

**MINUTES**  
**CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI**  
**SEPTEMBER 8, 2009**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 8, 2009, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER and HOPPE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 17, 2009 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nausser.

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

Mayor Hindman noted staff was requesting two items be added to the agenda. Mr. Skala made a motion to add Report N to the Reports section of the agenda and R220-09 to the Consent Agenda, and to approve the agenda with those two additions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- B245-09     Adopting the FY 2010 Budget for the Special Business District.**
- B246-09     Adopting the FY 2010 Budget.**
- B259-09     Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code to increase Public Health and Human Services Department fees.**
- B260-09     Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code relating to Parks and Recreation fees.**
- B261-09     Amending Chapter 20 of the City Code to increase Planning Department processing fees.**
- B262-09     Amending Chapters 13 and 22 of the City Code to increase sewage service utility rates.**
- B263-09     Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to increase commercial service solid waste utility rates.**
- B264-09     Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to increase wastewater connection fees.**
- B265-09     Amending Chapter 26 of the City Code to increase the development charge for new construction.**
- B266-09     Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code to increase electric rates.**
- B267-09     Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code to increase water rates.**

B245-09 and B246-09 were given third reading and B259-09, B260-09, B261-09, B262-09, B263-09, B264-09, B265-09, B266-09 and B267-09 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted they had introduced a series of budget amendments to make the public aware of possible changes to the budget. Ms. Fleming described the items on the amendment sheet and noted the net effect of these changes were minimal. She pointed out the Council needed to provide direction regarding CDBG funding. Mr. Watkins explained he believed the main issue was whether Council wanted to make a two-year commitment of \$100,000 per year to First Chance for Children for the Heibel-March building renovations.

Mr. Sturtz stated his understanding was that the request by First Chance for Children was for \$50,000 per year for two years for a total of \$100,000. Mr. Watkins stated it could be a potential of \$100,000 this year instead of \$50,000 per year for two years. Once that decision was made, he felt the other CDBG funding issues could be resolved.

Ms. Fleming noted they had asked for and received input with regard to the allocation of the Council Reserve fund. She listed the ideas that were provided and stated that if they carried forward unspent 2009 funds, \$125,000 would be available. She understood Mr. Skala was suggesting potential cuts in department budgets and pointed out taking money from the parking or electric utilities for the general fund might be problematic and cause issues with the Charter.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Mark Thomas, 4402 Celebrant Court, stated he was the Chair of the Human Rights Commission and asked Council to review the amount of funding for Human Rights enhancement programs in the FY 2010 budget. They were currently set to receive \$2,500, which was a severe cut, since they had received \$5,400 the past two years. He asked the Council to review the situation since there was no Public School funding for human rights or multicultural education and because the Human Rights Commission had filled that role in the community.

Mr. Wade asked how the money had been used in the past. Mr. Thomas replied in the past couple of years, they had funded the Amnesty International Club at Hickman High School and the Celebrate the Dream program, which involved job shadowing African-American role models, at Parkade Elementary School. They also provided funds to Services for Independent Living for some of their enhancement programs. He noted they had not spent the entire \$5,400 in the past two years, but had anticipated spending \$3,200 this year.

Dick Parker, 215 W. Sexton Road, provided a handout and explained he would be speaking to the capital purchase of the third generator at the Columbia Energy Center in contrast to the Wartsila generator. The CEC 3 was a larger generator at a cheaper price, but the Wartsila generator used 48 percent less energy. Burns and McDonnell had shown the Wartsila generator at half the size of the CEC 3, while still generating 72 percent more electricity through 2027. In addition, they had used the highest of four natural gas prices in the Integrated Resources Plan and the lowest projected gas price in the CEC 3 offer analysis. He did not feel the Federal Energy Information Association had a good record of making accurate forecasts, and all four of those forecasts had come from them in the last 21 months. He pointed out the City would save money with the Wartsila at three of the forecasted prices and would only save money with the Columbia Energy Center at the lowest projection.

Brad Frazier, President of the Columbia Professional Firefighters, stated he had been asked by the firefighters he represented and their families to comment on the proposed

personnel cost reductions. They accepted the premise that a reduction in personnel costs was necessary and believed the City Manager and City leaders were working hard to make decisions they felt were in the best interest of the City and its workforce. While these efforts were appreciated, they disagreed with the recommendations for these personnel cost reductions. The savings proposed were subject to many variables, such as weather, irregular operations and attendance patterns, and could directly impact the amount of money saved. The proposal of the Columbia Professional Firefighters offered specific savings and was not vulnerable to unforeseen circumstances. They felt City's proposal would affect the workforce disproportionately, leaving certain work groups to shoulder the burden of cost reductions while others would be unaffected. The proposal endorsed by the Columbia Professional Firefighters would distribute cost reductions evenly among every City employee with an average impact equivalent to one hour of salary per paycheck per employee. He commented that everyone was concerned for the workers at the lower end of the pay scale, but the City's proposal would take overtime dollars away from lower paid employees. He provided the names of two people who would lose almost 3 percent of their annual salary instead of 1.2 percent. They agreed the current economic condition was temporary, but understood the City was proposing permanent cuts, while their proposal was temporary and equitable. Approximately 60-70 people stood during this presentation.

Fred Eaton stated he was the spokesperson of the Water and Light Association and noted he represented the 60-70 people who stood during his presentation. He commented that he was speaking in regard to the personnel cost reductions proposed in the 2010 budget. While there was validity to the City Manager's statement of the proposed reductions having the least effect on those in the lowest pay ranges, there would be approximately 400 employees who could lose over the 1.2 percent and some of those people were in the lower pay grades. He commented that employees earning a six figure salary would not be affected by the current proposal, and that was the essence of their disagreement with the current proposed plan. He felt it was discriminatory that all employees were not expected to carry the same burden. In addition, overtime was a variable, which could not be accurately calculated. It was dependent on uncontrollable factors such as weather and equipment failure, and employees would readjust their schedules to get the half-time they stood to lose. He also felt these benefits had been negotiated in good faith in the past as part of the meet and confer process to likely ensure employee response times during emergencies and believed the employees had probably given up something to obtain these benefits. As a result, he did not think those should be randomly removed from the benefit package. He commented that Water and Light employees rarely worked overtime on their own terms. They worked weekends, holidays and in the middle of the night. Communication networks, internet providers and telecom companies only allowed work to be done during a maintenance window, which was typically from 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. An employee could come to work at 8:00 a.m. and still be working at 6:00 a.m. the following morning, and if the employee went home, they would have to take time off, which would mean a reduction in pay under the City Manager's proposal. They felt this was counterproductive and could present customer service issues. Overtime was worked in emergency circumstances and weather extremes, and the current proposal would affect dedicated employees who would work in all

conditions. It would not affect employees who never had to work on a holiday or in the middle of the night. He stated they understood the perils of the budget and were willing to support a reduction in personnel costs, but they felt it should be done fairly with all parties sharing equally in the burden.

Paul Prendergast stated he was the field representative for the Laborers' Local 773 out of Marion, Illinois and his unit represented 264 City workers of which many were the lowest paid. They were united with the firefighters and other labor representatives and urged the Council to consider the counterproposal provided. There were fewer variables with a 1.2 percent across the board pay decrease. In addition, he felt everyone should do their part with the City facing this financial crisis. He commented that the lowest paid City workers would be disproportionately affected by the overtime pay change. In addition, there were many on the top end of the pay scale that were not overtime eligible and would, therefore, not be affected. He felt the across the board pay would show they were all in this together. Approximately 5 people stood during this presentation.

Patty Forister, 3806 Zebra Drive, stated she was representing the Central Missouri Humane Society (CMHS) and asked those in support of the CHMS to stand. Approximately 40 people stood. CMHS was asking the Council for funding for its municipal shelter services. In 2008, CMHS received 3,064 animals directly from Columbia residents and did not receive funding through the Animal Control contract for those animals. The funds provided would be used to shelter and care for those animals. They were not requesting funding to support mission-based activities, such as intakes from other counties or State agencies. CMHS held 12 contracts with other counties, earned income through services and received donations for those purposes. In the last two years, CMHS had addressed many of the concerns of the Council, to include working with SCORE to analyze shelter operations and to address funding concerns. The root cause of their financial issues was the fact they took in more animals than they could afford and residents of Columbia contributed 45.8 percent toward their animal intake numbers. CMHS was also working with business students at University of Missouri to do benchmarking studies and found they were atypical in regard to staffing levels, resource allocation and breadth of services. She noted CMHS had provided the City of Columbia with three years of financial documentation and had added two ex-officio Board of Director positions for both a City and County representative. Those seats were still available although no one had attended the meetings. CMHS was also neutering animals through its veterinary services program to reduce the number of animal intakes and its veterinarians had fixed over 4,000 animals last year. This was their most expensive program as they spent over \$200,000 every year to support the effort. She explained CMHS was only seeking fair compensation for the services it provided.

Mr. Wade understood CHMS received revenues from fees from successful adoptions, the contract with the City, donations, and intakes. Ms. Forister explained there was a \$20 intake fee, but if someone refused to pay the fee, they were given an envelope and asked to donate in the future to help support their intake services.

Mr. Wade understood CHMS had contracts with 12 counties and the Missouri Department of Agriculture. Ms. Forister replied they did not have a contract with the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Wade asked if they received funds when they took in animals

from them. Ms. Forister replied they did not and noted the cost of care for those animals was being subsidized. Last year, they received 250 puppy-mill animals and did a special mailing to raise \$15,000 in donations for their care. She noted the CMHS voluntarily took those animals. They were not obligated to take them. They only took them when they felt they could. Mr. Wade asked how they justified taking those animals when they had a deficit. Ms. Forister replied their policy was to not turn any animal away, regardless of whether or not it was an animal from Columbia.

Mr. Wade asked what the “per animal” reimbursement fee was in the contractual agreements with the 12 communities. Ms. Forister replied \$20 per animal. Mr. Wade understood the average cost of care per animal was \$60-\$86. Ms. Forister stated the average cost of a stray animal was \$86 from intake to disposition regardless of whether it was euthanized or adopted.

Mr. Wade commented that based upon those numbers, it appeared as though the people of Columbia and Boone County were subsidizing the costs of animals elsewhere through the fee system and through private donations. Ms. Forister stated they received donations from everywhere, but Columbia was one of the better donor areas. Mr. Wade asked for the percentage of donations from Columbia and Boone County. Ms. Forister replied she did not know as they had not done that study.

Mr. Wade understood the citizens of Columbia and Boone County were providing the bulk of support for quality animal care and helping to eliminate the overpopulation of animals as they were subsidizing 40 percent of the intake costs for the State of Missouri and the 12 surrounding counties. He had a problem justifying taxpayer money for the subsidization of other entities. Ms. Forister stated the CMHS was spending \$200,000 to care for animals brought to them at the counter from the citizens of Columbia and noted those animals could be re-routed through Animal Control, if needed. She felt they were saving Animal Control a trip and it was costing them \$200,000. She pointed out almost 90 percent of their budget was from donations, so donors were supporting it regardless of geographic location.

Mr. Wade understood they had 6,697 animals in 2008, and 3,064 were from Columbia, 855 were from Boone County and 2,778 were from outside of Boone County. It was almost a \$200,000 subsidy for non-Boone County animals. Ms. Forister explained they did not need to spend taxpayer money on those activities as they were fundraising and earning money on their own to subsidize them.

Mr. Wade commented that the budget issue did not appear to be a Columbia/Boone County service issue, but a decision on whether or not to support non-Boone County animals.

Mr. Thornhill asked why the intake fee was \$20 for out of county animals. Ms. Forister replied the intake fee was \$20 for every animal. She noted CMHS was the largest open door shelter between St. Louis and Kansas City. In addition, the Fulton shelter, oftentimes, sent people to Columbia. Mr. Thornhill asked if they had considered raising the fee to an amount closer to the cost incurred per animal. Ms. Forister replied that because CMHS had an open door mission, they did not turn any animals away, so if a person refused to pay, they still took the animal for fear it might be dumped in the City of Columbia. They were averaging \$7 per animal overall instead of \$20.

Mr. Skala believed spaying and neutering animals was the answer to the problem and asked if funds could be tied to spaying and neutering services if the City decided to provide funding. Ms. Forister stated they were in favor of spaying and neutering, and could reallocate existing money for those services to other needs.

Ms. Nauser pointed out the City was paying for its services and the FY 2010 budget showed over \$111,000 for kennel and other services contracted with the CMHS. She noted she personally donated a significant amount of money to the CMHS, but had difficulty in justifying the notion that citizens of Columbia and Boone County should pay a disproportionate amount to continue the operations of a non-profit organization. No other non-profit agency, such as the Food Bank, was receiving \$79,000 in additional funding this year. She did not believe the citizens of Columbia should subsidize the costs of animal care for other communities. If the City was paying \$86, other communities should be expected to pay the same fee. Although she would support some additional funding, she stated she would not support increased funding of \$79,000.

Mr. Forister stated she felt the CMHS was saving the City money by operating a municipal animal shelter. They received money through an Animal Control contract for kennel space, the voucher program, office rental and the animals cared for through Animal Control. The additional funds being requested would be for animals that were brought in by people, and not the animals handled through Animal Control.

Mr. Wade noted that the contract also included the ACFA license fee for CMHS and over \$18,000 for the sterilization voucher program. He asked if that would increase or decrease. Ms. Forister replied the costs analysis indicated they had been under-allotting dollars for kennel space, so there would be a small reduction in the voucher program. Mr. Wade understood the City also paid the cost for the Bordetella vaccination program for all animals. Ms. Forister stated the Animal Control department paid for it when the animal came through them and the CMHS paid for all others.

Ms. Hoppe asked if they had requested additional funding from the other 12 counties for this purpose. Ms. Forister replied they had not approached them about municipal shelter services. The next highest community in volume was Fulton with 350 animals, so the funding they would be asking for from Fulton would be a minute amount. She commented that it was their goal to grow the contract, if they planned to continue to use CMHS services and this would be discussed as part of their strategic planning process. She feared they would have to change their mission and no longer take a number of animals without additional funding. She noted they were asking for a small fraction of an increase with regard to animals coming from within the community.

Mr. Wade commented that a \$30 intake fee per animal would balance the budget. Ms. Forister agreed if might if the people paid it. She noted not everyone paid the fee to include citizens of Columbia and County people. Mr. Wade asked who the contracts were with. Ms. Forister replied she did not have the list, but would be happy to provide it.

Chris Koukola, 603 South Cedar Lake Drive, stated she was a member of the Board of Directors at the CMHS and noted Council's concerns were being taken seriously. The Board was committed to the animals they sheltered, but also believed they were a business operation and needed to abide by the best business practices while being excellent stewards

of the public and private monies received. Steps had been taken to balance the budget. Hours at the shelter had been cut back, positions were being left unfilled and employee benefits had been cut in order to balance the budget while they continued caring for the animals. CMHS was not looking to the City to solve their problems, but as a long standing partner, they were asking the City to work with them to seek a solution. They had a strategic plan and the Board was discussing its mission and how it could remain a viable business while still performing the function of a humane organization in the community.

Libby Burks and Amanda Huhman stated they were speaking on behalf of the animals at the CMHS as they were both volunteers at CMHS and led the Zootoo campaign. They were amazed at how the community stepped up in support of the Zootoo campaign and many changes would soon take place at the shelter thanks to Zootoo and the community. The winnings, however, did not go toward the daily cost of running the shelter, which included veterinarian services, supplies, staff and educating and offering low cost spay and neutering services. They pointed out the animals at the shelter did not ask to be abandoned, unvaccinated, sick or unsprayed, and if everyone were a responsible pet owner, they would not be there tonight. They asked the Council to find extra funding for this important need.

Mike Willingham stated he was a 25-year employee of the Water and Light Department and would speak on the proposed changes to the FLSA overtime in the 2010 budget. One of the challenges of his job was to staff his operation with the proper personnel for 24 hours, seven days a week, and they had a certain number of employees that were trained in positions they needed to have there at all times. He noted they were the first to receive calls for outages and main breaks and monitored the transmission distribution system. Overtime was a great enticement in staffing positions and calling in personnel to respond to these situations. He asked the Council to not change the overtime standard.

Shirley Carden, 1830 Cliff Drive, stated she was a City employee and was in full support of the City Manager's proposed FY 2010 budget with regard to the personnel cuts. It had been the City's policy to pay overtime in a 40 hour work week whether or not the employee actually worked 40 hours. With this policy, an employee could take several hours of paid holiday, vacation or sick leave in a week and still receive overtime pay if the hours totaled over 40 for that pay period. In these economic times, she did not feel the City should continue this policy. She believed the City should follow federal guidelines with regard to overtime pay. The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) stated non-exempt employees who worked more than 40 hours in the work week had to receive at least time and one half their regular rate of pay for the overtime hours. FLSA was part of the New Deal that was passed in 1938 to address long hours and starvation wages, and the argument being made today was far from the spirit of the law that President Roosevelt worked so hard to pass in 1938. If the Council decided to amend the City Manager's proposed budget by using the suggested 1.5 percent across the board pay cut, she noted she would be disappointed. She believed they would be looking at budget cuts through 2012 and did not want to see it start with wage cuts this year. In addition, they would be falling behind due to the cost of living increases. She asked Council to pass the City Manager's proposed budget.

There being no further comment, Mayor Hindman continued the public hearing to the September 21, 2009 Council meeting.

**(A) Construction of a Bicycle Boulevard on Ash Street and Windsor Street between Tenth Street and Ann Street.**

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this project would be funded with non-motorized transportation funds, if the Council agreed to proceed with it. It would include the elimination of left turns to and from College Avenue, on both Windsor and Ash, and would add a pedestrian safety island in the middle of College at the intersection.

Mr. Glascock described the project using the overhead and explained the reason for trying a bike boulevard was to gather data to see what might or might not work.

Mr. Skala understood this was a pilot project. Mr. Glascock stated it was and noted it was a way to give preference to bicyclists. He commented that MoDOT was in favor of doing something at the intersection as well and if this worked, they would try it in other places along residential areas and College.

Ms. Hoppe understood there would still be two-way traffic. Mr. Glascock replied there would be two-way traffic on Windsor and Ash.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the Stephens College Elementary School had been contacted and if they were supportive. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know. He understood the focus had been on the people along Windsor Street as they were impacted the most.

Mr. Sturtz stated they had received a few letters from people representing the Elementary School and was confused as to why they were saying the entrance was on Walnut. He thought it was on Windsor. He understood the concern was that it would increase traffic on Walnut. Mr. Glascock noted it could increase traffic there because southbound traffic could turn on Walnut or the street before Windsor.

Mr. Sturtz commented that there was a fair amount of interest in the second project being proposed that would run from Alexander to Aldeah to Edgewood, and asked when it might begin. Mr. Glascock replied it would depend on the amount of money left and if it could be done.

Mr. Wade asked what was meant by the term “bike boulevard”. Mr. Glascock replied it was an area where bicycles and vehicles interacted without preferential bike lanes. Mayor Hindman explained it was an area cars were less likely to use on a routine basis due to the way it was set up with no left turns being allowed. Mr. Glascock stated it was an area that gave preferential treatment to bicycle traffic.

Mr. Wade asked for the anticipated level of bicycle use. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know. He explained data would be gathered before and after the project started to determine if there was an increase in bike traffic or a decrease in accidents at College and Windsor or Ash.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Robert Boxley, 208 N. Williams, believed a survey should have been conducted on bicycle usage before this idea was proposed. He stated he had lived on Williams for 44 years and bike traffic on Windsor did not exist. Williams Street, however, had a lot of bike traffic. He noted the hill on College near Windsor made it a very dangerous intersection and

there was recently a bicycle/vehicle accident in the area. He wondered what the City intended to accomplish with this project.

John Schultz, 1301 W. Colchester, noted one of his sons attended the Stephens multi-age classroom on the northwest corner of Walnut and Melbourne and the other attended the pre-school at the southeast corner of Windsor and Melbourne. He did not believe the City had communicated with Stephens with regard to this project. The multi-age classroom had 38 children and the pre-school had about 50 kids in the half-day and full-day classes. In addition, the Stephens dorms had a parking lot on Melbourne across from the pre-school. He commented that he was not opposed to the bike boulevard, but thought there was a problem with the elimination of left turns off of College and onto Windsor because it was a good way to route traffic to the school. If this changed, someone coming from the north, going south on College would have to turn left on Paris where there was no green arrow, and go down Hinkson and Melbourne and cross over the bike boulevard or go to Walnut, which also had no left turn, and turn left on Ripley, which was a narrow street with parking on both sides. He thought eliminating the left turn lanes would funnel traffic to the smaller residential side streets and asked for the safety element to be designed in a manner that would allow left turns on to Windsor. He did not have a problem with the left turn off Windsor onto College being eliminated because it was a dangerous intersection due to the hill.

Mr. Skala understood he was agreeable to the application of the bicycle boulevard. He only had a problem with the left turn restriction for automobiles. Mr. Schultz stated his concern was the elimination of the left turn from College on to Windsor.

Kurt Albert, 400 High Point Lane, stated his greatest concern was that they were funneling bicycle traffic onto a portion of College where the traffic could not see them. He noted a friend of his had been hit and hospitalized for a month. He suggested an alternative that would be a slight deviation from the proposed project. The sidewalk on the east and west sides of College by the dorms could be widened to about eight feet and the crossing and barriers could be placed at the top of the hill where everyone could see everything. The curb on the south side by the dorms could be cut, so bicycle traffic could come up over it and cross at the safest point.

Peter Bartok, 911 Park Avenue, stated he objected to losing the left turn. He had several properties in this area and turned left from Windsor on to College every day. Ripley was essentially a parking lot for Stephens with a narrow lane to navigate through and Melbourne was useless. There were minimal traffic ways in the area, and if the traffic way on Windsor was taken away, it would be difficult for him to access and service the properties in this area. He did not want to stop progress, but suggested they leave the left turn from Windsor on to College.

Ms. Hoppe understood he could use Walnut. Mr. Bartok stated he could, but he would still have problems. He wondered how he would get from Windsor to Hubbell or some of the other smaller side streets.

Patrice Albert, 400 High Point Lane, understood Mr. Glascock had indicated the parking could be moved to the north side of Windsor and noted parking had always only been on the north side. No parking was allowed on the south side. She believed there was ample

space for bicycles as it was now and agreed the intersection where they were planning for bicycles to cross was dangerous.

Kip Kendrick, 1601 Windsor, stated it would be inconvenient for him if the left turn was eliminated, but it was an inconvenience he wanted to see in a pilot project. It would be a disruption for the neighborhood, but it had benefits as well, to include the elimination of some through traffic on Windsor. In order to get the support of the Benton-Stephens neighborhood, he believed it needed to be viewed as temporary or a pilot project, and that the neighborhood needed to be involved in the process when determining if the project remained. He agreed with Mr. Albert in that the crossing on College Street was dangerous and the option of widening the sidewalk on the east side of Stephens College should be looked at to make sure people were crossing at the top of the hill where everyone could see and cross safely.

Mr. Skala asked if any other options, such as shifting the crossover on College, installing temporary barriers for a bike path or the possibility of widening the sidewalk, had been discussed at the interested parties meetings. Mr. Kendrick replied they were discussed at the working group meeting on July 16, but they had not met since then, so he did not know if those would be worked into the project.

Mr. Sturtz asked if there had been discussions with Stephens College regarding the project and the widening of the sidewalk on the east side of College. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure if Stephens had been contacted.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated he took the easier routes when riding his bike, so he would cross at Walnut and go up the side street where all of the cars were parked to get to Windsor. This issue had been discussed at the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission meeting and he had stated he did not feel this was a good intersection for bicycles to cross. Others believed that if there were barricades and fewer lanes to cross, it might be safer. He, however, felt the safest solution was to use the light at Walnut or move the crossing to the top of the hill as a previous speaker had suggested.

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

Ms. Hoppe stated the hill south of Windsor was short and steep and was dangerous for those taking a left. She suggested they have staff review the intersection for possible options based on the comments received.

Mr. Skala noted the bicycle boulevard would attract more bike traffic so they needed to ensure it was in the right place. They did not want to invite these people to a dangerous situation. He was uncomfortable with the interface of the bike boulevard with College. He liked the fact this was a pilot project, but wanted to make sure they had a discussion regarding public safety prior to implementing it.

Ms. Nauser wondered why the safety issue was being brought up now. She thought road improvements were needed prior to any bicycle improvements being made. In addition, she felt the community might be done with bicycle experiments for now. She suggested they resolve some of the underlying issues first. She stated she was not inclined to support this project today, but would be supportive of looking at the intersection to improve safety for current pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Mr. Thornhill suggested they identify an area known for heavier bike traffic for a potential bike boulevard versus the proposed area.

Mr. Sturtz stated they had a safety issue that had been overlooked as it was difficult for anyone to get across College. He felt safety islands on any four lane road should be looked into so people could safely cross. He also believed it would be better for traffic flow and the prevention of accidents if more left turns were removed. He noted Mr. Albert's idea was intriguing and with Stephens College's support, they could make the crossing more feasible. He pointed out he was concerned with calling it a bike boulevard as they might be inviting a lot of accidents and suggested they table the issue until they had more staff input.

Mr. Wade stated he felt this was the wrong project at the wrong place and time. The goal of GetAbout Columbia was a mode change in transportation, and the bike boulevard was a concept for a city that was further down the road in making that mode change. He felt they needed to get what they were already doing working and working better. He believed the project was a distraction as opposed to progress and had little value toward non-motorized goals.

Mr. Sturtz asked if he would be in favor of the elimination of left turns and creation of a safety island on College without it a bike boulevard. Mr. Wade replied that making College safer was a worthy but separate issue.

Ms. Hoppe stated she felt this was an appropriate spot for a bike boulevard in terms of the design and narrowness of the road. She understood the goal was to shift bikes off of Walnut since it was a narrow and busy street.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to table Agenda Item A to the October 5, 2009 Council meeting so staff could review the intersection at College and Windsor due to the safety concerns and the alternate suggestions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Wade stated he believed the GetAbout staff should focus their attention on getting its current projects working and was not interested in tabling this project.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not believe it was too early for the bicycle boulevard concept, but agreed this might not be the best location. He thought the safety issues needed to be clarified.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Skala was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Wade and Ms. Nauser voting no.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **B250-09 Rezoning property located on the east side of Forum Boulevard, north of West Old Plank Road, from R-1 to PUD 3.5; approving the Rocky Creek PUD Development Plan.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted the Planning and Zoning Commission had voted 4-4 on this issue, so there was no official recommendation.

Mr. Teddy stated this would allow three units at most on less than an acre of land. The request was for rezoning and a PUD plan approval. He described the location of project using the overhead.

David Cowan, 571 W. Hickam Drive, described where he resided on the overhead and indicated it was in the Old Plank Road subdivision with approximately 25 houses on about 40 acres. The Rocky Creek PUD would create three more houses beyond his back yard and he

felt that would be crowded and clustered. Although the lot was almost an acre, it was long and thin and would be difficult to build on. He did not think it was appropriate to use a PUD to allow more people in a part of the City that was already crowded. Old Plank Road did not have any sidewalks or shoulders, but had heavy traffic and was dark and twisty. He noted they were seven miles from downtown and thought there were other places closer to the center of the City for this type of development where trees and green space would not be eliminated. He asked the Council to not rezone the property as he did not believe this was an appropriate use for a PUD.

Tim Crockett, an engineer was Crockett Engineering Consultants at 2608 N. Stadium, explained this project started out being a PUD 4.5 and was denied by the Planning and Zoning Commission due to drainage and zoning concerns. The density was reduced from 4 units to 3 units and the drainage situation was revisited with City staff confirming this would not impact the current situation. He noted the site could currently be developed with two single-family homes, and possibly three, without the rezoning. The PUD allowed for a shared driveway to reduce impervious surface and create a better development. The overall density was a third of an acre per house and was consistent with the area across Old Plank Road.

Mr. Skala understood there was not a difference in density with R-1 or the PUD, and asked if the stormwater situation had been improved by reducing the density from four units to three. Mr. Crockett replied it improved it slightly. Mr. Skala understood the advantage of the PUD had to do with the flexibility of situating the dwellings. Mr. Crockett stated the PUD was needed so they could have one common drive and common areas for the association to handle and maintain.

Mr. Sturtz asked for the width of the shared driveway. Mr. Crockett replied 24 feet.

Mayor Hindman asked if there would be any sidewalk or pedestrian facilities. Mr. Crockett replied the sidewalks would be along Forum Boulevard. There was nothing internal to the development and they felt the driveway itself could address any vehicular or pedestrian traffic.

Mayor Hindman stated there was a lot of parking. Mr. Crockett explained each unit would have a two-car garage and immediately in front of each garage were another two spots, so each unit essentially had four spaces. He noted most single-family homes with a two car garage had four spaces.

Mayor Hindman noted a concern was that this would be student housing. Mr. Crockett replied he understood from his client that they would be single-family homes. If they wanted student housing, they would have created something that would be cheaper to build.

Ms. Hoppe understood two and possibly three units could be placed on the lot if it remained R-1 even with the unusual configuration and setback requirements. Mr. Crockett stated that was correct. It would only require more driveways on to Forum and more impervious surface if they were to do it under R-1 zoning. Mr. Teddy noted that due to the shape of the lot, they would need to get a variance and re-subdivide the lot into three lots since R-1 did not allow multiple residences on one lot. A tier lot would be required where there would be long lot stems to the farthest house from the street and the midway point into the parcel. There would also be a direct drive access.

Ms. Hoppe asked if there would be more impervious surface under R-1 zoning. Mr. Teddy replied there could be because there would be more driveways, although the driveways would likely be narrower. It depended upon how the driveways were configured. R-1 did not prescribe a minimum open space ratio, but the proposed statement of intent associated with the PUD indicated an open space ratio of about 65 percent.

Mr. Sturtz asked if driveways were generally 8-10 feet wide. Mr. Teddy replied he thought nine feet was the standard. The Fire Department preferred a wider driveway for longer driveways so they could get the equipment back there if the distance was beyond the reach of the road. Mr. Crockett noted most driveways were the width of the garage itself. In this case, they would be 20-22 feet wide. If they were set back off of the road, they could be narrowed, and typically they were 14-16 feet when narrower.

Mr. Thornhill asked if there was a natural tree line or if he would consider some type of evergreen tree screening. Mr. Crockett replied there was a tree line to the north that ran across the entire north property line. If that was not enough screening, they would be amenable to additional screening. Mr. Thornhill thought the screening might address Mr. Cowan's concerns. Mr. Crockett stated they were to the extreme east of this development where there were already trees. He showed the area being discussed on the overhead.

Ms. Hoppe understood there would be three driveways onto Forum and long, narrow lots if this development moved forward with R-1 zoning. Mayor Hindman noted a variance would be required if they were to build three units.

Ms. Nauser commented that there was a lot of new construction in this area and some of the infrastructure was inadequate. Since the existing zoning would likely allow three units and a PUD could be used for odd shaped properties, she thought the rezoning was appropriate and would support the request. She noted the PUD also provided the City with extra oversight and control in the process.

Mr. Thornhill stated he felt this property was similar to the properties immediately to the south. In addition, there was a natural barrier and the PUD allowed the City some control and a better plan.

Mr. Sturtz stated he was glad the density had been reduced as it had been his main concern before. He thought the PUD was being used in the correct way by limiting the impervious surface. He wished the drive could be less than 24 feet while allowing fire trucks to still get through.

Mayor Hindman agreed with Mr. Sturtz regarding the driveway and suggested a sidewalk with a narrower driveway as he felt it would be a better arrangement. He also agreed this was probably better than what they would get if it were developed under R-1 zoning. His concern involved the infrastructure because if children lived in this development, it could be a bad situation due to the location of the school.

B250-09 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER and HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

- B247-09**     Voluntary annexation of property located on the east and west sides of North Tower Drive, northwest of the Prathersville Road and U.S. Highway 63 interchange; establishing permanent M-P zoning.
- B248-09**     Voluntary annexation of property located on the northeast corner of North Tower Drive and Prathersville Road; establishing permanent M-P zoning.
- B249-09**     Voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of North Tower Drive, northwest of the Prathersville Road and U.S. Highway 63 interchange; establishing permanent M-P zoning.
- B251-09**     Appropriating CDBG-R Stimulus Funding received from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for the construction of sidewalks on the east sides of Walnut Street, Anthony Street and Paquin Street.
- B252-09**     Appropriating funds for the Fire Station No. 9 drainage project.
- B253-09**     Accepting a conveyance for utility purposes.
- B254-09**     Authorizing a license agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the County House Trail crossing at State Route 740 (Stadium Boulevard).
- B255-09**     Accepting a donation from the Wal-Mart Foundation for the purchase of video and digital cameras for the Fire Department; appropriating funds.
- B256-09**     Accepting a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency - Department of Homeland Security to retrofit Fire Station Nos. 4, 5 and 6 with fire sprinkler systems; appropriating funds.
- B257-09**     Appropriating tax increment financing (TIF) application fees received from Tiger Columns, LLC.
- B258-09**     Appropriating tax increment financing (TIF) application fees received from 10<sup>th</sup> & Locust, LLC.
- R204-09**     Setting a public hearing: the East Side Sidewalk Reconstruction Project, Phases 1 and 2 to include the reconstruction of sidewalks along portions of the north and south sides of Walnut Street, the north side of Paquin Street, the north side of Anthony Street and both sides of Broadway and College Avenue.
- R205-09**     Setting a public hearing: construction of a water main serving Lot 2 within Providence Village South, Plat 1.
- R206-09**     Authorizing an Adopt a Spot agreement with Poehlmann's Lawn & Landscape LLC.
- R207-09**     Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for Regional Public Health Emergency Planning and Preparedness.
- R208-09**     Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the WIC Supplemental Food Program.
- R209-09**     Authorizing an agreement with Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri for Title X Family Planning Services.

- R210-09 Authorizing a Contract of Obligation with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for financial assurance for proper closure and post-closure activities at Columbia’s landfill.
- R211-09 Transferring funds for on-street striping, bike parking and other miscellaneous work and personnel expenditures.
- R212-09 Authorizing an agreement with Commerce Bank for the subordination of a CDBG loan for property located at 100 Leslie Lane; authorizing the City Manager to execute Full Deeds of Release on CDBG loans to Six-O-Seven House, Inc.
- R213-09 Accepting a donation of a 2006 Segway from Lorah Steiner to be used by the Police Department.
- R214-09 Approving the by-laws of the Chapel Woods Neighborhood Association.
- R220-09 Urging Congress to repeal the rescission of SAFETEA-LU transportation funding.

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

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

**R215-09 Authorizing the sale of Revenue Bonds for Water and Electric System Improvements.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted this bond had been approved by the voters and this resolution would authorize the City to take bids. The actual awarding of the bids would take place at the September 21, 2009 Council meeting. He pointed out the City was also pursuing State Revolving Loan funds for a number of the water projects and that was why the total did not add up to everything that had been authorized.

The vote on R215-09 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R216-09 Authorizing the sale of Build America Bonds for Sewer System Improvements.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this would authorize the City to take bids. State Revolving Loan funds had been approved for the wastewater treatment plant and a \$3 million grant had been obtained from the State through the stimulus program to help the project. There were a number of sewer projects that were not a good fit for the Revolving Loan fund, so staff was suggesting these be done with Build America Bonds instead of revenue bonds as it might save money in interest.

The vote on R216-09 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R217-09 Approving the Integrated Resource Plan for the Water and Light Department.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins noted the Council created a task force, which held nine meetings and two public hearings, in developing the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). In addition, the Council participated in a work session involving the IRP.

Mr. Wade asked what it meant to “approve” the IRP. Mr. Watkins replied it gave staff direction indicating this was something the Council wanted to do.

Mr. Skala understood this would not preclude them from disagreeing with some items. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct. He noted they could make changes as they went along and pointed out the issue of the Columbia Energy Center was not addressed by the IRP as it only discussed the Wartsila engines.

Mr. Wade understood this would not create policy or approve any projects. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct.

The vote on R217-09 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

**R218-09 Authorizing an operations agreement with Thumper Productions, LLC for the 2009 Roots ‘N Blues ‘N Barbecue Festival.**

Upon her request, Mayor Hindman made the motion that Ms. Nauser be allowed to abstain from voting on R218-09 due to a conflict of interest. Ms. Nauser noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that her husband had the beverage contract for the festival. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained staff was asking for Council review and discussion of the operational plan for this year’s event.

Mr. Sturtz understood Thumper was proposing the City receive \$1 per ticket in exchange for services beyond trash and recycling and asked if they had an estimated cost for the services. Mr. Watkins replied it included the out of pocket cost of bringing in additional people that were not scheduled to work that day and they expected those costs to be about \$20,000. As a result, the cost recovery was based on selling 20,000 tickets. Mr. Sturtz understood the costs were mostly police personnel and those costs had come down a bit from an earlier proposal. Mr. Watkins pointed out it was not entirely police personnel as there were also some fire personnel and a command center as well.

Mr. Skala understood there was some misinformation in that some people thought elderly people could not bring chairs. He understood Thumper had changed its mind and chairs would be allowed.

Richard King stated he was representing Thumper and agreed they were allowing chairs. He noted there were several entities they were trying to please, to include the City of Columbia, the University of Missouri and several businesses downtown. Although not everyone was happy, he thought a reasonable agreement has been reached.

Mr. Thornhill asked if he had any idea on how many single day and two day passes they would sell. Mr. King replied the bulk of the tickets sold were weekend passes. Mr. Thornhill asked if he had a ticket sales count at this time. Mr. King replied his box office had sold about 200 weekend passes. He noted they had distributed over 2,000 tickets to Boone County National Bank and Break Time as well and had recently replenished them. He thought there would be high ticket sales the last three days before the event.

Ms. Hoppe understood Thumper was receiving \$15,000 from the Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB) for the barbeque contest and asked if they were always going to do this or if it had been added. Mr. Watkins replied he did not know that was going through the CVB process until he received something indicating it had been approved by the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board. He thought it would be most appropriate to tie it into the overall agreement versus bringing it to Council separately.

Mr. Skala asked if this \$15,000 had been handled any differently than in previous years. Mr. Watkins replied the City through the CVB provided Thumper with \$100,000 for talent. This year the CVB money was focused on prizes for the barbeque contest.

Ms. Hoppe assumed that portion of the event included a lot of out of town people coming to Columbia. Mr. Watkins stated that was what the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board had decided.

Mr. Wade commented that he was disappointed by the fact there was not a City guarantee and suggested the City be reimbursed the same percentage for a weekend pass as they were being reimbursed for day passes.

Mr. Wade made a motion to amend Item 4 of the agreement associated with R218-09 so it read "...will pay City one dollar (\$1.00) for every one day pass sold and one dollar sixty-five cents (\$1.65) for each weekend pass sold for admission to the Open Container Area..."

Mr. King stated he did not have a problem with the change.

Mr. Thornhill asked for clarification on why he thought the ticket sales would pick up on the last three days. Mr. King replied that because the ticket price was so low, people generally waited until the last three days to purchase them so they could address the weather and other obligations. He noted they might add a box office or two at the entrances to handle ticket sales.

The motion made by Mr. Wade to amend Item 4 of the agreement associated with R218-09 so it read "...will pay City one dollar (\$1.00) for every one day pass sold and one dollar sixty-five cents (\$1.65) for each weekend pass sold for admission to the Open Container Area..." was seconded by Mr. Thornhill and approved by voice vote with Ms. Nauser abstaining.

Ms. Hoppe asked if a decision had been made regarding the distribution and tracking of the 200 tickets the City would receive. Mr. Watkins replied no and noted he was open for suggestions. Mr. Sturtz recommended a high percentage of the tickets go to low income citizens. Mr. Watkins asked if he should provide them to the Voluntary Action Center. Mr. Skala thought that would be appropriate. Mr. Watkins stated he would contact them to see if they would be willing to distribute and track them.

Mr. King stated volunteers were still needed and pointed out anyone that volunteered for two hours would get a free one day pass.

The vote on R218-09, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: HINDMAN, STURTZ, THORNHILL, SKALA, WADE, HOPPE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSTAINING: NAUSER. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

## INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- PR219-09 Adopting the City of Columbia Debt Management Policy.
- B268-09 Authorizing the issuance of Revenue Bonds for Water and Electric System Improvements.
- B269-09 Authorizing the issuance of Build America Bonds for Sewer System Improvements.
- B270-09 Rezoning property located east of Bowling Street, south of I-70 and north of Business Loop 70 (1619 and 1717 Mores Boulevard) from R-1 to M-1.
- B271-09 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation planning services.
- B272-09 Authorizing the East Side Sidewalk Reconstruction Project, Phase 1 to include reconstruction of sidewalks along portions of the north and south sides of Walnut Street, the north side of Paquin Street and the north side of Anthony Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B273-09 Authorizing construction of sanitary sewers in Sewer District No. 166 (Thompson Road); calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B274-09 Authorizing construction of the Columbia Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility improvement project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B275-09 Authorizing an agreement with Black & Veatch Corporation for engineering services relating to construction of the Columbia Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility; appropriating funds.
- B276-09 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with William W. and Lara F. Florea relating to property located adjacent to Wetland Treatment Unit 4.
- B277-09 Authorizing an agreement for conveyance of easements with Crown Center Farms, Inc. relating to the Clear Creek Pump Station and Force Main Improvement Project.
- B278-09 Authorizing a right of use permit with Alex and Marti Waigandt for placement and maintenance of a handicap ramp with a decorative handrail within a portion of right-of-way located at 808 Cherry Street.
- B279-09 Authorizing a right of use permit with Robert Grove for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a balcony to extend within the right-of way from the building located at 203 North Tenth Street.
- B280-09 Accepting conveyances for drainage, sewer, utility, access, storm water and temporary construction purposes.
- B281-09 Authorizing construction of a water main serving Lot 2 within Providence Village South, Plat 1; providing for payment of differential costs.

- B282-09 Authorizing Supplemental Agreement No. 2 with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to construction of the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) bridge over U.S. Highway 63.
- B283-09 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B284-09 Authorizing a park operation and management agreement with Boone County for the Jay Dix Station Park.
- B285-09 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Safety Center to conduct enforcement activities relating to hazardous and non-hazardous moving violations including seat belt and child safety restraint usage; appropriating funds.
- B286-09 Establishing new group insurance premiums for employee health and dental care plans.
- B287-09 Amending the Classification Plan and adopting the FY 2010 Pay Plan.
- B288-09 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

**(A) Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Requests.**

Mayor Hindman noted this report was provided for informational purposes.

**(B) Consideration to Add a Missouri CORE Representative to the Airport Advisory Board.**

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to bring forth an ordinance to amend Chapter 3 of the City Code. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(C) Paquin Metered Parking.**

Mr. Glascock explained metered parking was already along Hitt Street and staff wanted to extend it to Paquin Street.

Mr. Skala asked for the cost to meter a certain area. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it was a few hundred dollars to install since it had to be a certain type and had to have the correct software.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to proceed in contacting property owners for comment and to bring forth a resolution setting a public hearing to further discuss the issue. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thornhill and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(D) Report – Temporary Abeyance of Development Approvals and Permits.**

Mr. Watkins commented that they probably wanted to talk about this report in October when discussing all of the land disturbance issues, but the County Commission had proposed and asked for comments regarding this issue now.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to draft a similar ordinance for Council consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Wade asked if it would be more appropriate for this to come with all of the items involving land disturbance. Mayor Hindman understood the County did not want to go forward until the City did this and stated he was anxious to get the County on board with the project. Mr. Skala agreed.

Ms. Hoppe understood the County was holding public hearings and this issue would go before the County Planning and Zoning Commission in the near future.

Mr. Watkins stated Commissioner Miller indicated she hoped to have this approved in some form by the end of the calendar year. He suggested the City send it to the City Planning and Zoning Commission for comment prior to it being brought to Council. Mr. Skala suggested they notify the Environment and Energy Commission as well.

Mayor Hindman revised his motion to direct staff to draft a similar ordinance for the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Environment and Energy Commission to review and provide recommendations prior to Council consideration. The revised motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Nauser stated she wanted to know what other communities had done with regard to this issue and what constitutional challenges there might be in telling people what they could or could not do during this period of time. She asked for this information to be provided as it was going through the other processes.

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

**(E) College/University – Pedestrian Lights.**

Mr. Glascock stated MoDOT had added signals to the intersection, but they had not been activated due to conflicts with pedestrians. They believed it would be worse to have the arrow with pedestrians than not to have the arrow.

Mayor Hindman asked if there were pedestrian walk signals at the intersection. Mr. Glascock replied he thought there were. Mr. Skala asked if those had been activated. Mr. Glascock understood they had not activated the left turn signals.

Ms. Hoppe understood the left turn light to turn on College from University would give the driver permission to turn even though the pedestrian pattern was to cross the street then, even without the walk light. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. It was safer for a pedestrian to cross if the left turn signal was a green ball versus a green arrow.

**(F) Electronic School Signs.**

Mr. Watkins stated the City had received a letter from the Principal of Columbia Independent School regarding a request for safety zone signage. Staff agreed there was a high safety issue on Route E and suggested moving one of the signs scheduled for another school in a residential area to this area.

Mr. Glascock noted the Columbia Independent School was on Route E in a 40 mph speed zone, so they were suggestion pushing the Paxton-Keeley sign back one month, so a sign at the Columbia Independent School could be posted now.

Mr. Wade understood both Paxton-Keeley and Smithton sign projects would be delayed and asked if that was because more signage was needed on Route E. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mr. Sturtz understood Lee Elementary did not have an electronic sign either and asked why Lee was not on the schedule for signage. Mr. Glascock replied they worked with the Columbia Public Schools to identify where signs were installed. Mr. Sturtz understood these were the priority of the Columbia Public Schools. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Sturtz understood they were moving Columbia Independent School to the top over Columbia Public Schools because they had the responsibility for everyone. Mr. Glascock stated they normally would not, but Route E was a 40 mph zone and they wanted to make it safer. Most of the other areas were in a 25 mph zone that would be reduced to 20 mph.

Ms. Hoppe understood it had been the City's policy to provide these signs to all schools, not just public schools. Mr. Watkins stated that was correct.

Mr. Wade made a motion approving the adjusted implementation schedule for the electronic school signs. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(G) 1025 Walnut Street – Berry Building Renovations.**

Mr. Watkins stated this building was being renovated and the owner was asking for a number of exceptions and improvements, to include some 50/50 sidewalk match money. Staff was supportive of all of the requests except for the variance from paying for the three removed parking spaces.

Mayor Hindman commented that removing the parking spaces benefited the City as well due to the public improvements being made, so he was okay with the lost revenue.

Mr. Skala asked if the \$17,000 figure included the matching cost of the sidewalk and the cost of parking. Mr. Glascock replied the \$17,000 was the lost parking meter revenue they would pay the City. Mr. Watkins noted the City would pay the developer about \$10,000 for the sidewalk, so they were requesting \$10,000 for the sidewalk and were requesting to not pay the \$17,000 for lost parking meter revenue.

Mr. Thornhill asked if they were paying for the improvements mentioned in the report, which included curbs, sidewalks, crosswalks, etc. Mr. Sturtz thought those were the amenities they were offering in order to not pay the \$17,000.

Mayor Hindman stated this appeared to provide a general benefit versus a benefit for only the developer due to the crosswalk and the other improvements to the downtown, and thought the rule could be modified. He understood the parking utility would be affected. Ms. Hoppe thought the parking utility might not be affected negatively if this promoted more people in the downtown using the rest of the meters more often. In addition, they had recently installed more meters on Ash Street, south of the Orr Street Studios.

Mr. Sturtz made a motion to approve the developer's proposal of providing the twelve improvements and benefits in exchange for waiving the lost revenue due to the removal of metered parking spaces and to reimburse 50 percent of the cost of the sidewalk improvement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thornhill and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(H) Virtual Sewage Treatment Facility.**

Mr. Watkins stated this was in response to a Council request and involved the idea of eliminating inflow and infiltration (I and I) to slow down the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity.

Mr. Wade commented that a virtual sewage treatment facility was different than composing a private I and I reduction program. Mr. Glascock stated they were looking for a dollar figure and asked if \$300,000 was enough. He noted that was the amount they felt the utility could afford. Mr. Wade stated he wanted a more elaborate program and had some ideas.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to propose a virtual sewage treatment program, including the private I and I reduction program. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(I) Master Plan Update – Southeast Regional Park (A. Perry Philips Park and Gans Creek Recreation Area).**

Mr. Watkins stated the Parks and Recreation Department was preparing to hold some public information and interested parties meetings on the Master Plan for the 140 acre Perry Philips Park and the 320 acre Gans Creek Recreation Area.

Mr. Hood noted the upcoming meetings should be the third and final phase of the public input process. The meetings were scheduled for September 15 and September 23. After completing this round of public input, they expected to bring a plan back to the Council for review and approval.

**(J) Council Report – Automatic License Plate Recognition.**

Mr. Watkins explained this technology automatically read license plates, stored information and checked plates against databases of stolen vehicles and people with outstanding warrants. The Police Department felt it would be helpful and wanted to proceed with the purchase of this technology.

Mr. Skala stated he still had questions regarding how the database would be managed, how long the data would be kept, who was in charge of the data and how the data would be used. He understood the technology could be helpful if used in the right way for the right reasons, but noted there was the potential for abuse so he wanted detailed information regarding how the system would be managed and what controls were in place.

Mr. Watkins suggested it be the third item for discussion at the September work session.

Ms. Nauser asked how many systems or cameras would be purchased with the \$25,000. Mr. Watkins stated they were intending to use forfeiture money, but there was more to it than just the camera.

Ms. Nauser stated she was supportive of the police and the reduction of crime through proactive measures, but felt technology was getting ahead of them. While intentions might be good today, she was unsure of future policy changes. She understood the system could provide up to four cameras affixed to a designated vehicle and could capture up to 3,000

license plates per hour. This meant there was the potential for 72,000 license plates to be captured a day, and this was half of the population of Boone County. She wondered where the data went if it was not used. She wanted more information.

Mr. Thornhill wondered what data would be collected if there was nothing illegal associated with the vehicle. Ms. Nauser stated it was collecting the license plate information. Mr. Thornhill pointed out that was public information if the vehicle was registered. He asked what information was being collected that might cause concern. Ms. Nauser felt the problem was that they did not know.

Mr. Skala commented that if there were multiple pictures of the same license plate, there was the ability to track a vehicle. Mr. Thornhill noted anyone with GPS had already given up the ability to hide. Ms. Nauser pointed out GPS systems were not government owned.

Ms. Hoppe stated some of these same questions came to her when reading this report and agreed a work session was necessary.

Mr. Wade wondered how they could provide the police this as a tool while avoiding the imposition on privacy.

Ms. Nauser noted they also needed to determine how to handle sunshine law requests.

Mayor Hindman understood this would be discussed at a work session.

**(K) Bid Process.**

Mr. Wade stated he planned to talk to some small business owners, the Chamber and COLORS to see if they might find this information useful in determining how they might relate to the City's system.

**(L) “Stale” Multiple-Family Residential Zoning.**

Mr. Wade suggested this be discussed at a work session in October or November to determine what might still be stale and if they wanted to do anything.

**(M) WiFi on City buses (Update).**

Mr. Watkins stated this was in response to a Council request and the cost was about \$480 annually per bus plus an additional \$295. The initial cost would be \$31,000 if they had WiFi on all of the buses. Staff was suggesting a pilot project for some of the buses to determine its usage.

Ms. Hoppe asked if they would determine if it resulted in an increase in ridership. Mr. Watkins replied he thought they could look at that as well, but believed they first needed to find out if anyone used it. He suggested installation of this on a couple of the high use routes and noted data from a survey could be provided in six months or so.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to proceed with the pilot project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(N) DWI Unit Grant Contract.**

Mr. Watkins explained a grant opportunity had been offered to the City by MoDOT as they felt Columbia would be a great location for an example project for two officers whose primary function would be DWI apprehension. MoDOT had offered to cover 100 percent of the salary, benefits, cars and equipment for the first year. They would cover 75 percent and 50 percent the following years as funding allowed.

Mr. Wade stated he would be comfortable in moving ahead with the grant as there was evidence that specialized units had huge impacts.

Mayor Hindman agreed and noted with the dry campus, many students left campus and then drove home. He suggested this be coupled with a program to encourage safe cabs, etc. Ms. Hoppe stated she was hopeful they would eventually have a bus system that provided late night service and service on the weekends so people had another alternative.

Mr. Wade made a motion directing staff to prepare the necessary legislation to accept the grant. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

John Koschak, 1306 Rosemary Lane, asked Council to review the rates of other cities before amending Chapter 27 to increase electric rates. He understood St. Louis currently paid 4 cents per kilowatt, Kansas City paid 6 cents per kilowatt and Springfield paid 2 cents per kilowatt, while Columbia was paying 12 cents per kilowatt. He wondered why Columbia paid the most in utility rates when its population ranked fourth among those cities. He felt increasing the rate could be detrimental to constituents and suggested a cost benefit analysis be done before passing this amendment.

Ms. Hoppe commented that with regard to the improvements at Broadway and Old 63, there were no signs to tell drivers going west on Broadway and turning north to wait for pedestrians to walk by. She thought coordination and signage was needed so people understood the pedestrians in the walkway had the right of way. Mr. Watkins stated he thought it was in the works, but would look into it and get back to her.

Ms. Hoppe understood that a turn light at Stadium and Audubon would be installed as part of the approval for the Crosscreek development and asked for a status of when those lights would be installed. Mayor Hindman noted Crosscreek had not been developed yet. Ms. Hoppe clarified they had a light, but not a protected left turn. In addition, she understood Crosscreek was proceeding with three of its developments. Mr. Watkins stated he had heard that as well, but they had not received any plans. He stated he would look into it and provide an update.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there had been a report at the previous Council meeting regarding renaming a portion of Rock Hill and suggested they ask the Historic Preservation Commission to suggest a name.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing the Historic Preservation Commission to suggest a historic name for the portion of Rock Hill that would be renamed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe asked staff to look into the possibility of reducing the speed in front of the main entrance and exit areas to the Wal-Mart complex on Grindstone to 35 mph. Currently the speed limit was 50 mph there, but was reduced to 35 mph as one got closer to Green Meadows. She thought it was a dangerous situation because people coming out of the shopping area did not realize how fast cars were coming. She understood there would eventually be a light with more development, but felt this was an immediate concern. Mr. Watkins stated he would ask staff to look into it.

Ms. Hoppe understood more neon signs were appearing inside windows since those signs were not allowed on the outside of buildings. She asked if there was any prohibition against flashing or neon signs on the inside of windows. Mr. Watkins replied there was not.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to look into this issue and provide possible solutions to the Council. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Sturtz understood the Board looking into the chicken ordinance had rolled it into a larger animal control policy that was complicated and would take a long time to resolve.

Mr. Sturtz made a motion directing the Board of Health to extricate the chicken ordinance aspect from the larger animal control policy so it could proceed at a faster pace. The motion was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Wade and Ms. Nauser voting no.

Mr. Thornhill understood a traffic study had been done for Creasy Springs Road, north of the trailhead, and asked for a copy the study and for information regarding whether anything had been done.

Mr. Thornhill asked if staff could look into the intersection of Fairview and Ash to determine if it could be a 4-way stop instead of a 2-way stop. He also asked for cost estimates to be provided. Mr. Watkins thought there was a placeholder in the CIP as they understood something needed to be done in the future, but was not certain.

Mr. Skala thanked staff for working with the elderly lady who had been flooded near the Hinkson Creek as she was appreciative.

Mr. Wade asked staff to provide a report comparing Columbia's electric rates with those of other Missouri communities. Mr. Watkins stated he would provide that information.

The meeting adjourned at 11:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk