's Club, and establish initial zoning as C-P, O-P and PUD-9. While the title showed PUD-12, there was an agreement at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to downgrade the density. He pointed out the Planning and Zoning Commission added an additional restriction having to do with convenience stores in the C-P area, and with that stipulation, they recommended approval. He noted this would normally be on the consent agenda per current policy, but the applicant had asked for it to be put on old business due to the convenient store issue. He pointed out the applicant could withdraw the request for annexation if the zoning was not satisfactory. He noted a letter from the County Commission had been provided to the Council with regard to a Commission order dealing with the development.

Mr. Teddy stated the Commission's recommendations were in favor of three zoning tracts of C-P, O-P and PUD-9. With the consent of the applicant to reduce the density, it would make a difference of about 72 units in the potential build out of the PUD. As Mr. Watkins indicated, the issue that led to this item being removed from consent was the applicant's desire to restore the convenience store with fuel sales as an eligible use on Tract 1, which would be zoned C-P. Staff did not recommend removal of that from the C-P district because they found it to be compliant with the neighborhood marketplace concept, which was one of the conditions cited for Tract 1. If they took the guideline from the Metro 2020 literally, it allowed for a convenience store/gas station as compatible in the neighborhood marketplace concept. The Commission was concerned with its proximity to Cedar Ridge Elementary School and the appropriateness of that use combination.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the school was consulted with regard to the traffic situation and having a convenience store/gas station next door. Mr. Teddy replied they had not heard from the Columbia Public Schools, but as an adjoining property owner, they had received notice.

Ms. Hoppe asked about the traffic implications. Mr. Teddy replied every commercial use had a unique pattern to some extent. If it was not allowed, there might be another retail use, such as a drugstore or restaurant, which would produce as many trips on a daily basis, but the turnover or pattern of traffic might differ in some regard. Generally speaking, the convenience store/gas station involved high turnover and would have a steady flow of traffic

throughout the day and certain peak periods during the week that were intense. He noted the tract was located at an arterial and collector street with a signal that was not yet actuated at Daniel Boone Drive and Highway WW, so it could be viewed as a corner lot on an arterial roadway, and the convenience store/gas station was considered a classic arterial use. There were also plans in the Major Roadway Plan to run an extension of Daniel Boone as a collector to the north. At some point in the future, if there was continued development north of WW, he thought it would become a four-way signalized intersection.

Ms. Hoppe understood traffic could be directed away from the school on the east. Mr. Teddy replied there could be access to Daniel Boone. The conceptual plan the applicant submitted showed a new north/south street that would originate in Tract 3 and come out to Highway WW on the west side, but there could be a restriction to access Daniel Boone, where it was opposite the Elk's Lodge and the other lots that were zoned CGP. MoDOT had stated in their comments that the road he previously spoke of would be right-in/right-out at WW because of its proximity to the signal and the general nature of traffic on WW.

Ms. Hoppe understood if a gas station/convenience store was allowed, it could be design so traffic was more toward the east and away from the school. Mr. Teddy thought the traffic impacts could be mitigated during the site plan review.

Mr. Skala asked if the future projection was dependent on development north of this site and if it was a potential connector to the St. Charles corridor or if it was this further west. Mr. Teddy asked if he was referring to the collector street. Mr. Skala replied he was referring to the one that was next to Tract 1. He wondered if a road was put in if it would be a potential connector. Mr. Teddy explained, as indicated on the Major Roadway Plan, it would not connect to St. Charles. It was shown running north and then east. He thought it could run both east and west. There was a collector shown out to El Chaparral. The concept was to bring traffic to and from Rolling Hills. It was a mid-point route between Richland Road to the north and WW, which diverged from Richland.

Mayor Hindman noted the letter from Commissioner Elkin indicated he would oppose any changes in the negotiated agreements and conditions that took place between the County, the developer and the El Chaparral Neighborhood Association. He asked about its status. Mr. Teddy replied that by the zoning, there was no proposed modification to the detention improvements that had been made. Testimony was heard from several residents that owned property on Pecos Court during the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Two had an intermittent stream that ran in their back and/or side yards and testified in favor of the detention continuing. There was nothing in the staff or Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation to contradict it, so the detention would remain as far as he could tell. There were plans for the developer or County to expand the culvert under Pecos Court, which was the object of several questions by Commissioners. It would increase the capacity for storm events to exit downstream. In addition, the detention calculations that had been done to date by the applicant indicated the post-development runoff rates would be less than or equal to the pre-development runoff rates because of the detention for all magnitudes of storm events.

Mayor Hindman understood this met the requirements Mr. Elkin was supporting. Mr. Teddy replied the zoning did not change any of those County conditions. He noted there

would be further review and analysis upon the submittal of the development plan because additional impervious would generate more need for detention and stormwater treatment. He thought there would be additional facilities elsewhere on the tracts. He stated there was not a recommendation from staff to contradict the stormwater improvements that had been put in place.

Mr. Janku asked about the condition involving connections at El Chaparral. Mr. Teddy replied a connection was available only south of this tract. Unless an existing improved lot was removed and replaced by a road, they could not see any way to get into El Chaparral along the entire residential perimeter of this proposed annexation. He referred to the drawing on the overhead and stated there was a dead end street out of El Chaparral to future phases of The Vineyards that would be a possible general interconnection between developments, but not directly with this particular development.

Mr. Janku understood the staff report indicated that although the City's Parks and Recreation Department did not view this as an appropriate site for a City park, staff felt there should be some sort of recreation provided as part of the PUD. He wondered if they could make that a condition of approval, even though it was not specified in the statement of intent. Mr. Boeckmann stated that involved the issue of rationale or relationships between what they were trying to exact from the developer and what the impact of the development would be. Mr. Janku noted the staff report indicated it would involve 288 units and there would be a need for recreation, so this sort of amenity would be appropriate. Mr. Boeckmann stated they could probably make that argument, but counterarguments could be made also.

Mayor Hindman asked if they were precluded from making it a condition for approval since it was not included in the statement of intent. Mr. Boeckmann replied not necessarily. Ms. Hoppe asked if they were weakened. Mr. Boeckmann replied yes.

Leilani Logan, 1546 S. Pecos, stated her property backed up to the east side of Tract 3 and the creek ran behind and along the side of her house. Since the detention pond had been put in, they had not had any major flooding of their backyard, but this had been a major problem prior to that time. They were requesting it stay in that condition for this purpose. She understood there was talk about a park possibly being located in a 3.64 acre green space and stated she did not believe it would be a good spot for a park because it ran along the creek, which had the potential for problems since children were drawn to water. In addition, they had initially discussed pod-style, upscale townhomes, which she felt was a good idea, but understood they were now talking about duplexes. They had duplexes on Santa Barbara and Santa Anna, which were not working out. The area was dirty and windows were falling out. She stated it was a mess. She did not think duplexes were a good idea. She preferred something that would bring people who were upscale and not transient.

Ms. Hoppe understood Mr. Logan believed the proposed park was too close to the stream due to flooding and asked how far, in terms of feet, she considered it to be a problem. Ms. Logan replied that if they received any significant rain, her yard and her neighbor's yard flooded up to the foundation. Ms. Hoppe asked how many feet it was from the stream. Ms. Logan replied she was not sure, but thought it might be 75 feet. She stated it was significant, but with the detention pond, they were not seeing as much flooding. She hoped when the property was developed, there would not be an increase in flooding.

Don Rippeto, 1524 S. Pecos, stated he was Ms. Logan's neighbor and wanted to clarify their objection to the park. He explained the 3.6 acres was a fairly narrow strip behind their houses. There was a good bank that was part of the detention pond, so the area was not wide enough to make a significant difference. In addition, the stream ran through that area as well. He was concerned with children playing around the stream because the creek rose very quickly when it rained. He stated he would not allow his children to play back there due to safety concerns.

Mr. Wade stated he was not comfortable with the requested zoning. He explained he had no problem with the convenience store/gas station because it was an appropriate business at that location. If they were going to have services to serve a neighborhood, he felt it was a main one. He noted he liked the idea of access from Daniel Boone Boulevard as opposed to WW. He understood Tract 2 was zoned O-P and the observation made was that it was transitional, but it looked like an office area in the middle of residential to him due to residential being on three sides. It was a transition from commercial, but it put planned office back off of the main highway and in the middle of residential, which did not seem to make sense. He thought it should also be residential. He pointed out he had a problem with the density on Tract 3 as well. He understood the tract to the south had a very high PUD and was not sure when it was approved. He commented that he might have even voted for it, and if he had, he was not sure why. He felt that in order to make the PUD-9 work, they would have to have multiple-unit dwellings, and even with good intentions, they would create the potential of a rental complex in the middle of single-family residential. He commented that he also believed the buffer zone on the west side was a poor location for a park. Access from El Chaparral would be difficult. He concurred with the people from El Chaparral and the developers regarding it. He thought the park should be on a major access road versus in the middle of nowhere. In addition, he believed that area had a different function, which needed to be left as it was.

Ms. Hoppe understood that although the PUD-12 had been reduced to a PUD-9, Mr. Wade thought it should be reduced further. Mr. Wade explained a PUD-9 would allow up to 216 units on about 20 acres after removing the buffer area, and there was a potential of that becoming a degrading rental complex in the middle of the area. He noted they had seen too much of that around town, and believed it was not a location due to the transportation system for high density. It was not at the intersection of major roads. It was in the middle of nowhere, and not a location for high density residential.

Mr. Janku commented that if it could be used for duplex development under the statement of intent, he would also have grave concerns with regard to the number of duplex units in an area of size. Mr. Wade explained with that kind of density, they could have duplexes, 4-plexes or 8-plexes. Mr. Janku felt the larger units might be better than duplexes. Mr. Wade commented that they had a chance for higher quality and stricter management with the larger units, but felt it was an area that needed a lower density. He thought it would be an ideal area for affordable housing, such as a substantial cottage development, but the City did not have models from which to do that. He reiterated he thought it would be very difficult to prevent it from becoming a rental complex.

Mayor Hindman stated he thought Mr. Wade made some interesting points about Tract 3, but believed the office zoning on Tract 2 was reasonable. If they decided to zone it all R-1, there would be an awful lot of residential without any kind of mixed use. He thought the office proposal for Tract 2 would work out well, and agreed Tract 3 was questionable being as far back as it was.

Mr. Skala agreed there were some compelling arguments with regard to Tract 3. In addition, he thought Mayor Hindman's argument in terms of mixed use was reasonable. He did not have any problem with Tract 1 or the convenience store, as long as it was projected to be on the west side. He commented that they tried to stay away from marketing considerations because they were not marketing experts, but they were overbuilt in many areas, and this area was ripe for residential over-development. He did not want to do something that might jeopardize this piece of property as it could be integrated within the neighborhoods. There was a likely possibility that even though it might not be a duplex development, it would be a denser development than they wanted to see in this area.

Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with Mayor Hindman in that the office zoning could fit in as a mixed use that served the neighborhood. In reading through the Planning and Zoning Commission minutes, she did not believe the adjacent neighbors were concerned about it. She thought Mr. Wade had good points with regard to Tract 3 and the need for a lower density. It also responded to the neighbors' concerns of how it would work within the residential area. If a park was needed, she agreed it would be good to keep it out of the buffer/tree zone because it served an important stormwater function. She did not think they wanted to counteract its uses. In addition, there was the safety issue with regard to children.

Ms. Nauser stated she did not believe Tract 3 was an appropriate place for a park. The neighbors wanted the buffer zone to be a buffer with trees and vegetation. She understood the concerns of Mr. Wade, but noted none of them could look into the future. She commented that they were trying to strike a balance between higher density and residential and did not want to continue sprawl into the County. In addition, they wanted density, but PUD's were one of the only ways to have density. Since it was lowered from a PUD-12 to a PUD-9, she stated she would be supportive of it. She stated she was also supportive of the convenience store on Tract 1 with access being primarily off of Daniel Boone Boulevard to keep the traffic away from the school. She noted she was inclined to vote in favor of the request of the applicant.

Mr. Sturtz agreed there was a trade-off between higher and lower density and Mr. Wade's point about where it was situated was compelling. He thought they would all agree they would be in favor of the higher density if it was near bigger roads and a little closer in. He noted he recently toured a duplex neighborhood just south of Rock Bridge High School and saw what could happen with the lack of maintenance. In addition, he had received a lot of reports about PUD's that had not been maintained very well, so he had some trepidation about being a part of a vote to accept one that might not be in the right spot where there was not a lot of good public transit. He commented that he did not have any bad feelings about the office area. He noted he lived on a street with a school at the end and it mixed quite well. He pointed out it was all in the design.

Ron Shy, an engineer with Allstate Consultants, asked the Council to keep in mind that there was a PUD-12 to the south and duplexes to the north zoned R-M. In addition, they had conceded to go to a PUD-9 at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. The letter of intent indicated it could be cottage homes, single-family attached or detached and no more than eight plexes. He noted it could be a combination of those or just one, but a plan had not been developed yet. He pointed out the 3.46 acres at the west end was rather sacred to them as well because they promised the neighbors five years ago the property would be zoned this way and the buffer would remain. He commented that they appreciated the fact the Council agreed with them with regard to a convenience store being appropriate at a signalized four-way intersection. He stated they would enhance that by keeping it on the east half of the tract, which would be further away from the school. He thought there was room for office development in a mixed use area, such as this, because there were a large number of single-family and multi-family residents that could be served by it. It was flanked on three sides by residential, but if they did the PUD-9 with duplexes, it would be multi-family on two sides with commercial on the other side.

Mr. Skala asked if there had been discussion of any contribution by the developer for off-site road infrastructure for some of the adjacent roads. Mr. Shy replied there had been, and explained the infrastructure at the signal was done by a development agreement. Mr. Skala understood that was part of the entire package. Mr. Shy stated that was correct. He explained it had already been completed by the developers as part of a three party improvement involving the County. Mr. Skala asked for the cost. Mr. Shy replied he did not know, but suspected it was about \$200,000.

Mr. Janku asked if he could respond to the concern that this would become another large rental duplex development under separate ownership. Mr. Shy replied the Council would see a plan and could act on it at that time. He stated he could not answer that question because they were too far off from a plan. Due to the demand for housing in Columbia, he thought it would be several years before it was developed to a large extent. He stated he was certain it would not all be duplexes. The idea of cottage homes had been mentioned several times, and they had attempted several layouts of those. It was an excellent way to find starter homes. He expected there would be a component of that in the PUD-9 portion.

Mayor Hindman explained the Council had approved some developments where they ended up with a sea of duplexes they wished were not there, so it made it hard to grant zoning where that was a possibility because although they had to approve the plan, the developer had made a huge step in being able to do what they wanted. It was not what they intended to do, but the possibility of what might happen that was bothering the Council. Mr. Shy stated he understood.

Mr. Wade stated he was comfortable with the discussion regarding the office, but was not comfortable with the high density on Tract 3. He noted they were trapped because there was one ordinance for three different zonings. He had to vote yes or no on them all.

Mayor Hindman asked how quickly the applicant could return with a revised version if the Council was to turn it down. He wondered if they would have to start from scratch. Mr. Boeckmann replied he thought they would, but was not sure of the time frame. He noted

there were situations in the past when the applicant did not have to start from scratch because the changes were not too big and the time between denial and reapplication was not too great, but he felt that as a judgment call. If the Council voted it down and the applicant came back a year from now, they would need to start over. If they came back at the next meeting, they could rely on the public hearing as long as the change was not too great. Mayor Hindman asked if it was acceptable if they continued this item so it could be modified. Mr. Boeckmann replied yes.

Mr. Wade stated he was amenable to a continuance. He explained he was not opposed to a higher density than R-1, but felt they were trapped because the City's zoning regulations that did not let them get to where they wanted. The City's zoning regulations led them to making decisions where the development ended up being a ghetto. The PUD-9, as a land use, had that characteristic. They had seen too many of them and it was not fair to the neighbors. They needed the higher density to have affordable housing in an area like this, but it was not built into the statement of intent. He would be willing to see if there was a way in which those issues could be resolved before they voted.

Mr. Shy suggested this proposal be tabled. He noted this was the proposal they had at the County, so they would have to consult with the neighbors regarding any changes to the letter of intent. He stated they would work with staff to define the letter of intent more clearly in order to satisfy Council's concerns.

Mr. Boeckmann suggested the Council pass the amendment sheet before tabling the item. He noted it merely changed the PUD zoning from 12 to 9 in the title. It was a mistake in the title as the actual text had 9.

Ms. Hoppe made the motion to amend B62-09 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade made the motion to table B62-09, as amended, to the May 4, 2009 Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B72-09 Authorizing an agreement with Sustainable Farms & Communities, Inc. for the long-term lease of city-owned property located on the west side of Clinkscates Road for the operation of a farmers' market.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained at the February 16, 2009 meeting, Council directed staff to bring back a lease agreement. The lease was similar to the lease proposed in 2002 with three exceptions. The term of lease was five years longer, so it was fifty years, the allocated time to raise funds for the development was increased to 48 months and the time frame for completion of the Phase 1 improvements had been increased to 72 months. He understood there was considerable interest on the part of the State to help fund some of these improvements as part of the stimulus package, and this would provide the necessary site control to make the project eligible.

Casey Corbin, 1024 Crestland Avenue, stated he was the Executive Director of Sustainable Farms & Communities, Inc. and on behalf of the Board of Directors, the Farmers Market, the many partners and the thousands of market goers, he thanked the Council and Parks and Recreation Department for their guidance in this effort. This lease, if approved, would represent the establishment of a secure and permanent home for the Columbia

Farmers Market, which had become an icon in the community. On Saturday, April 4, they had over 3,500 people, which was a record for this part of the season. This also established the critical step in the building the Columbia Farmers Market pavilion, which he believed represented a significant benefit to all of citizens of Columbia with regard to sustainability issues, health, nutrition and economic development.

Mayor Hindman commented that they had tried this before, but there appeared to be a substantial possibility for funding this time. He felt it would be a terrific benefit for Columbia and thought they should move forward. He pointed out Ron Shy's family had made the donation of property that was making this possible, and thanked him.

Mr. Skala commented he attended the Spring Fling put on by Sustainable Farms & Communities, Inc., and a speaker had provided some amazing statistics from Cedar Rapids, Iowa with regard to economic development. There was a return of \$14.60 for every \$1.00 invested in terms of leveraging local foods sources. He believed they had a tremendous opportunity to appreciate the local farmers, institutionalize this and reap tremendous benefits at the same time. He noted he was happy to support this issue.

Ms. Hoppe thanked Sustainable Farms & Communities, Inc. for their efforts during the last couple of years. She felt it was obvious the community was valuing it more. It was an old fashion marketplace of food and community interaction and ideas.

Mr. Janku stated this had been a long standing goal of the community and Councils over many years and believed this would be a great benefit to the community.

B72-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B73-09 Amending Chapter 12 of the City Code to establish a domestic partnership registry.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was an ordinance to establish a domestic partnership registry and resulted from a request of the City's Human Rights Commission.

Ms. Browning stated the Human Rights Commission unanimously approved this to move forward for Council consideration at their March 3, 2009 meeting. It would establish a domestic partnership registry similar to what was in Kansas City, Missouri. She noted there were a number of other communities around the Country with such a registry, and this one would be maintained by the Health Department.

Darryl Lanza, 514 W. Sexton Road, thanked the Council for considering the registry. He explained in 1996, his long term partner of about seven years developed non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and passed away. The day after he passed away, the realtor they had rented from told him he would have to move because his name was not on the lease. Fortunately, they had time to get their affairs in order because they knew he was sick, so he had durable power of attorney. The realtor was not aware of this and was only interested in getting him out of his home. He believed things like the domestic partnership registry would help people in similar situations. It would provide them some type of visibility in the community and establish a relationship in lieu of marriage. He reiterated that appreciated the Council's consideration of it.

Mike Garver, 1700 Forum Boulevard, Apt. 2605, stated about five years ago he became very sick and spent some time in the hospital, and after being discharged from the hospital, he went through several months of treatments and appointments to figure out what was going on with his body. His family lived eight hours away in Indiana and he could not imagine going through all of that by himself. He was reminded of all of this as his dad battled cancer. He felt there was a big difference between his dad's situation and his. When his dad was in the hospital, he was able to devote his time and energy into getting better. He did not have to worry about doing it all alone. He knew his family could come and go freely without any hassles or worry and that the family was there to make important decisions when he could not do it himself. On the other hand, he noted he was constantly afraid he would have to go through this alone because the hospital or clinic would not allow someone he had spent ten years of his life with into the room. He needed the love and support his dad was receiving back home in Indiana. He stated it was hard for him to focus on getting better and getting through another test because he was concerned someone would ask his partner to leave the room. His partner knew everything about him and his wishes if something more serious had happened, but those wishes might not have been honored. He believed everyone needed to have an advocate or voice in times of illness and that his situation could happen to anyone. It could have involved two elderly people who did not marry for fear of losing medical benefits, someone who chose not to marry or someone one loved but did not marry because the state did not allow it. By approving the domestic partnership registry in Columbia, they could eliminate some of the concerns and problems an individual might face. He hoped the Council would support the domestic partnership registry.

Wayland French, 114 Miramar Lane, stated his concern about this ordinance involved what he perceived as a lack of communication to the community. He was not aware this was even pending until he heard the news today. He noted this was the type of action that would give them national notoriety and one sided, as could be seen by the number of people present in favor of it. The people that had called him this afternoon were unaware that such an ordinance was being considered. He recommended the Council let the community make the decision on this. The majority of the people who would be opposed did not know this was happening, and he believed there could be a backlash of resentment. He recommended this be a City-wide vote, if possible, as opposed to something the Council did on its own.

Mayor Hindman stated he believed this had been fairly well covered and there had been a first reading at the last Council meeting. He understood some people just missed these things.

Erin Horth, 400 S. Ninth Street, Apt. 3A, stated she represented her interests and the interests of the Mizzou Triangle Coalition, as she was the Vice President. The Mizzou Triangle Coalition was Mizzou's LGBT activist group. She believed the registry, if passed, would bring rights to all of the members of the LGBT community and would enhance the diversity of the entire University community. If these benefits were not offered, staff and faculty that might be interested in coming to the University might decide to go somewhere else where more benefits would be offered to them. She did not think it was fair to the students that such qualified faculty would turn away because of something the City did not offer. She believed this was something the Council should consider.

Dan Viets, an attorney in private practice with offices at 15 N. Tenth Street, stated he was the President of the Mid-Missouri ACLU and was speaking on behalf of the ACLU in support of this ordinance. He believed it was entirely appropriate for the City to adopt an ordinance such as this and felt it was an important step in the direction of tolerance and the respect of human rights for all people. He believed Columbia should be a leader in this area and was pleased they were taking this action. He noted it was not a radical move since Kansas City and St. Louis had both adopted similar ordinances years ago, but felt they could still be proud of it. He hoped the Council would unanimously support the ordinance.

Nathan Gerth, 4000 Hyde Park, stated he had been in a loving same sex relationship for almost two years, but pointed out this would not only affect same sex couples but anyone in a loving relationship. He stated his parents, as landlords, had two very devoted tenants who happened to be a brother and sister and when their parents died, they took care of each other. They ran into difficulties with insurance and policies. He commented that he loved Columbia, Missouri and was proud of the fact the City protected sexual orientation in the work place. He commented that he had experienced discrimination in the work place and felt this would increase visibility, inclusiveness and acceptance.

Dick Blount, 1508 Chadwick Avenue, stated he had been a citizen of Columbia for eighteen years and was a retired United Methodist pastor with 50 years of ordained ministry. He commented that he felt very strongly about this matter and knew it was one of the most troublesome matters before the Council, although it was not as complex as they made it. He noted these people were hurting. He stated he had pastured partners of the same sex who were hurting and felt they were one of the last outstanding oppressed groups in the Country that had not been given what was their right. This was the Country of the free and of equal rights. He commented that when Jesus was a young man beginning his ministry, he said he had come to speak for the poor and so forth, but he had also come to release the oppressed. He stated he left a meeting at the church tonight to come here because he felt his ministry was here.

Mayor Hindman stated he believed this was the right and decent thing to do because it might be helpful. He noted it had no legal effect, but could influence some situations where the influence might be useful. It was also recognition by the Council, as they represented the community, that Columbia was an open, receptive and tolerant community. He thought that was important in terms of self-respect and the quality of life they wanted. It also had some economic development aspects, which had been mentioned, because the people they were trying to attract to the community would typically be interested in a diverse, tolerant community, and this helped make that statement. He stated he would vote in favor of it.

Mr. Skala commented that this decision was not troublesome for him and felt this was a way for the Council to lead by example. This was a public confirmation of someone's commitment to someone else. He stated there were a lot of problems in the world and Columbia, and they needed everyone to be a problem solver. He believed the best way to go about doing that was to restore some balance with fairness and equity. He noted he would vote to support it.

Mr. Sturtz stated it was a simple choice and a matter of justice for him. Having a sister who was a lesbian, he had been immersed in it for most of his life. He commented that this

was symbolic except for the use and access of City facilities, but believed it was important to afford the same protection, rights and dignity to same sex partnerships. He stated it was a pleasure to vote just a few days after their neighbors to the north did something more courageous.

Mr. Janku stated this was one of a number of steps Columbia had taken over the years in its progressive tradition. He noted it was not only publicized through normal City procedures, but there was also a front page story about the issue a couple of weeks ago, and he had received at least one comment indicating people who were not in support of it were aware of it.

Ms. Hoppe commented that when she was first approached by the people sponsoring this, it seemed very simple and natural. Since she had been on the Council, the City had extended staff benefits to domestic partners. She noted the ordinance did not impose any obligations on employers or businesses. It only made the registry available if they wanted to use it as a tool. She believed life was difficult enough without extra barriers to surmount. This only allowed people to live their lives. In addition, this applied to older citizens that might have problems if they were to get married. She stated she had no problem supporting it.

Mr. Wade stated it was very seldom a person had the opportunity to vote because something was morally the right thing to do. He felt this was a fundamental statement about human rights and dignity and noted he looked forward to voting yes.

Ms. Nausser stated she agreed no one should be kept from those they loved and this offered a tool for any individual to work through the hurdles of medical and other challenges of life. She did not see a downside to voting in favor of it.

B73-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B78-09 Amending Chapter 18 of the City Code to remove the chief of police from coverage under the Police Retirement Plan; amending Chapter 19 of the City Code to provide for City contributions on behalf of the chief of police to a deferred compensation plan.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins commented that as they discussed during the selection process for the chief of police, both of the finalists had indicated an interest in not being within the City's Police Retirement System. He noted they had some experience with a previous chief who had the same request. This would remove the chief from the retirement system and allow the City to contribute a lesser amount to his retirement system than it would cost as a member of the Police Retirement System.

Mr. Janku made the motion to amend B78-09 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B78-09, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B61-09 Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Heller Road, east of Ewing Industrial Park and west of Rogers Road; establishing permanent M-C and A-1 zoning.
- B63-09 Authorizing construction of the Cascades Pump Station Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B64-09 Authorizing acquisition of easements for the Sewer District No. 159 (South Route K) project.
- B65-09 Authorizing an agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for special event recycling containers; appropriating funds.
- B66-09 Accepting conveyances for sewer, drainage, utility and street purposes.
- B68-09 Authorizing the owners of Blue Acres Mobile Home Park to resell water service to tenants.
- B69-09 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B71-09 Authorizing the City Manager to execute a trail connector license agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Hinkson Creek Trail and Old 63 Pedway Project at State Route 740 (Stadium Boulevard).
- B74-09 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Safety Center to conduct DWI enforcement activities; appropriating funds.
- B75-09 Appropriating tax increment financing (TIF) application fees.
- B76-09 Appropriating funds for the Fire Station No. 9 Percent for Art Project.
- R68-09 Setting a public hearing: considering modifications to the water treatment process at the McBaine Water Treatment Plant.
- R69-09 Setting a public hearing: construction of exterior repairs to the J.W. "Blind" Boone Home.
- R70-09 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Summer Food Service Program for Children.
- R71-09 Authorizing an agreement with Services for Independent Living for personal care assistance services.
- R72-09 Authorizing an Adopt a Spot agreement with Belinda Karney.
- R73-09 Authorizing a field practice agreement with the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University to provide internship experience as it relates to water supply and wastewater treatment operations.
- R74-09 Authorizing an agreement with Allstate Consultants LLC for engineering services relating to the design and construction of the Upper Hinkson Creek Outfall Sewer Extension Phase I Project.
- R75-09 Authorizing a HOME agreement with Bethel Ridge II, L.P.
- R76-09 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Ewing Industrial Park Phase 3 located on the south side of Heller Road, east of Ewing Industrial Park and west of Rogers Road; setting forth conditions for approval; granting a variance to the Subdivision Regulations.

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

NEW BUSINESS

R77-09 Transferring funds to lease closed circuit television camera equipment for use in the downtown area.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins commented that one of his priorities for the year was to put money into the budget for video cameras for the downtown area, and Council had approved the funds as part of the budget. They had completed a one month trial period and were proposing to add other cameras. They liked this system because it was portable and could be easily moved if they saw a problem elsewhere because it was satellite linked. In addition, the company would provide a service. If they needed the film for a particular time or date, a law enforcement officer would not have to try to find it. The company indexed it and could provide it almost immediately. This would allow the transfer of funds so the City could lease four units for two years.

Chief Burton stated law enforcement appreciated any additional tool that could be made available for the investigation of crimes. He noted the deterrent factor could not be measured. When people of the criminal persuasion knew the cameras were there, it acted as a visible deterrent, and the Police Department would support anything that could be done to help them in that area.

Ms. Hoppe asked if this was a 360 degree picture and how wide of an area it would cover. Mr. St. Romaine replied the trial unit was a mini-mobile unit and had four cameras mounted on a telescopic pole, so it provided a good 360 degree view of the area. There was the ability to maneuver the camera through a pan/tilt zoom type operation. If it had a normal optical viewing, it could view at least a block or two, but it could also be zoomed to see a license plate very clearly a couple of blocks away. Ms. Hoppe asked if this would be used for probation violations. Mr. St. Romaine replied they did not have the resources to monitor them 24-7. If an incident occurred, they would request the images from the camera company.

Mr. Skala understood the deterrent factor could not be measured and noted that made him nervous. He asked if there were any results of the pilot study. He understood the Council had already okayed \$50,000 for the installation of the pilot unit and asked for the cost of the extra units. Mr. St. Romaine replied the trial period was provided as a result of the request for proposals. As part of the scope of services, they asked the companies they would evaluate to provide a unit for 30 days at no charge. There were two types of units. One was a mini-mobile unit and the other was a mobile unit, which was a little larger. If this legislation was approved tonight, they would negotiate based upon the \$50,000 Council approved as part of the budget. He thought they could provide four units for a two year period. He noted there had not been sufficient time during the 30 day demonstration period to evaluate any crimes or suspicious activities. It had been a demonstration and evaluation

of the unit's capabilities. Chief Barton commented that with regard to not knowing the deterrent factor, he provided the example of a police car driving down the road and a person inclined to commit a crime being deterred due to the visibility of the police vehicle. He thought the same principle applied here. He stated they needed to be aggressive with signage, so people understood the area was under video surveillance and a person who came into the area intending to commit a crime or seeking the opportunity to commit a crime would be deterred.

Mr. Skala asked if the unit had been accessed through the vendor for any particular incident that had occurred during its operation. Mr. St. Romaine replied the Police Department had a limited opportunity to use the cameras during the trial period, but felt the camera might have caught some valuable evidence for a certain number of criminal acts and were in the process of requesting some of that imagery. Thirty days did not provide sufficient time to evaluate that part of it. They were able to evaluate the fact the camera company was responsive in providing the imagery and it was of such a high quality that it would be able to help when circumstances existed for the need of the video.

Ms. Nauser understood the camera units had the ability to be moved to any area in the community, so it would not necessarily be focused on one area of the community. It could be moved where they were having trouble.

Mr. Skala asked if they could put up fake cameras in some locations to save money.

Mr. Wade noted the report indicated the Police Department would be discussing procedural and policy issues in the near future and was confident the cameras would improve the quality of life for the downtown community, assist in crime deterrence and help solve crimes, and asked what the unanswered policy issues were and if those should be addressed before the money was committed. Chief Burton replied the issues would primarily involve the circumstances and level of crimes for which they would seek the video. He believed there was an expense involved so they would need to be selective with their requests. He felt a serious crime would be more justified than a minor property crime. Mr. Wade asked why there would be an expense in getting the video since it was the City's video. Chief Burton replied he was referring to the time it would take to get the video off of the system because there would be a time factor for an officer to review the video footage to detect any evidence.

Mr. Wade commented that if they made the commitment to spend \$50,000 for two years, he asked when they would have data that would let the Council know whether it had improved the quality of life, helped deter crime and helped solve crimes. He wondered when they would know if they were getting a return on their investment. Chief Burton replied that was a tough question. They would need crimes to occur with the cameras assisting them in the apprehension of those offenders. They hoped the relatively small investment would result in the deterrence of crimes. He reiterated they could not measure what they would deter by having the cameras. He stated it would be difficult to quantify until they had a crime when the video was used to detect an offender.

Ms. Hoppe asked if they could compare the 30 day trial period with the 30 days prior to the trial period. Chief Burton replied they could make that comparison, but it might not give them any solid data because there could be other factors involved.

Mr. Wade understood the downtown community and business owners were supportive and asked for the reasons for their strong support. Mr. St. Romaine noted someone might speak to that matter when public comment was taken.

Dan Viets, 15 N. Tenth Street, stated he had been a resident and business person in downtown Columbia for most of the 40 years he had been in Columbia and felt this was a major step in establishing the kind of society that they did not want. He believed expanding the surveillance of everyone who was downtown on the theory they might catch some evil-doers or receive some evidence that might convict someone was an awfully flimsy excuse to turn downtown into a police state. He understood the fact they wanted to give law enforcement a tool and noted everyone wanted law enforcement to be effective, but there were some competing values to include the right of privacy. Although not explicit in the Constitution, every American believed they had some right to privacy and should be left alone if they were not doing something wrong. He commented that there was a big difference between private property owners, who chose to surveil their own property, and the government putting up cameras to surveil everyone in the center of the community. He noted there was no crisis or rash of new crime that was forcing them to take extreme measures. He asked where the evidence was indicating this would deter crime or help solve a crime. He presumed there were instances in other communities where a camera helped catch someone sometime, but did not believe it was not worth the trade-off. He pointed out violent crime was way down in this community even though the media was reluctant to acknowledge it, since it did not sell newspapers or draw viewers. He noted the fact there were fights at the bars downtown was nothing new and he did not believe it was any worse than it had ever been. There had always been graffiti as well. In addition, Chief Burton mentioned not using the cameras for low level property crimes and he thought of graffiti when he heard that. If they would not be using it to catch people spray painting the walls, he wondered what they expected to gain by using the cameras. He did not believe there had been a thorough discussion and debate of this idea in the community and suggested this matter be tabled until they had more empirical data regarding the usefulness of the cameras.

Matt Volkert stated he was a small business owner in The District and worked at the law firm of Van Matre, Harrison, Volkert and Hollis at 1103 E. Broadway and noted he was not in favor of the cameras being utilized in the downtown. He commented that it was not uncommon for him to work past midnight several times per month and past 9:00-10:00 p.m. frequently. He parked his car in a little lot in the back of the office, next to a dark alleyway, which he went out to in the middle of the night. He noted he had two small children he took out at night in the downtown as well. He understood some people's concerns about safety and possible deterrence, but he was against this proposal. He did not believe this would create a police state, but did believe it was another step toward the erosion of civil liberties. With regard to the discussion about being progressive, he did not believe they could be considered progressive if they spied on their own citizens. He did not believe having cameras installed was an appropriate way to try to deter crime. Thinking the installation of cameras would be okay was one small step toward bad government when looking at the history of governments. The effects on civil liberties would not happen tomorrow or even in a decade, but might happen when his children were grown. He suggested the Council look at

the last ten years to see what a touch of hysteria could do to roll back liberties. He felt tools like this would be abused, as people were corruptible. He felt the lack of any statistics was also telling. There was no way to determine what this would deter, and from a practical standpoint, he did not think it would deter. He did not believe it was worth it. He understood one of the stated reasons was cutting down on vandalism and graffiti, but from living in Chicago for three years, he learned vandals were as creative in finding a location for graffiti as they were in creating the graffiti. If they taped one alley, they would put the graffiti in another alley. He noted Wal-Mart had cameras every ten feet on their ceilings and it had not deterred shoplifters much. He felt this was particularly true with property crimes when people were often drunk or acting out because they were not thinking ahead. He did not think it would have the affect they wanted it to have. He noted they could just install signs indicating the area was being taped for the deterrent effect.

Dan Goldstein, 604 Redbud Lane, wondered who owned the video that was taken on the public street and what legal limitations were there for the vendor to use the video. He wondered if they could sell the video, post it on the web or use it for advertising purposes. He thought the policy issues when using a private vendor versus the City taking and owning the video was different. He asked if the City had any say over what the private vendor could do with the video. He thought the policies should be determined in advance.

Carrie Gartner, 11 S. Tenth, stated she was the Director of the Special Business District and the Central Columbia Association and noted that over the last year or so, there had been a sharp increase in the number of incidents involving graffiti, property crimes and late night bar fights in some areas of downtown. She explained that was the primary reason why security cameras were something the Board supported unanimously. She noted they already had some public and private security cameras in the downtown area. There were security cameras in some of the parking garages and some private businesses had them as well. She commented that they had seen some success with them. The parking garage cameras had led to the arrest of graffiti vandals and the Boone County National Bank security cameras led authorities to someone who had sprayed graffiti on a moving truck. This success was one reason they felt good about moving forward with this. She understood it was very hard to determine what might deter something. She noted they could paint traffic boxes, increase foot patrols, add cameras, paint over graffiti, etc., but they could not be sure of what exactly was the main deterrent. She thought it was a little bit of everything. She commented that Karis Community Church was doing another volunteer graffiti cleanup in a couple of weeks, and they would be cleaning one of the alleys that had a camera in it already. It would be a clean slate at that point, so she thought it would help determine if the camera was deterring graffiti. In terms of procedures, they were telling their members to file a police report as that would lead to pulling the tape. She believed one of the procedural questions still being discussed by the Police Department involved cases, such as a fender bender, where a person wanted the tape pulled to use with the insurance company. She noted two businesses had already filed police reports for graffiti incidents and they believe the perpetrators were likely caught on camera, so the Police Department was in the process of pulling those tapes.

Ms. Hoppe asked what the downtown association's intent was with regard to the number of cameras. Ms. Gartner replied they wanted as many as could be afforded and liked the idea they were mobile. The majority of members had asked when they could get one in their alley. The mobile cameras allowed them to cover a large area of hot spots and ensure everyone benefited from the cameras.

Mr. Sturtz noted Mr. Viets had mentioned the decline in violent crime, but anecdotally, he remembered a spate of muggings last year. He understood one was in the parking lot at First Christian Church and another was in the alley between Broadway and Cherry and asked if she had any statistics on what kind of muggings there had been and whether they were increasing or decreasing. Ms. Gartner replied she did not. She thought there had been a series of them about a year ago, but not a lot lately. As of late, there had been more property crimes and bar fights. Mr. Sturtz asked if there was anything to attribute the decline. Ms. Gartner replied she thought that could be better answered by the Police Department, but noted she was happy it had declined. She was, however, unhappy people were now spray painting the fronts of people's windows. They wanted a safe place for customers and visitors to come and thought this would help.

Robert Nix, 1503 Stone Street, stated he was baffled and amazed cameras taking pictures of the general population that had the assumed right of privacy via anonymity was even being considered. He believed two amendments to the Constitution were clearly being violated. He referred to Amendment No. 4, which involved the right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures not being violated, and no warrants being issued, but upon probable cause. The search of one's anonymity and the seizure of it by the video being stored were violations. He questioned whether there was probable cause because he happened to travel down Broadway or be at a business in town. He referred to Amendment No. 9, which involved the enumeration of the Constitution of certain rights not being construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people, and felt that was the right to privacy. He hoped the Council would reconsider this as there were other methods and ways to handle the potential crimes. He commented he had been mugged in Columbia within the last year, but did not want cameras taking pictures of anyone with their images being stored. He believed there were other ways they needed to approach the problems in the community and this was not it.

Mr. Janku asked if the issue of ownership and access was in the contract. Mr. St. Romaine replied because the company was under contract with the City, the ownership of video was with the City, so anyone requesting a section of the video would have to come to the City. It would then be requested through the contractor, who was an extension of the City. Mr. Janku understood the contractor would not have the opportunity to use it for whatever purpose without the City's permission. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe asked if there were provisions indicating the film would be destroyed within a certain period of time if the video was not requested. Mr. St. Romaine replied the DVR would have a certain storage capacity and depending upon the image rate used in storing the video, they could store 2-4 weeks before it would start overriding itself. If they wanted those images, they would have to request them before it started overriding itself.

Ms. Nauser asked if they had any cameras other than in the parking garages. Mr. St. Romaine replied there were some on the outside of this building in the rear and throughout the Grissum Building, which was a Public Works maintenance site. Mr. Skala asked if there were any cameras at the Municipal Court. Mr. St. Romaine replied there were cameras inside the City buildings. Ms. Hoppe asked how long those were kept. Mr. St. Romaine replied about 30 days.

Ms. Nauser asked if this would come back to the Council for renewal when the contract expired. Mr. St. Romaine replied he thought it would be a funding issue at that point in time. They thought they had enough money for four cameras for two years. He noted some extensions would be written into the agreement. He thought that would probably one year extensions for a maximum of five years. If the Council was satisfied with the operation and performance of the cameras after this two year period, he thought it would be discussed as part of the budgeting process.

Ms. Hoppe understood this would be used if a specific crime was reported. The City, however, would not be viewing it to see how many people were walking around with open containers in order to try to identify and charge them. Chief Burton stated they would wait for a specific complaint and use the video evidence to support the offense. They would not be looking for crimes unless they had a report of a crime.

Ms. Nauser asked if the Council would be seeing the policy developed by the Police Department. Chief Burton replied it would be a policy regarding how the video was requested and how they would handle the video within the Police Department. He thought they would be generic policies regarding their dealings with the vendor.

Mr. Skala stated he was uncomfortable with this idea. They did not know what the numbers were and did not have any data. He wanted to believe it had a deterrent effect, but thought a dummy camera or non-camera might have the same effect if someone thought they were being surveilled. He noted the vendors and store owners had the right to protect their property with their own cameras. He understood the SBD wanted as many cameras as could be afforded. This was a cost to all of the citizens and was not only a budget issue in two years. He felt it was a budget issue now. He stated he wanted to see some numbers to suggest this was an effective deterrent and tool for the Police Department in excess of the \$50,000 for this two year time frame. He reiterated he was uncomfortable with this idea until he had data to make a more informed decision. He felt it was an empty pilot study at this time and was not convinced of its effectiveness.

Mayor Hindman stated he was in favor of this. It was a situation where there were some excellent arguments against it, but there were also some good arguments in favor of it. The cameras would be taking pictures, but they would not be accessed unless there was a complaint. The storage issue would be taken care of since the DVR would be overridden. As a result, there were limits. He understood the concern of government and surveillance and knew it could be abused, but believed the expectation of privacy was significantly lower when someone was on a public sidewalk. In his opinion, the downtown suffered because people were hesitating to be on the downtown sidewalks under many circumstances and that was enough to persuade him to be in favor of cameras. He agreed there was a distinction between private property with cameras and the public sidewalk with the cameras. The

private property owners who were catering to the public recognized that people felt safer when in a place that was monitored. They knew there were graffiti and fights in the downtown, so people felt insecure in the downtown. Because the downtown involved a public sidewalk, it was not monitored the same way as private property, such as a Wal-Mart. He thought the stores in the downtown and the “would be” customers were entitled to have monitoring. He believed it would improve the enjoyment of the downtown for law abiding citizen. He commented that the statistical data would be hard to come by because it was difficult to show a crime that did not occur and the fact people were more comfortable. He felt this was the proper thing to do recognizing the arguments against it were excellent.

Mr. Janku commented that had pushed for security cameras in the garages and thought most people were accepting of it. This was a little different as some people might not be as concerned for their safety on the streets and sidewalks in the downtown. He suggested they ask for a report on the effectiveness of the cameras if they decided to move forward. If they were not accomplishing anything after a certain period of time, he would think they would not want to spend the money the next time this was discussed as part of the budget. He did not know how they could prove a negative of what did not occur, but thought they would want to know if it was effective. He thought they would want to know the locations of the cameras as well. If they were in places they all recognized had some degree of concern for safety, he thought it would be more acceptable. He recommended they focus on areas recognized by the public as having safety issues.

Ms. Nauser stated she concurred with Mr. Janku and asked if after the two year period, it could come to the Council for a vote versus being accepted through the appropriations process. This would allow them the opportunity for data to determine if they were beneficial. Mayor Hindman thought that could be included the resolution. Mr. Boeckmann explained the resolution before them was for a transfer of funds. It was under the capital part of the budget because the thought was that the City would purchase the cameras. They were now switching it to operating because they planned to rent the cameras. The Council did not vote to install the cameras, other than by appropriating the funds. He did not believe this was a good place to add that condition.

Mr. Watkins agreed they needed a track record and 30 days was not enough. The 30 day test was to see the technical capabilities. If they could not prove its usefulness inside of one year, he thought it might be time to reconsider. He noted he had no problem with coming back to Council after a certain time period in order for them to decide whether it worked or not.

Mr. Sturtz asked if the vendor would be amenable to compromise time periods for further evaluation, such as six months, before entering into a long term contract. Mr. St. Romaine replied he thought they would. He explained they had asked for various pricing options, to include a month to month lease, a one year and two year lease. The pricing between a one year contract and two year contract was about 20 percent, so the reason staff was suggesting the two year option was because they could get more cameras over a longer period. Mr. Watkins stated he would not recommend going with less than a one year because he thought they would want to see all of the seasons. He also thought it would take a while to learn how to use them most efficiently.

Mr. Wade commented that over the last 15 years in this Country, they had seen a major move in sacrificing individual freedom for the collective safety. He wondered where the line was in terms of quitting the move toward collective safety in favor of individual rights and freedoms. This was that type of issue on a very micro-level in Columbia, Missouri, and he was not sure where that line was and whether this would move that line. He felt there was a more fundamental question than whether it was effective or not. If the cameras did not work, it was an easy answer. If it did work, there was the question of liberty and freedom. He stated he had long been concerned about the increasing willingness to give freedoms for safety, but understood that as the population grew, they would have more and more of these kinds of issues.

Ms. Hoppe wondered if a policy could be written so the video was used only if a crime was reported. She wanted to ensure it was not used to monitor the general public for any kind of violation. She also wanted to ensure it could not be used by individual citizens, such as evidence for a divorce case. She wondered if there was a way to balance safety with individual freedom. Mr. Boeckmann pointed out this would be a record covered by the Sunshine Law. He noted it was being taken of people in public places, but the red light cameras involved the same circumstances and situations. He explained if someone wanted access to the photograph where someone ran a red light, he did not think they would be able to limit access. He agreed it was a privacy issue, but not a legal privacy issue. It was more of a philosophical privacy issue. If there was an automobile accident or a fist fight and someone wanted to sue, there was the possibly the video could be requested. Based upon the cameras the City did have, he did not recall ever having a Sunshine Law request, but noted it was a possibility.

Mr. Skala commented that despite the fact he offered some arguments against it, he believed they should have some data to determine its effectiveness. He also thought there should be some policy changes to provide safeguards. He stated, on principle, he was someone who would feel uncomfortable because the cameras were there and would vote against it. If it passed, however, he felt it was imperative that they deal with the data. In addition, he thought a one year period would be the minimum amount of time they would want to collect data to make an evaluation. He pointed out the problem with the data was how much it was worth and where to draw the line. He did not believe they should intrude to this degree because he felt there were other ways to deal with it.

Ms. Hoppe commented that it disturbed her that the range was two blocks worth of people because that was a larger range than a parking lot.

Ms. Nauser asked if it was imperative that the transfer of funds happen today. She wondered if they wanted to allow staff the opportunity to come back with some policies and guidelines. Mr. Watkins commented that if there was this much consternation and four votes against it, he did not want to go through the time and effort to do it. If this was approved, he thought the idea of a motion directing staff to do what they wanted staff to do would be more appropriate rather than now since it might not go forward.

The vote on R77-09 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN. VOTING NO: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA. Resolution declared defeated.

R78-09 Authorizing an intergovernmental agreement with the County of Boone relating to a program award of Justice Assistance Grant funding.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a procedural agreement with the County and the law required they split it between the City and County. In the past, it had been a 60-40 split, and they were proposing to do that again. They would come back to the Council with an appropriation ordinance that would show exactly what equipment would be purchased.

The vote on R78-09 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, STURTZ, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

B79-09 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to the definition of duplex and villa dwelling units.

B80-09 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to allowing funeral homes and mortuaries as a permitted or conditional use in zoning Districts O-1 and O-P.

B81-09 Approving the Final Plat of I-70 Eagle Stop Plat 1 located on the northeast corner of Providence Road and Texas Avenue; authorizing a performance contract.

B82-09 Vacating a water line easement located generally east of South Ninth Street and north of University Avenue.

B83-09 Authorizing construction of a new parking garage located on the south side of Walnut Street between Fifth Street and Sixth Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B84-09 Authorizing construction of sewers in Sewer District No. 159 (Route K); calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B85-09 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to special pickup fees of unlawfully placed material.

B86-09 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Clear Creek Pump Station Force Main improvement project.

B87-09 Appropriating funds for the purchase of five (5) transit buses.

B88-09 Appropriating funds for the purchase of a runway sweeper at Columbia Regional Airport.

B89-09 Appropriating sidewalk variance funds for landscaping as part of the Chapel Hill Road project and to offset expenditures for the use of tax bill funds for the construction of Chapel Hill Road.

B90-09 Appropriating funds for the Maguire Boulevard extension project.

B91-09 Authorizing modifications to the water treatment process at the McBaine Water Treatment Plant; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B92-09 Authorizing a supplemental agreement for highway/rail crossing improvements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation

Commission to upgrade the railroad active warning device at the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with Route B; appropriating funds.

- B93-09** **Appropriating funds for construction of the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) bridge over U.S. Highway 63.**
- B94-09** **Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.**
- B95-09** **Authorizing the construction of exterior repairs to the J.W. "Blind" Boone Home; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**
- B96-09** **Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia School District for a playground improvement project at Fairview Elementary School.**
- B97-09** **Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code as it relates to membership on the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission.**
- B98-09** **Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri and Boone Hospital Center relating to the Columbia Fire Department Advanced Life Support Program.**
- B99-09** **Accepting the FY 2008 Missouri State Homeland Security Grant; authorizing a grant agreement; appropriating funds.**
- B100-09** **Amending the FY 2009 Annual Budget and the Classification Plan and Pay Plan to establish the position of Deputy Police Chief and to upgrade the position of Assistant Fire Chief to Deputy Fire Chief.**
- B101-09** **Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to unclassified positions.**
- B102-09** **Accepting an Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Grant from the Missouri Department of Public Safety; appropriating funds.**
- B103-09** **Appropriating funds to be received from the Missouri Department of Transportation – Highway Safety Division for the purchase of radar guns for use in traffic enforcement activities.**
- B104-09** **Selecting an artist for the Fire Station No. 9 Percent for Art Project; authorizing a Percent for Art agreement with Glenn Williams.**

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

(A) Intra-departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Hindman noted this report was provided for informational purposes.

(B) 1510 I-70 Drive SW Sidewalk.

Mr. Janku commented that he appreciated the report, but wondered what an addition was as it was a substantial building. Mayor Hindman thought they had a rule that the addition had to be a certain portion of the building. Mr. Glascock explained the requirements did not apply to the construction of an accessory building, so the addition had to involve the main part of the building for it to apply.

(C) Potential Sewer District on Anderson Avenue.

Mr. Watkins explained staff was requesting Council direction to proceed.

Mr. Sturtz commented that he lived next door to the sinkhole caused by the failed pipe, so he would need to abstain. Upon his request, Mr. Janku made the motion that Mr. Sturtz

be allowed to abstain from voting on Report C. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to repair private common collector, and to proceed with the preliminary design to determine the feasibility and costs associated with a sewer district and submit a report to the City Council. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(D) Proposed East Campus Collection Route Change.

Mr. Watkins explained they had discussed the problem with the trash out early in the East Campus and Grasslands neighborhoods. Staff was suggesting a shift to the collection of both of those neighborhoods to Monday because they were seeing most of the trash being put out over the weekend. The advantage was that Wednesday was a heavy day and Monday was a light day, so they would be shifting the balance. They wanted Council's input prior to proceeding.

Mr. Wade stated it made sense to him, but he was not sure why staff needed the Council to concur as he felt it was an operations decision. Mr. Watkins agreed, but believed it was a significant operations change, so they wanted Council's thoughts before moving forward.

Ms. Hoppe thought it was good idea, but wondered if it should be on the agenda to provide the public an opportunity for input. She noted she ran the idea by the neighborhood presidents and various people, and although it was not unanimous, she was not sure anyone would object.

Mr. Janku suggested they start the new trash day in July or August when new people were moving in, if they decided to proceed, so the change was not in the middle of the lease.

Mayor Hindman agreed this came close to micromanaging. He felt changing a trash pickup route was an administrative action. If there were a lot of complaints, the Council could complain to the administration. Mr. Glascock pointed out the Council had asked for this report.

Mr. Skala noted the staff report indicated Sunday could be problematic with trash out early issues in East Campus and asked if there were a lot of violations on regular weekdays. Mr. Glascock replied most calls were due to trash sitting there during the week.

(E) Potential Sewer District of Westwood Addition.

Mr. Watkins noted this involved a petition for a sewer district. A motion would be required to proceed.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to proceed with the preliminary design to determine the feasibility and costs associated with the sewer district and to submit a report to the City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(F) Sanitary Sewer Districts.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a requested report and noted they had provided some additional information this morning with regard to the current districts.

(G) West Boulevard Classification.

Mr. Watkins commented that they had a request to look at changing West Boulevard from a minor arterial to a major collector and staff needed Council's guidance.

Mr. Wade explained he had asked for a staff report for the purposes of the City Council, but it ended up going to CATSO and was now back. He understood it was evaluated by the CATSO Technical Committee and discussed by the CATSO Coordinating Committee, and that neither group took a position on it because it was a Council issue. He stated he wanted two ordinances to be prepared to be dealt with as a Council. The recommendation of the staff report was that they gain more data, but he did not think that was necessary. He wanted one ordinance to change the designation from a minor arterial to a major collector and the other ordinance to restrict through truck traffic. He understood there were two definitions for truck traffic. The one used by Public Works in terms of standards did not meet the levels that created the problem. He thought the real definition was what it meant to have all of the trucks running down West Boulevard, which was a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to prepare one ordinance changing the designation of West Boulevard from a minor arterial to a major collector and another ordinance restricting through truck traffic. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade asked when they could expect the ordinances. Mr. Glascock replied the first meeting in May.

(H) Review Process of the 2009 International Codes.

Mr. Watkins explained this was done every three years and noted they had already begun some discussions between the Building Construction Codes Commission and others. A motion directing staff to begin was needed.

Mayor Hindman wanted to ensure they considered the code that provided for higher insulation. Mr. Wade stated they were the codes the International Code Council considered and did not include. He thought they needed to ensure that set was considered.

Mr. Janku understood they could hire consultants as part of the stimulus package and asked if they wanted to do that since the Code was an immense document. He was not sure the Public Works staff had the time to do that. Mr. Glascock pointed out the Public Works staff did not go through it. The Building Construction Codes Commission reviewed it. Mr. Janku noted they were the ones who were not that amenable to the concept before, so he wondered if they would take another document and thoroughly cross reference it. It would take a lot of time at a professional level.

Mayor Hindman agreed he thought there was money as part of the stimulus package for code review. Mr. Janku asked if that was something they could request. Ms. Hoppe understood they wanted to use some of the energy block grant for an expert to make recommendations regarding the green building code.

Mr. Janku thought they had some strict insulation standards in the codes in the past, but those were somehow removed.

Mr. Skala stated this would always be a controversial issue because of competing interests and thought it was a good idea.

Ms. Hertwig-Hopkins noted one of the eligible activities under the energy block grant was building codes and inspections. Mayor Hindman suggested that be included in the package of things they were seeking.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to proceed with the review of the 2009 International Code and the energy standard codes that were not included in the 2009 International Code. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(I) C.A.R.E. Program Recommendations.

Mr. Watkins explained the Council passed a motion requesting staff to come back information regarding the C.A.R.E. Program, to include where more money was needed if it was available, and how much money was in the Council contingency fund. The Parks and Recreation Department was recommending the money be put in the options program.

Mr. Hood stated staff had discussed what options would be available if there was additional funding, and they had worked with 30 youths during the year and were nearing the end of the funds that were set aside to support the options program, so that would be their first preference for additional money. If the additional money was given it would ensure they could continue the program through the end of the school year without touching the money set aside in reserve to run the summer program. He believed the options program had been very successful as evidenced by the report they provided. Of the 20 fully enrolled in the program, it appeared as though 17 would graduate with their class or receive their GED. The report also provided numbers indicating how they add youth to the summer program, and if the Council chose, they could also implement it. Of the \$15,000 they were suggesting might be added to the options program, any unspent funds would be added to the summer program.

Mayor Hindman understood they were having trouble finding employers. Mr. Hood replied it had been a little more difficult this year due to the economic conditions. A lot of employers had reduced staff and did not feel comfortable supervising youth with the amount of staff they had. He thought they would find placements for the 200 they were planning for, but pointed out it had been more difficult than normal.

Mr. Janku stated he concurred with the recommendation of authorizing the \$15,000 for the options program to make sure it could continue successfully without getting into the summer program budget. He noted this was one of the best programs the City offered and commended the employers who had participated in the program. He hoped more publicity would help with the employers and if they did receive more employers, he suggested staff come back to Council to see if additional money could be provided.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to draft legislation transferring \$15,000 from the Council discretionary fund to the C.A.R.E. budget for the options program. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(J) Status of Dedication Plaque for Albert-Oakland Swimming Pool.

Mr. Watkins explained Council had requested a status of the original plaque from the Albert-Oakland Swimming Pool. He understood it disappeared during the major renovation of the pool in 1998-1999. Staff was in the process of re-creating the exact plaque and expected it to be installed at the Albert-Oakland Swimming Pool for this summer's swim season.

(K) Potential Sewer District on Edgewood Avenue.

Mr. Watkins noted this was another private common collector sewer district.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to proceed with the preliminary design to determine the feasibility and costs associated with the sewer district and to submit a report to the City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(L) Draft Vision Implementation Plan.

Mr. Watkins explained that as part of the Vision document and the Visioning process, the City Manager was required to prepare a Draft Vision Implementation Plan, which was presented first for public comment and then to the Council. It was their intent to discuss the Vision Implementation Plan at the work session later in April, and to use it as a basis for budget discussions and to finalize priorities during the retreat. He noted they were provided a copy of the Plan by CD and it was also located on the City website for anyone who had an interest in it.

(M) Proposed Amendments to City Major Roadway Plan.

Mr. Teddy explained this was an overview of some recently completed hearings by the Planning and Zoning Commission with regard to proposed amendments to the City's Major Roadway Plan. The purpose of this was to consider whether certain recently added roadways to the CATSO Major Roadway Plan should be adopted as part of the City's comprehensive plan as it related to roadways. The Planning and Zoning Commission and staff held several hearings and worked for several months. They talked to various neighborhood and homeowner associations and individuals and their representatives, and obtained input from the Boone County Commission. In the southwest area, a little more than half of the roadways considered were recommended to be added to the City's Major Roadway Plan. He noted the Council had been provided an interim report in February, so a lot of the information might be familiar. They were now seeking information on how to proceed. One idea would be to bring the ones recommended for removal from the CATSO Plan to the Council as a public hearing with the understanding the proposal by the Planning and Zoning Commission was to not have these items placed on the City's Major Roadway Plan and to refer them back to CATSO to remove them. Then, those that were recommended could go forward in groups of smaller roadways organized by geographical area. They had the Route K sub-area and a south Scott Boulevard sub-area. They found with the nine Rangeline Corridor Major Roadway Plan amendments that it was cumbersome for the Council to have to jump from one end of the corridor to the other and discuss all of those in the context of one hearing. He thought 4-5 at a time would be more manageable.

Mr. Janku asked if they had a policy of notifying the affected neighborhood associations. Mr. Teddy replied it was discussed mid-stream when it became apparent they did not. When amending the CATSO Major Roadway Plan, they only did general notices. When these amendments were set up for consideration by the Planning and Zoning Commission, they did the general newspaper notice and the listserv notice for those that subscribed to the agendas by webmail, and sent letters to the City-recognized neighborhood associations, but they did not have policy for the organizations within the Boone County jurisdictional areas. Mr. Janku asked if the County recognized neighborhood associations. Mr. Teddy replied he did not think they did in the same way the City did. He explained it was their job as the CATSO staff to handle those things. They did not rely on the County to send out the notices. He pointed out the word did get out and they discussed how they might go forward in the future with a new policy at the CATSO Technical Committee meeting. He thought they would send notices to the neighborhood associations with County staff assistance. They might also link the County's Planning and Building webpage with the public hearing announcements, so they had that method of reaching constituents as well. He stated they recognized giving notice for these planned corridors was problematic, and explained the practical reason for not providing notice directly to property owners was because these were conceptual alignments, so they would have to do a wide radius to capture all of the possible affected properties. In addition, since the alignments could change when the project became a reality, there would be the phenomenon of spotty notice and some people being notified while others were not. The Technical Committee staff felt a good middle of the road strategy was to contact the neighborhood leadership and homeowner association leadership.

Mr. Skala thought the direction staff suggested to break them up into groups was reasonable. Mr. Watkins stated if that made sense that was what they would do.

(N) Street Closure Requests.

Mr. Watkins noted the City Manager's Office received four downtown requests that required Council approval. Those involved the Parks and Recreation Department for the Family Fun Fest events, the Columbia Public Schools for Partners in Education, Richard King for the Summerfest concerts and the YouZeum for the Street Fair/Birthday Party.

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

(O) Resolution Starting Comprehensive Plan Process.

Mr. Watkins explained one of the work items Council had given staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission jointly was to review the City's comprehensive plan, which was the Metro 2020. The Planning and Zoning Commission had prepared a resolution that outlined the process, and rather than putting it on the agenda, they were providing it as a report. The last time this was done, there were a lot of people that joined the process toward the end. He hoped the general process outlined by the Planning and Zoning Commission, particularly if they had a wide variety of stakeholders to participate, might provide a better and broader overview. He was not sure they wanted to adopt the exact process the Planning and Zoning Commission put together, and noted he had some concern with the Commission making the

appointments. He felt the Council should make the appointments. He thought the Planning and Zoning Commission could make recommendations as to the types of stakeholders they wanted, but that the Council should make the appointments. If the Council was pleased with what the Planning and Zoning Commission had proposed, staff would bring the resolution forward for Council review and adoption. Another alternative would be to work on it during a work session.

Mr. Skala understood this was an extension of the discussions they had at the Council retreat, and although the Metro 2020 Plan was part of this, there were actually three documents to be named as part of the comprehensive plan for the City, and one involved CATSO. Mr. Teddy explained the ordinance that approved the Metro 2020 Plan also named the Major Thoroughfare Plan, which was known as the Major Roadway Plan, as the two elements of the comprehensive plan. In looking at comprehensive plans around the Country, they were usually a little broader than just a land use document and a roadway document. He noted the City had numerous master plans and other types of documents that inform the comprehensive development planning process, so one idea was to compile all of those different elements into a one source document they would call the Interim Comprehensive Plan. If the Council officially kicked off this process, one of the first tasks would be to do a study and evaluation of the existing comprehensive plan.

Mr. Skala recalled they would eventually review the zoning and subdivision codes, and ultimately engage in the growth management planning effort as well. Mr. Teddy stated the Planning and Zoning Commission had asked that growth management planning references be included in this resolution, so it was understood it would be a focus of the effort to evaluate the existing plan and develop a new plan.

Mr. Wade asked if that planning process would run parallel to the other pieces of putting the comprehensive plan components together. Mr. Teddy replied the process of doing an evaluation would include bringing in the Vision Report recommendations, which would be cited in the resolution. He explained there were references to growth management planning in the Vision document, and that would be a guidance document for this effort. The step of evaluation and existing policy review would look at how the different goals, policies and planned elements performed against those goals that were expressed in the relevant parts of the Vision Report. An activity of the task force could be to educate the general public on these concepts of growth management planning.

(P) Columbia Vision Commission Reporting Format.

Mr. Watkins commented that as part of the Vision document, the oversight committee, which was the Columbia Vision Commission, was to provide the Council a reporting format.

Ms. Hopkins explained the Columbia Vision Commission had completed its initial reporting format, which was attached to the cover memo.

Mr. Wade made a motion to accept the report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Kurt Albert, 400 E. High Point Lane, provided a handout, and commented that at this time, the abuses of the past were obvious for all who had followed the Albert-Oakland Park issue and it was time to move forward. He suggested the Council pass a law to discourage such behavior in the future. If the people of Columbia were to benefit from self-government, he believed they should be able to depend on the correct actions of City employees. He asked the Council to consider an ordinance to help ensure the future and suggested adding a fourth item to Section 16-223 of the revised ordinances of the City of Columbia, which dealt with the misuse of official information. It would read “a public servant commits the crime of misuse of official information if he or she (a) knowingly makes false statements to the City Council; (b) delivers false documents to the City Council; or (c) delays more than sixty days a request by Council without providing a written explanation.” He stated that they had the right to expect honesty in the Council Chamber and this law would help protect the future needs of City Council members and Columbia citizens. He thanked the Council for their time, dedication and service.

Mayor Hindman explained he received a letter from Phil Peters, who was involved with the Early Childhood Summit. Last year, the City sponsored it to the extent of \$1,500 from the Council discretionary fund. This year the keynote speaker was Senator Bond, and the County would put some money toward it, but he was not sure how much. Mr. Peters was asking if the City would sponsor it again. Although he favored a sponsorship, he did not have a set amount and thought \$1,500 would be on the top side. He noted he thought the Early Childhood Summit was significant to Columbia. He asked if there was any interest in providing some funds.

Mr. Skala stated he was interested and would like to know how much they were wanting.

Mr. Janku asked for the date of the summit. Ms. Amin stated she thought it was May 27, 2009.

Mr. Watkins stated staff could contact Mr. Peters and draft a resolution not to exceed \$1,500, and the Council could make a decision when the resolution came forward. Mayor Hindman thought that was a good idea. He noted the City sponsored the event last year, so it was called the Mayor and City Council’s Early Childhood Summit. This year they were proposing to call it the City and County Early Childhood Summit.

Mayor Hindman commented that John Riddick found something that was part of the transportation bill that allowed employers to pay up to \$20 per month in cash to employees if they rode a bicycle on a daily basis. He had implemented it at his company. The employees received the money tax free if they met the requirements. He was proposing that the City do the same thing. He understood Mr. Riddick’s company contracted with the City to provide the cafeteria plan benefits, so they could do all of the accounting work without charging the City. It was called the ASI Flex Bicycle Commuting Program. He thought this was something the City should consider because there were obvious benefits. People who exercised were less likely to have claims for health issues. They worked better after having exercised. In addition, using a bicycle might be something lower paid employees would have to resort to,

and if they did they would receive some extra tax-free money. He did not think it would cost all that much because it could only be received if the employee commuted a substantial amount of time during the month.

Ms. Hoppe understood there was no distance requirement. Mayor Hindman stated it had to be by bicycle. A pedestrian did not count. He understood Mr. Riddick's company set it up so the employees rode at least half of the distance from where they lived. He noted that did not have to be the requirement though.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding the potential of providing payment to employees for commuting by bicycle, which was part of the transportation bill, as described by Mr. Riddick. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala stated one of his constituents was suggesting pink bags in addition to blue bags for the recyclables that could not be comingled. He explained this idea was based upon the City's inability to recycle certain plastics. He was not sure whether this was financially feasible and noted it did not have to be pink. He thought it might help in getting a broader recycling effort in terms of items they did not normally recycle.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to provide a report with recommendations for broadening the City's recycling efforts. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala stated he was intrigued by Mr. Albert's suggestion to add a fourth paragraph to Section 16-223, which dealt with the misuse of official information. The other three paragraphs had to do with a pecuniary advantage, but the suggestion of Mr. Albert had to do with making false statements, so he was not sure it should necessarily be the purview of just making false statements to the Council. He thought it might be legitimate for the Council in making false statements to anyone else. He wanted staff to look into the idea of misusing information and knowingly falsifying information. He commented that they talked a lot in government about transparency, openness and accountability.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to provide a report considering some of the language suggested by Mr. Albert as a fourth item to Section 16-223, which dealt with the misuse of official information. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala commented that the "Nation's Cities," which was the newsletter from the National League of Cities, recently had a headline that stated "one hundred mayors join national challenge to improve child and family well-being," and he thought it was a good idea. He noted the challenge called on mayors to set specific, measurable, locally defined goals and targets in each of four areas to ensure every child had opportunities to learn and grow, a safe neighborhood to call home, a healthy lifestyle and environment and a financially fit family in which to thrive. It indicated that the mayor had committed to collaborating with the school district, the county, state and community partners in identifying effective strategies and interventions. He pointed out it involved a lot of stuff they had been talking about for some time.

Mr. Sturtz stated he had read the same article and was struck similarly. Those principles were a great unifying way to decide whether the City was moving in the right direction.

Mr. Skala made a motion for Mayor Hindman to review the mayors' action challenge for children and families through the National League of Cities to determine if he might be interested in participating as there might be support on the Council to assist him. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sturtz and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Wade stated he had previously announced he would hold a Ward 4 forum on the budget on April 9, 2009. That was postponed and the meeting was now scheduled for April 16, 2009 from 6:30-9:00 p.m. at Fairview School. Anyone was welcome to attend, but it was a Fourth Ward forum and discussion would be limited to Fourth Ward constituents.

Mr. Wade stated a constituent noted the sign for Rothwell Drive off of West Broadway was set far from the road. It was a major entrance into Rothwell Heights and the residents were having difficulty giving instructions to people who were not familiar with the area as to where to turn. His constituent suggested putting a sign on the right hand side of Broadway that pointed toward the road. He asked staff to evaluate it to determine if it would be a relatively inexpensive and easy way to ensure people were able to find that road.

Ms. Nauser wondered if it would be worthwhile to have staff prepare a report addressing the concerns of the Council with regard to the downtown cameras. She noted if they did not appropriate the funds, they could also come up with other ways to use that money, such as short-term loans for the public to purchase their own security cameras.

Ms. Nauser commented that in the March 27, 2009 current events, staff had provided preliminary research on graffiti and asked for guidance from the Council. She did not think they needed a stakeholder group. She felt it was something the Council could deal with on its own. She suggested staff move forward. She noted she liked what she saw in the Washington, D.C. ordinance, except that she wanted to see a 48 hour turnaround time instead of a 24 hour turnaround time, and a mechanism to allow property owners to apply for an extension. She stated they had talked about the City purchasing some graffiti removal kits to provide at cost to property owners. In addition, she thought this would need a public awareness campaign. She believed if staff would prepare something along those lines, they could discuss it as a work session. She provided a copy of her recommendations.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to prepare a draft ordinance similar to the Washington, D.C. ordinance with the modifications described her recommendations, and to schedule it for discussion at a work session after the ordinance was drafted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser commented that with regard to youth and crime, she and Commissioner Karen Miller would like to develop a consequences manual, which was a way to inform youth of the legal consequences of their actions. She wanted staff to pull together a task force with the individuals staff and Commissioner Miller agreed would be appropriate to address the issue. She had a copy of a sample consequence manual from Miami/Dade County along

with newspaper articles on some of the important issues affecting kids today. She asked that she be able to present here vision for the document when the task force was implemented, but felt this was something the legal departments and law enforcement would need to deal with. She provided a copy of the items she described.

Mr. Skala asked if there should be an interim step so the entire Council could look at this. Ms. Nauser pointed out it was a legal document and explained what happened to people in the court system. It was an informational piece that told kids that this was what would happen if they were arrested. Mr. Skala thought Ms. Nauser could give a presentation to the Council. Ms. Nauser stated she would after the manual was done because she only had the Miami/Dade County laws. She did not have the Missouri laws.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to pull together a task force with individuals the staff and Commissioner Miller agree would be appropriate to develop a consequences manual for Columbia/Boone County. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser stated she had noticed the after hour issues in the downtown area and would probably bring those at the next Council meeting.

Ms. Hoppe noted Moon Valley dam was no longer in existence and the stream was being restored. She had talked with the property owner at 801 Bucks Run, which was at the end of Bucks Run and on the lake when it was there, and understood there was a storm drain on the road that dumped into the lake. This worked when there was a lake, but it was now dumping water into the back of his house. It was just stagnant water, so he was concerned about mosquitoes and West Nile. She asked staff to talk to the property owner to see what could be done.

Ms. Hoppe understood Columbia was ranked fifth in the Forbes best places for businesses and careers and on the best small cities for start-ups in the Business Week, and noted they must be doing something right. She commended everyone to include the City and community.

Ms. Hoppe pointed out violent crime had gone down in 2008 and property crime was going down in 2009. She thought it was important for the people to know this as it seemed as though there was a lot of misinformation.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there was also some misinformation regarding the cost of the 25 mph neighborhood pilot program. The Shepherd Boulevard area involved four 25 mph signs. She was not sure if they took down any 30 mph signs, but noted they would be reused, so it involved a very minimal cost. The large figures did not apply to this program. If the pilot program was successful, the Council could vote to do it in other neighborhoods, but it would not be universally applied.

Mr. Sturtz noted they had heard disturbing testimony from the gentleman in the 200 block of West Sexton with regard to sewer backup and 18 inches of water in the basement.

He suggested staff determine if the problem extended past this property and to the entire block, and if so, whether CDBG funds could be used for to update the sewer.

Mr. Sturtz made a motion directing staff to determine if the sewer back up and water in the basement issue applied to the entire 200 block of West Sexton Road, and if it did, to determine if CDBG funds could be used to update the sewer. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Sturtz commented that he had received a few reports from people in the Ridgeway neighborhood about unimproved alleys between Grand and Garth, south of Forest. He understood they had received conflicting information from staff as to whether they were private or public alleys. They were between Forest and Fourth and Fourth and Third. He thought it would be good to get the correct information regarding it.

Mr. Sturtz commended the Council for taking a step towards going paperless. He understood a good percentage of the Council had gone without the big thick packets.

Mr. Sturtz stated he wanted to pay a tribute to Mr. Janku, who had been on his left for the last year and had been a very helpful mentor. He thought he might be the longest serving Council Person in the history of the City. He thanked him for guiding him over the last year.

Mr. Janku thanked Mr. Sturtz and Mayor Hindman for their comments. He appreciated his constituents for the opportunity to serve and his family for their support and inspiration. He noted he would make more remarks at the swearing in ceremony.

Mr. Janku commented that with regard to being paperless, he thought they would be able to access the agenda through the internet using WiFi because he had not realized they had not gotten WiFi in the Chambers yet. He hoped that when the new Council Chambers were operational an outside contractor could provide the service as was done at the Airport since there were security issues with accessing our system. It would make the Chamber more accessible for public meetings as well.

Mr. Janku understood a number of semi-trucks, over the road trucks, trailers and cabs parked on Smiley Lane near the western boundary of the park over the weekend. They were at the back of people's homes and were not appreciated. He did not think it should be permitted as it was a no parking zone.

Mr. Janku noted there was a gap in the sidewalk on Brown School Road. He understood that per the development agreement, the City would build the sidewalk because the developer was paying for the road. Adjacent to where the Mosers was going in, there was a gap between the sidewalk and 763. He thought it might not have been done since 763 was being reconstructed. He wanted to ensure it was filled in, but noted he was not sure if it should be part of the 763 project or if it was the City's responsibility.

Mr. Janku stated he received a very intense phone call from a constituent about the COLT crossing, and even though he explained how it would be corrected, the caller felt something should be done in the interim. He suggested speed limit changes. Since they

would probably have speed limit changes with construction, he asked if they could approach MoDOT to get the speed limit reduced earlier.

Mr. Janku commented that Mr. Wade had mentioned the fact it could cost more money if they wanted the package that included the City channel due to the cable channel changes, so he wondered if they had approached Dish Network or other satellite providers to find out if they would carry the City channel and other public stations. He noted there was a story in the Wall Street Journal about Verizon developing its own local channel because they realized people wanted that as part of their package. He thought that was ironic since the cable company here fought the City when they wanted to develop the local channel.

Mr. Janku stated the funeral home zoning issue was on the agenda for next Council meeting, and when they had the two rezonings before the Council, both funeral homes indicated a willingness to down-zone if it did not impact their current rights and if it did not cost them anything due to the concerns of the neighbors.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to provide a report on the same agenda explaining the process for the down-zoning assuming the ordinance passed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku commented that he and Mayor Hindman were strong supporters of community foundations and noted the Council had voted in favor of it as part of the budget. He noted that there was a story in the Springfield paper about their efforts to support the arts with a community foundation. They had come up with an arts sustainability director funded through the community foundation due to their funding issues. There was also an article in the Kansas City paper about a community foundation helping to fund life sciences work. He hoped they would continue to pursue the community foundation for Columbia.

Mr. Janku stated the National League of Cities had a story about cities saving residents money with the NLC prescription discount plan where they used local pharmacies.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding whether Columbia should participate in the NLC prescription discount plan. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 11:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk